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ABSTRACT

The focus of this thesis is discretionary work effort, that is, work effort that is voluntary, is above and beyond what is minimally required or normally expected to avoid reprimand or dismissal, and is organisationally functional. Discretionary work effort is an important construct because it is known to affect individual performance as well as organisational efficiency and effectiveness. To optimise organisational performance and ensure their long term competitiveness and sustainability, firms need to be able to induce their employees to work at or near their peak level. To work at or near their peak level, individuals must be willing to supply discretionary work effort. Thus, managers need to understand the determinants of discretionary work effort.

Nonetheless, despite many years of scholarly investigation across multiple disciplines, considerable debate still exists concerning why some individuals supply only minimal work effort whilst others expend effort well above and beyond what is minimally required of them (i.e. they supply discretionary work effort). Even though it is well recognised that discretionary work effort is important for promoting organisational performance and effectiveness, many authors claim that too little is being done by managers to increase the discretionary work effort of their employees. In this research, I have adopted a multi-disciplinary approach towards investigating the role of monetary and non-monetary work environment characteristics in determining discretionary work effort. My central research questions were “What non-monetary work environment characteristics do employees perceive as perks (perquisites) and irks (irksome work environment characteristics)?” and “How do perks, irks and monetary rewards relate to an employee’s level of discretionary work effort?”

My research took a unique approach in addressing these research questions. By bringing together the economics and organisational behaviour (OB) literatures, I identified problems with the current definition and conceptualisations of the discretionary work effort construct. I then developed and empirically tested a more concise and theoretically-based definition and conceptualisation of this construct. In doing so, I disaggregated discretionary work effort to include three facets – time, intensity and direction – and empirically assessed if different classes of work environment characteristics have a differential pattern of relationships with these facets. This analysis involved a new application of a multi-disciplinary framework of human behaviour as a tool for classifying work environment characteristics and the facets of discretionary work effort. To test my model of discretionary work effort, I used a public sector context in which there has been limited systematic empirical research into work motivation.
The program of research undertaken involved three separate but interrelated studies using mixed methods. Data on perks, irks, monetary rewards and discretionary work effort were gathered from employees in 12 organisations in the local government sector in Western Australia. Non-monetary work environment characteristics that should be associated with discretionary work effort were initially identified through a review of the literature. Then, a qualitative study explored what work behaviours public sector employees perceive as discretionary and what perks and irks were associated with high and low levels of discretionary work effort. Next, a quantitative study developed measures of these perks and irks. A Q-sort-type procedure and exploratory factor analysis were used to develop the perks and irks measures. Finally, a second quantitative study tested the relationships amongst perks, irks, monetary rewards and discretionary work effort. Confirmatory factor analysis was firstly used to confirm the factor structure of the measurement models. Correlation analysis, regression analysis and effect-size correlation analysis were used to test the hypothesised relationships in the proposed model of discretionary work effort.

The findings confirmed five hypothesised non-monetary work environment characteristics as common perks and two of three hypothesised non-monetary work environment characteristics as common irks. Importantly, they showed that perks, irks and monetary rewards are differentially related to the different facets of discretionary work effort. The convergent and discriminant validities of the perks and irks constructs as well as the time, intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort were generally confirmed by the research findings.

This research advances the literature in several ways: (i) it draws on the Economics and OB literatures to redefine and reconceptualise the discretionary work effort construct to provide greater definitional clarity and a more complete conceptualisation of this important construct; (ii) it builds on prior research to create a more comprehensive set of perks and irks for which measures are developed; (iii) it develops and empirically tests a new motivational model of discretionary work effort that enhances our understanding of the nature and functioning of perks and irks and advances our ability to predict discretionary work effort; and (iv) it fills a substantial gap in the literature on public sector work motivation by revealing what work behaviours public sector employees perceive as discretionary and what work environment characteristics are associated with their supply of discretionary work effort. Importantly, by disaggregating discretionary work effort this research provides greater detail on how perks, irks and monetary rewards are related to the different facets of discretionary work effort. Thus, from a theoretical perspective this research also demonstrates the conceptual meaningfulness and
empirical utility of investigating the different facets of discretionary work effort separately. From a practical perspective, identifying work environment factors that are associated with discretionary work effort enhances managers' capacity to tap this valuable resource. This research indicates that to maximise the potential of their human resources, managers need to address perks, irks and monetary rewards. It suggests three different mechanisms through which managers might influence discretionary work effort and points to the importance of training for both managers and non-managers in cultivating positive interpersonal relationships.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

This chapter outlines the background and context for my thesis. It presents the overarching objectives and the contributions that my program of research makes to the literature. It also provides an overview of the remaining chapters of my thesis.

1.1 BACKGROUND

What motivates people to invest work effort beyond what is normally required is of immense interest to employers and business researchers alike. Today’s uncertain and turbulent business environment brought about by the current global economic crisis makes it even more critical for employers to find ways of gaining full potential from their employees (Sheedy, 2009). Thus, understanding what motivates employees to work at or near their peak level is a critical issue for business and society. To work at or near their peak level of performance, employees must be willing to supply discretionary work effort, that is, work effort that is voluntary, is above and beyond what is minimally required or normally expected to avoid reprimand or dismissal, and is organisationally functional (Barnard, 1938; Katz, 1964; Leibenstein, 1979; Organ, 1988; Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983). Discretionary work effort is both a theoretically and practically important construct because it is known to affect individual job performance (Latham, 2007; Leibenstein, 1979) as well as organisational efficiency and effectiveness (Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; 2004; Katz, 1964; Organ, 1988). This thesis is designed to identify those work environment factors that are related to the discretionary work effort of employees.

Decades of interest in better understanding the determinants of and the processes through which individuals decide to expend varying levels of work effort has resulted in a proliferation of work motivation theories and empirical studies into the determinants of work related behaviours. Despite many years of scholarly investigation across multiple disciplines, however, there have been limited efforts to integrate the many theories, concepts and empirical findings. As a result, considerable debate still exists concerning why some individuals supply only minimal work effort whilst others expend effort well above and beyond what is minimally expected or required of them (i.e. they supply discretionary work effort).

For many decades, traditional economic theories of work motivation have been dominated by the income-leisure trade-off labour supply model (Hicks, 1932 [1968]; Robbins, 1930), principal-agent and work discipline models (Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Shapiro &
Stiglitz, 1984), and various variants of efficiency wage theory (Akerlof, 1982, 1984; Akerlof & Yellen, 1990). The emphasis in these models has been the role of monetary rewards and supervision as motivators of work effort. Some more radical models of worker motivation have also appeared in the economics literature over the years. These have taken a more multi-disciplinary approach, integrating some personality, psychological and/or social phenomenon drawn from other behavioural sciences as motivating factors (Frey, 1997; Leibenstein, 1979; Tomer, 1981). These models were developed within a rational choice and utility theory framework but differed from conventional economic theory in several ways.

These multi-disciplinary approaches employed the individual as the unit of analysis rather than using a firm level or more macro level analysis that is common in conventional economic theory. Also, they drew attention to the importance of psychological and social factors in influencing human behaviour. Leibenstein (1966; 1979) was amongst the first economists to draw attention to work effort being discretionary. He emphasised the importance of worker motivation in inducing employees to invest in discretionary work effort. He highlighted the role of personality and organisational demands (supervisor and co-worker relations) in influencing worker motivation and hence effort. Tomer (1981) extended Leibenstein’s model to include elements of the work environment and opportunities for growth. Frey (1993; 1997) developed a crowding-out theory that focused on identifying conditions under which external intervention by employers (principally intensity of supervision and monetary incentives) would crowd-out intrinsic motivation, thus lower employee work effort. These multi-disciplinary economic models of worker motivation were conceptual and only limited empirical testing of the propositions contained in them was found in the literature.

In contrast to the economics discipline, the psychology discipline contributed numerous theoretical and conceptual advancements in work motivation theory especially over the four decades preceding the 1990s (Adams, 1963; Greenberg & Folger, 1983; Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Herzberg, 2003 [1968]; Katz, 1964; Locke, 1968; Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1961; Vroom, 1964). These developments included a variety of content (i.e. what motivates individuals) and process (i.e. the process of motivation) theories (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Mullins, 2006). Amongst the key advances were needs-motives-values based theories, job design theories, expectancy theories, goal setting theory, social cognitive theory, and equity and organisational justice theories (Kanfer, 1990; Katzell & Thompson, 1990a; Latham, 2007). There were also some efforts to integrate the plethora of work motivation constructs and theories within the psychology discipline (Kanfer, 1990; Katzell & Thompson, 1990a; Locke & Latham, 1990). Beyond this period, however, interest in work motivation in the behavioural sciences generally waned and no radically new theory developments have occurred since (Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004). Consequentially, over the last decade or more, claims continue to be made that
work motivation theory is lagging behind dramatic changes in the workplace and business environments, thereby failing to provide managers with the necessary guidance for managing contemporary organisations (Kanfer, 1992; Manville & Ober, 2003; Steers et al., 2004).

Special editions of the Harvard Business Review (2003: 81(1)) and the Academy of Management Review (2004: 29(3)) highlighted the significance of work motivation to organisations. Both special editions featured calls for more intellectual energy to be channelled into developing new theories and models of work motivation (Manville & Ober, 2003; Steers et al., 2004). Locke and Latham (2004) argued that even though existing work motivation theories shed some light on this subject, they all have limitations, and thus, our knowledge and understanding of what motivates employees is still very much incomplete. Amongst the issues and deficiencies that Locke and Latham identified in the field of work motivation research are the lack of clear definitions for many motivational concepts, and inadequate consideration of theories and research findings across disciplinary boundaries. They identified a need for theories that are more complete, broader in scope and more useful to practitioners. These authors also argued for new developments that are built on extant theories, take a cross-disciplinary approach and enhance our understanding of employee motivation in the contemporary workplace. Work motivation research has thereby been placed centre stage on the management research agenda. There have been similar calls in the economics literature for fresh approaches to theories of labour supply that take a more multi-disciplinary approach (see for example Kaufman, 1999; Spencer, 2003; Spencer, 2004a). My research responds to these calls for revitalised interest in work motivation. Its particular focus is on what motivates employees to expend discretionary work effort,

Work motivation and work effort are not synonymous but they are closely related constructs and are often used interchangeably in the literature. Work motivation is “a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual’s being, to initiate work related behaviour, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration” (Pinder, 1984). It involves “the multiple processes by which individuals allocate personal resources, in the form of time and effort, in response to anticipated outcomes or consequences” (Kanfer, 1987, p.239). These definitions suggest that work motivation manifests itself through work effort (Igalens & Roussel, 1999; Latham, 2007; Nadler & Lawler III, 1977). Work effort is, therefore, a critical outcome of work motivation with the level of motivation reflected in the extent to which an employee allocates time and energy to the performance of tasks (Kanfer, 1987). Thus, it is evident that a higher than normal level of work motivation can be expected to manifest itself as discretionary work effort, the primary construct and dependent variable of interest in this thesis. As previously noted, discretionary work effort is that part of work effort that exceeds what is
minimally required or expected. It is discretionary as it is entirely under the control of the individual (Leibenstein, 1966; Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983).

Kanfer (1990) noted that while researchers cannot directly observe work motivation, they can observe the stream of behaviours that reflect it. She contended that since work motivation theories are concerned with the determinants of effort allocation rather than the results of this behaviour, work effort is the appropriate indicator of work motivation (Kanfer, 1987). By deduction, discretionary work effort is the appropriate indicator of a higher than normal level of work motivation. Thus, within work settings, a higher than normal level of work motivation as observed through discretionary work effort, should be reflected in “what a person does (direction), how hard a person works (intensity), and how long a person works (persistence)” (Kanfer, 1990, p.78). Discretionary work effort therefore, involves allocating more than the normal amount of time and energy to one’s job and directing one’s effort toward activities that are beyond what is normally required as part of one’s job.

While early work motivation research conceptualised how motivational forces affected broad measures of job performance, the trend now is to investigate what motivates specific components of performance such as work effort (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999; Kanfer, 1992). Kanfer (1992) asserted that an advantage of this approach “lies in the extent to which specific motivational interventions may ultimately be mapped to remediate specific deficits in job performance”. In focusing on the determinants of discretionary work effort, this is the approach taken in my research.

1.2 THE RESEARCH ISSUE

Many authors have argued that too little is being done by managers to increase the discretionary work effort of their employees (Boshoff & Mels, 1995; Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; 2004; Mellina, 2003; O’Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000; Tan, 1999). More than two decades ago, Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983) contended that the low level of work effort often found in the workplace is a result of management practices and workplace structures that are outdated and undermine the work ethic. The continuing interest in worker disengagement found in the popular management literature (Aubrey, 2006; De Vita & Vernon, 2007; Fielder, 2006; Johnson, 2004; Kimball & Nink, 2006) suggests that this continues to be a concern. Dubinsky and Skinner (2002; 2004) questioned why some people voluntarily work hard while others choose not to, and what can be done to unleash discretionary work effort. They argued that answers to these questions are of theoretical and practical importance as they are critical to helping managers understand how they can foster a work environment that encourages high employee effort, and thus, enhances an organisation’s performance and success.
While economists and psychologists have a common interest in work effort, the different nomenclature used and the divergence of approaches taken in these two disciplines has meant that only limited attempts seem to have been made to bring these two disciplines together to investigate the phenomenon of discretionary work effort. Locke and Latham (2004) contended that the reluctance of organisational behaviour (OB) researchers to draw on theories and findings from other fields has obstructed the advancement of research in this area. Drawing on knowledge from different disciplines is an important step for creating a “boundaryless science of work motivation” (Locke & Latham, 2004, p.392). Thus, one gap in the work motivation literature that my research addresses is to adopt a cross-disciplinary approach to researching discretionary work effort as recommended in the recent calls for new directions in work motivation research (Latham, 2007; Locke & Latham, 2004; Spencer, 2004a, 2004b).

In the economics and psychology disciplines, various models have been developed to describe and explain work effort behaviour. Amongst these, there is no single theory of work motivation that incorporates all of the significant factors that motivate discretionary work effort. Rather, each field has a group of theories each of which provides a degree of insight to different aspects of work motivation, and hence, discretionary work effort. Each of these theories has its own strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, in my research I provide an overview of the dominant work motivation theories, concepts and research findings from across the labour economics literature in the economics discipline and the OB literature in the psychology discipline to describe and explain the nature of the relationships expected between work environment characteristics and an employee’s level of discretionary work effort.

While researchers in each of these disciplines acknowledge that the work environment, monetary rewards and individual differences can play a part in affecting an employee’s motivation to expend discretionary work effort, the emphasis given to these variables differs considerably. My aim is to examine the question of whether monetary rewards and non-monetary work environment characteristics are related to the level of discretionary work effort of employees.

The work environment is defined as “features of the job and the organisation that generate the stimuli to which workers may respond positively or negatively” (Katzell & Thompson, 1990a, p.68). These stimuli serve as cues to potential rewards (benefits) or punishments (costs) from which employees expect to derive satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Katzell and Thompson (1990a) maintained that these job and organisational characteristics can be used by managers as important levers for creating a more motivating work environment, thereby indirectly affecting the employee’s level of discretionary work effort. Thus, an improved
understanding of the critical work environment characteristics that motivate discretionary work effort will improve managers’ capacity to tap this valuable resource.

My research also draws specifically on findings relating to workaholism and entrepreneurship. This research is concerned with extraordinarily hard workers (e.g. enthusiastic workaholics, work enthusiasts and some entrepreneurs) and highly motivating work environments (as found in entrepreneurial organisations). Thus, this should provide further insight to the determinants of discretionary work effort.

1.2.1 The Economics Perspective on Work Motivation

Economists have traditionally focused on monetary rewards as the principal motivator of work effort. This view, however, has been extended to give some recognition to the influence of individual differences like employee attitudes (Hicks, 1932 [1968]; Robbins, 1930; Spencer, 2005), and work environment factors (Akerlof, 1982, 1984; Akerlof & Yellen, 1990; Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984). These models have included the influence of the intensity of monitoring by supervisors, cost of job loss and concepts of gift exchange, reciprocity and fair wage. These models primarily focus on firm level analysis and treat intra-firm behaviour as a “black box”. Some researchers within the economics discipline, however, have incorporated additional aspects of the OB perspective in their empirical studies and examined these phenomena at the individual level of analysis (for example Drago, 1991; Goldsmith, Veum, & Darity Jr, 2000; Mosca, Musella, & Pastore, 2007). This empirical research, combined with the multi-disciplinary conceptual and theoretical developments discussed earlier, has resulted in a small but growing body of multi-disciplinary literature on employee work effort in the economics discipline.

Two additional notable contributions to integrating OB perspectives into economic analysis have been the introduction of the concept of relational goods and the associated general theory of investment in relationships by Gui (1996, 2000), and the rational sociality framework of human behaviour by Ash (2000). These theoretical advancements retained the economists’ basic assumption of rational choice but enhanced it by incorporating well-established socio-psychological relationship-based phenomenon.

Gui (1996) proposed that the formation of interpersonal relationships results in the production of relational goods, social capital and flows of services originating from intangible assets implicit in relationships formed by individuals. Individuals may derive instrumental and intrinsic benefits from these relationships. Gui conceived that these benefits enter the individual’s utility function indirectly. Ash’s rational sociality framework is a general model of human behaviour that focuses on the benefits derived from the formation of interpersonal relationships by economic actors in various economic contexts (Ash, 2000). He extended Gui’s
view of interpersonal relationships by distinguishing between primary and secondary relationships. He conceived that primary relationships have intrinsic value and enter an individual’s utility function directly. Secondary relationships provide instrumental benefits and so enter the individual’s utility function indirectly. No evidence was found in the literature, however, of the ideas contained in Ash’s conceptual model being empirically tested.

Despite these developments, progress in multi-disciplinary work effort research in the economics discipline has been slow and substantial gaps still exist. Several of the theoretical models discussed use conceptual arguments and empirical findings from other disciplines to build propositions about the determinants of discretionary work effort. Many of these are yet to be empirically tested. In addition, only a limited number of variables have been considered in these models as potential determinants of discretionary work effort. Also, only a few empirical studies in the economics discipline have investigated discretionary work effort using the individual as the unit of analysis. Research using worker discipline and gift exchange models of the efficiency wage theory has primarily had a firm level or macroeconomic thrust. Furthermore, even when the individual has been the unit of analysis, discretionary work effort has been operationalised using either a proxy measure of work effort (e.g. Goldsmith et al., 2000 used self-efficacy to represent worker motivation and effort) or a relatively simplistic observable measure such as extra time worked (Drago, 1991). While Leibenstein’s theory of intra-firm behaviour presented discretionary work effort as a multidimensional construct, I found no economics studies that have operationalised this construct to reflect this multi-dimensional conceptualisation.

Thirty years ago, Leibenstein (1979) argued strongly for economists studying individual behaviour and building on the accumulated knowledge that already exists in other behavioural sciences to develop an intra-firm (or what he called ‘micro-micro’) economics research frontier. He supported employing methods of inquiry such as questionnaire surveys and observation that are commonly used in other social science disciplines to study individual behaviour in organisational contexts. My research aims to take up the approach posed by Leibenstein and contribute to the multi-disciplinary developments in the intra-firm economics literature to extend our understanding of the determinants of discretionary work effort. I aim to do this by combining research findings in the economics literature with those in the OB, workaholism and entrepreneurship literatures to identify a set of positive and negative non-monetary factors (called perks and irks) that are related to the level of employee discretionary work effort. The terms perks and irks have been borrowed from the entrepreneurship literature (Douglas & Shepherd, 2000) and will subsequently be defined and discussed (see Section 1.2.4).
In taking this approach, I extend the work of Gui (1996) and Ash (2000) by linking the rational sociality framework and the notion of relational goods with the perks and irks constructs. I apply Ash’s rational sociality framework as an organising structure for classifying work environment characteristics and I examine the usefulness of this framework in a specific behavioural setting (i.e. in a discretionary work effort choice situation). Furthermore, I extend Ash’s framework to encompass an instrumental monetary dimension of work environment characteristics as well as the instrumental and intrinsic relational dimensions posed by Ash to assess how these relate to different facets of discretionary work effort. In developing an enhanced understanding of the nature and functioning of these factors and how they relate to employee work behaviour, this research should help extend the range of variables incorporated in future intra-firm economic models of discretionary work effort.

In addition, in his economic theory of personal motivation, Frey (1997) contended that the relationship between monetary rewards and work effort depends on conditions in the work environment. He posited that in an environment that employees perceived as controlling, external intervention in the form of monetary rewards or intense supervision would crowd out intrinsic motivation and hence lower employee work effort. Under conditions where the work environment that is perceived as supportive, however, a crowding-in effect (i.e. increased worker motivation and hence increased work effort) might be anticipated. Thus, in considering how monetary rewards and non-monetary work environment characteristics relate to each other in affecting an employee’s level of discretionary work effort, I examine whether the relationship between monetary rewards and discretionary work effort is moderated by the presence of perks (as representative of a supportive environment) and irks (as representative of a controlling environment). This will add to the limited empirical testing of Frey’s crowding-out theory using a larger and more diverse sample than has been reported in the literature.

1.2.2 The OB Perspective on Work Motivation

Compared to economics researchers, OB researchers place less emphasis on the role of monetary rewards in determining discretionary work effort and focus more on psychological and social factors associated with the work environment and individual differences (Latham, 2007; Pinder, 1998). Work motivation theories are concerned with the effects of these situational, individual-difference and self-regulatory variables on the allocation of work effort (Kanfer, 1987). Within this discipline, the role of monetary determinants of work effort has been a major point of contention (Deci, 1975; Latham, 2007; Lawler, 1971).

The discretionary work effort literature in the OB discipline has primarily focused on extra-role behaviour (ERB) and the related concept of organisational citizenship
behaviour (OCB). This body of literature has researched how a wide array of non-monetary factors relate to discretionary work effort. These included individual characteristics, job characteristics, leader and co-worker relationships, and organisational characteristics (Organ, Podsakoff, & McKenzie, 2006; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996a; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). ERB is conceptualised as discretionary work behaviours that are not formally recognised by an organisation’s reward system. As a result, there appears to have been very little investigation into whether monetary rewards correlate with discretionary work effort. One notable study found in the OB literature was by Schnake and Dumler (1997). These researchers maintained that monetary rewards are a potentially important antecedent that has been overlooked. They argued that while ERB is not formally rewarded, employees may develop perceptions of these discretionary behaviours being indirectly rewarded.

My research approaches the investigation of discretionary work effort somewhat differently to prior studies in the OB discipline. I examine both monetary and non-monetary factors as potential determinants of discretionary work effort. The ERB research findings suggest that there is a potential link between monetary rewards and ERB. Supervisor ratings of employee ERB have been found to influence employee performance evaluations by supervisors. Thus, employees may form expectancies of pay rises as a result of engaging in ERB (Schnake & Dumler, 1997). By simultaneously examining monetary and non-monetary (i.e. perks and irks) work environment characteristics as correlates of discretionary work effort, it becomes possible to contrast the effects of a ‘basket’ of work environment characteristics. My research takes on board the economics approach of specifying a basket of work environment characteristics (rewards and costs) and looks at how these relate to the individual’s choice of level of discretionary work effort. This basket of work environment characteristics was drawn from the economics, OB, workaholism and entrepreneurship literatures. This approach contrasts with that taken in the OB literature where current research approaches focus more on how psychological processes translate work environment characteristics into an investment in discretionary work effort.

Furthermore, the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort in the OB literature emphasises the “direction” component of this construct. The narrowness of the scope of behaviours considered in the ERB research has attracted some criticism (Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; Entwistle, 2001; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). My research takes the different approach of incorporating a more sophisticated operationalisation of the discretionary work effort construct. In doing so, my research extends the study by Schnake and Dumler (1997) where a narrower conceptualisation of discretionary work effort was taken.
By bringing together the economics and OB literatures, it suggests that discretionary work effort can be categorised in terms of discretionary work time (i.e. extra time voluntarily invested in work that is above what is normally required or expected), discretionary work intensity (i.e. engaging voluntarily in work activities at a pace or with a level of energy that is above what is normally required or expected), and discretionary directed effort (i.e. voluntarily undertaking activities that are not part of one’s job description). This approach more completely represents the conceptual definition of this construct and enables an examination of whether each of these components of discretionary work effort has different determinants. This conceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct will be discussed in Chapter 2. Briggs and Cheek (1986) suggested that research incorporating sub-scales of a potentially unitary construct may be important if they are conceptually meaningful and have empirical utility, that is, if they are differentially related to other measures. Thus, if monetary rewards, perks and irks are differentially related to the different facets of discretionary work effort, then they are worth investigating separately.

Overall, my research will extend our understanding of the nature of the perks and irks constructs as perceived by employees and our understanding of how perks, irks and monetary rewards are related to self-reported levels of discretionary work effort.

1.2.3 Contributions from Workaholism and Entrepreneurship

As mentioned above, this research also draws from research in the workaholism domain. The workaholism literature specifically concerns individuals who contribute an excessive amount of work effort that is voluntary and well exceeds normal organisational requirements (Douglas & Morris, 2006). Thus, a central element of workaholic behaviour is an investment of time in work that is clearly discretionary. The workaholism research has investigated a variety of individual characteristics, environmental factors and even economic factors (particularly monetary reward) as potential antecedents of workaholism (Buehns & Poelmans, 2004; Burke, 2000, 2001c; Burke, Oberklaid, & Burgess, 2004; Harpaz & Snir, 2003; Scott, Moore, & Miceli, 1997). Thus, this literature offers an additional source of insight to what motivates discretionary work effort by examining individuals who demonstrate extremely high levels of discretionary work effort. Of particular interest are those factors that motivate enthusiastic workaholics and work enthusiasts as these two worker types are highly productive employees and derive enjoyment from work (Bonebright, 2001; Spence & Robbins, 1992).

Similarly, successful entrepreneurs work long and hard, voluntarily work longer hours than others and, like workaholics, often put their work ahead of their personal and family life (Bird & Jellinek, 1988; Hofer, 1976; Schein, 1987). What causes employees working within entrepreneurial organisations to be highly motivated and to behave entrepreneurially (i.e. to show...
initiative and engage in proactive, creative and innovative behaviours) has been of considerable interest amongst entrepreneurship researchers (Amabile, 1997; Hornsby, Kuratko, & Zahra, 2002; Hornsby, Montagno, & Kuratko, 1992). Like the preceding bodies of literature discussed, these investigations have examined the effects of individual differences such as needs and personal traits and dispositions, as well as the nature of the work environment and income as possible motivators of these forms of discretionary work effort. Consequently, this field of research, particularly that pertaining to corporate entrepreneurship, can also be instructive on prospective determinants of discretionary work effort.

1.2.4 The Theoretical and Conceptual Framework for the Research Method

Considerable value can be gained from bringing these different disciplines together to consider where they diverge, how they overlap, and how they might enlighten our understanding of what motivates discretionary work effort. In taking this multi-disciplinary approach, I opted to employ two extant theories of work motivation and their associated concepts from the economics and OB literatures, namely utility theory and expectancy theory, as the general theoretical framework on which to base my research.

Utility theory (Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Douglas, 1989; Hicks, 1932 [1968]; Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Robbins, 1930) is a dominant paradigm in economics research, and expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) is similarly a dominant paradigm in OB research. Utility theory and expectancy theory are the two cognitive choice models used respectively in economics and OB research. That is, they view work motivation as the consequence of rational choice based on a subjective assessment of what are the expected outcomes associated with a chosen behaviour and the perceived attractiveness of these outcomes (Steel & Konig, 2006). Steel and Konig (2006) effectively integrate these two models to show that they are essentially identical. Therefore these two theoretical frameworks can provide a useful common ground on which to bring together these two disciplines to investigate the antecedents of discretionary work effort.

According to the economist’s utility model of individual behaviour, a person chooses that behaviour which is expected to provide the greatest net utility (or overall satisfaction). It recognises that the consequences that any given behaviour or action may include both positive consequences (i.e. utility) and irksome consequences (i.e. disutility). Personal needs, and thus the subjective value employees place on the positive and negative elements, will differ for each person. These individual differences help to explain why employees with comparable abilities and experience, who work in the same organisation with similar pay and working conditions, and have the same supervisor, might expend different levels of discretionary work effort.

Similarly, the essence of expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) is that a person’s perceptions and beliefs determine how he/she chooses to behave, and that this behaviour is governed by
his/her expectancies about outcomes that will result from the behaviour and the value placed on those outcomes (called valences). Vroom’s notion of valence is comparable to the notion of subjective utility (Kopf, 1992) although it has been suggested that utility and valence have different properties (Latham, 2007). Valence refers to the attractiveness or value placed on the outcomes associated with a particular behaviour and, like utility, these may be either positive or negative. To avoid confusion from the differing terminologies used in these two disciplines, for the purpose of my research I employ the terms satisfaction and dissatisfaction, which I equate to the concepts of utility and disutility employed by economists and the concept of positive and negative valence employed by Vroom.

From the preceding discussion, it is apparent that to varying degrees the economics, OB, workaholism and entrepreneurship literatures recognise the potential role of individual characteristics, the work environment (including job characteristics) and monetary rewards as motivators of discretionary work effort. In my research I focus on the non-monetary work environment and monetary rewards as these are most directly able to be influenced by employers and managers. Further, I conducted my research in the public sector. This sector generally faces tighter financial constraints than the private sector and so is often unable to offer competitive financial compensation packages to attract, motivate and retain employees. Thus within this research context, the non-monetary work environment characteristics were of particular interest. Nonetheless, I considered the role of monetary rewards along with the non-monetary work environment characteristics.

As noted earlier, I use the terms perks and irks to refer to the positive and negative non-monetary work environment characteristics associated with a job. These terms were borrowed from Douglas and Shepherd (2000) who used the term “net perquisites” to describe the other working conditions (or non-monetary elements) a person associates with his/her job (although they had already separated out autonomy, work effort demands and risk). These authors identified net perquisites as comprising two elements, perquisites (or perks) and irksome working conditions (or irks). These two factors represent the non-monetary rewards and costs a person associates with his/her job. Thus for the purpose of my research, I specifically define perks as the positive non-monetary work environment characteristics and I define irks as the negative non-monetary work environment characteristics (Morris & Douglas, 2004). These factors are expected to be related to the level of discretionary work effort.

Recognising the different perspectives on the relative importance of non-monetary work environment characteristics and monetary rewards in determining the level of discretionary work effort, and the belief that employees will choose to invest a level of discretionary work effort
based on their subjective evaluations of the rewards and costs expected, the model of discretionary work effort developed for my research is presented in Figure 1.1.

**Figure 1.1**

**Model of Discretionary Work Effort**

While the above model of discretionary work effort does not explicitly include variables representing expectancies and satisfaction/dissatisfaction derived from the monetary and non-monetary work environment characteristics associated with the job, these are captured to some degree in the measures of perks and irks. These two constructs were operationalised as the non-monetary work environment characteristics that employees commonly perceived as attractive and unattractive (hence reflective of their valence/utility), and thus, motivate their discretionary work effort. Also, in the interest of retaining a manageable scope for my program of research, I opted not to include individual differences in my model at this point. It is recognised, however, that employee attitudes toward monetary rewards, perks and irks (together with a range of other attitudinal or dispositional factors such as attitude toward hard work or work ethic) could clearly and easily be added as potential moderator variables.

The central research questions that emanated from my model of discretionary work effort were:

- **Research Question 1:** What non-monetary work environment characteristics do employees commonly perceive as perks and irks?
- **Research Question 2:** How do perks, irks and monetary rewards relate to an employee’s level of discretionary work effort?
- **Research Question 3:** Do perks and irks moderate the relationship between monetary rewards and discretionary work effort?
These research questions were addressed through three related studies that comprised my program of research (see Chapter 3).

1.3 IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH ISSUE

The nature of today’s workplace is being strongly impacted by the changing nature of work and the changing composition of the workforce. Strong growth of the services sector, new technologies, the emergence of the knowledge economy, changing social and personal values, and a more highly educated and skilled workforce have contributed to the emergence of a large percentage of ‘high discretion’ jobs (Skinner, 2000; Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983) and this trend continues. This has reduced employer power and managerial control over employees, thereby placing greater work effort discretion in the hands of employees. Employees have come to expect and demand greater autonomy.

The highest discretion is typically found in customer contact jobs and knowledge jobs (Skinner, 2000). The rapidly growing services sector has a prevalence of high discretion jobs and so motivating employees to expend discretionary work effort in this sector is critical to the provision of quality service (Stamper & Van Dyne, 2003). High quality service requires high performing employees and high performance requires discretionary work effort (Bennett, 1991; Donnelly & Skinner, 1989; Isaac, Zerbe, & Pitt, 2001; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2003; Steers et al., 2004). Low pay and stress often associated with services sector jobs typically work against employee motivation and willingness to contribute extra effort.

By establishing highly-motivating work environments, leaders can inspire employees to expend high levels of discretionary work effort and, thus, high performance (Dubinsky & Skinner, 2004; Isaac et al., 2001; O'Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000; Skinner, 2000). Since this is not so easy to accomplish, a highly motivated workforce is a hard-to-copy and non-substitutable resource (Barney, 1991) of high-performance firms. Thus in today’s highly dynamic and competitive global economy, a motivated workforce is a critical strategic asset that can enable firms to create a competitive advantage and to compete successfully (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1998; Steers et al., 2004).

High performing firms induce discretionary work effort from their employees (Bennett, 1991; Donnelly & Skinner, 1989). Discretionary work effort can range from minimal effort (the level that just avoids reprimand or losing one’s job) to peak levels (the most an individual can be induced to supply voluntarily). Graziar (1992) noted that skills, knowledge, talent and creativity may remain idle without the motivation of individuals to use them. Thus, work motivation is critical to the discretionary work effort decision of individuals (Steers et al., 2004). It is recognised that discretionary work effort does not translate directly to job (or firm) performance.
as the latter is also affected by other factors such as employee skills and experience. Slippage between work effort and performance, however, represents a separate management issue. Nonetheless, holding other factors constant, greater discretionary work effort should bring about higher performance.

After taking into account differences in monetary rewards and individual characteristics, understanding what employees commonly perceive as perks and irks in the work environment and the relationship that these factors have with discretionary work effort is crucial to creating a motivating work environment. This can provide the means by which managers can foster levels of discretionary work effort that approach the full potential of their employees and thereby improve organisational effectiveness and efficiency.

1.4 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

This research makes at least five substantive contributions to the existing body of literature on discretionary work effort. Firstly, my research redefines and reconceptualises the discretionary work effort construct to provide greater definitional and construct clarity than currently exists in the literature. In a recent review of work motivation research, Locke and Latham (2004) noted that the diversity of work motivation concepts and approaches has created much confusion amongst researchers. Furthermore, Scott et al. (1997) contended that a construct can only be consistently measured and studied if it is clearly defined. As I note in my literature review below, the most commonly cited definition of discretionary work effort in the OB literature is problematic in that it defines potential rather than actual discretionary work effort and is inconsistent with the theoretical conceptualisations of work motivation and work effort. By adopting a multi-disciplinary approach for my research I was able to develop a concise theoretically based definition and a more complete conceptualisation of this construct. This contribution to the literature progresses the development of a “boundaryless science of work motivation” (Locke and Latham, 2004, p.392) and will enable a more consistent approach to the measurement and investigation of discretionary work effort especially across disciplines.

A second contribution of my research is the development of a more comprehensive set of perks and irks than previously explicated in the literature and the development of measures for these two constructs. Although the terms ‘perks’ and ‘irks’ were previously used by Douglas and Shepherd (2000), these researchers provided only limited insight to what constitutes perks and irks as this was not a focus of their research. These authors identified autonomy as a perk and risk exposure and work effort required as irks. All other perks and irks were lumped together as “other working conditions”. Furthermore, as they used conjoint analysis in their study, these researchers did not develop any measures for the perks and irks constructs. My research significantly extends this prior work by further unpacking what comprises these “other working...
conditions” to identify a more comprehensive set of non-monetary work environment characteristics that constitute perks and irks and by developing measures of these factors. In my research, the motivational effect of these constructs is then considered within the context of a person’s discretionary work effort decision which is a different application to that investigated by Douglas and Shepherd.

Another contribution of my research is to test a new motivational model that examines the relationships between perks, irks, monetary rewards, and discretionary work effort within a utility-expectancy framework. This model also incorporated a new application of Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework of human behaviour to work motivation. My research represents the first known empirical testing of the conceptual ideas contained in Ash’s framework and suggests the development of a revised conceptual model of discretionary work effort that enhances our understanding of the nature and functioning of perks, irks and monetary rewards in motivating discretionary work effort. While only at a developmental phase, the rational sociality framework appears to provide a useful organising structure for classifying different types of work environment characteristics and improving the prediction of discretionary work effort.

Next, the simultaneous testing of the time, intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort in the same study is a further distinguishing feature of my research. This approach enabled me to assess the conceptual meaningfulness and empirical utility of investigating these facets of discretionary work effort separately (Briggs & Cheek, 1986). The research findings revealed that there is a differential pattern of relationships for the different facets of discretionary work effort, thereby supporting the usefulness of this approach.

A final area in which my program of research extends the literature is in public sector motivation. Public sector motivation has attracted considerably less research interest than private sector motivation. In particular, there has been little systematic empirical research into what work behaviours public sector employees perceive as discretionary and what work environment characteristics affect these. Most prior public sector motivational research has focussed on individual dispositional and context-related attitudinal characteristics rather than work environment characteristics as determinants of discretionary work effort. Thus, my research addresses three main gaps in this literature. It identifies how public sector employees perceive discretionary work effort and shows that it is perceived in a manner that is consistent with the theoretical conceptualisation of discretionary work effort that I proposed in my redefinition of this construct. In addition, it establishes that existing measures of the facets of discretionary work effort, which were developed from research in the private sector, exhibit good validity in a public sector context. Furthermore, it reveals that non-monetary work environment characteristics are
important factors associated with discretionary work effort by public sector employees. Chapter 7 articulates each of the contributions of my program of research to the literature in greater detail.

1.5 THESIS OUTLINE

This thesis comprises 7 chapters. The introductory chapter sets the scene for the thesis. It provides an overview of the research aims and their significance, and an outline of the research issue, the research model and the research questions that form the focus of my thesis.

Chapter 2 provides an interdisciplinary review of the literature on discretionary work effort. It commences with a discussion of the discretionary work effort construct that has its origins in the economics and OB literatures. It examines how each of these disciplines conceptualises this construct. It then provides an overview of the determinants of discretionary work effort from these two perspectives and the theoretical framework in which my research is embedded. It explores the theories and concepts relevant to the supply of discretionary work effort by individuals, how they overlap and the limitations of these two perspectives.

A critical question that needed to be addressed before my research model of discretionary work effort could be tested was what constitutes perks and irks? Having an understanding of the perks and irks domains was essential to the operationalisation of these two constructs. Thus, Chapter 2 concludes with a review of the economics, OB, workaholism and entrepreneurship literatures to identify potential perks and irks. Here I also consider how monetary rewards, perks and irks relate to each other in influencing discretionary work effort. From these discussions, a set of research propositions are developed.

Chapter 3 describes the empirical component of the research program that involved three studies. This chapter outlines the research design for my thesis and provides an overview of how the three studies build upon each other to ultimately test my model of discretionary work effort.

The methodology, results and discussion of the findings from Studies 1 and 2 are described in Chapters 4 and 5. These studies addressed research question one and developed measures for perks and irks. The findings from Study 3 are then reported in Chapter 6. That chapter firstly concentrates on refining and confirming the measurement scales for assessing the level of perks and irks in the work environment, and then describes the empirical results of the hypothesised relationships between the variables in my model of discretionary work effort.

The final chapter, Chapter 7, revisits the research aims and integrates the findings from the three studies to show how this research program extends the discretionary work effort research frontier. It discusses the significance and implications of this research, its limitations and directions for future research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 OVERVIEW

Discretionary work effort is the dependent variable of interest in this thesis. The central research question addressed by my research is “what monetary and non-monetary work environment characteristics motivate employees to expend discretionary work effort?” Understanding why some employees expend more or less discretionary work effort than others is an important issue for researchers and practitioners as it has implications for the efficiency and effectiveness of organisations and the economy. This question has interested behavioural scientists including economists and organisational behaviourists for many years. Despite this common interest, the theories and concepts developed and the empirical approaches taken to investigate this phenomenon have differed greatly.

The economists’ conceptual models of discretionary work effort provide an understanding of some central work effort concepts and how individual differences influence the supply of work effort. The economist’s perspective in labour economics has typically emphasised the role of monetary rewards and monitoring as determinants of the level of work effort. In contrast, the organisational behaviour (OB) literature in the psychology discipline provides a well-established framework and mature theoretical base for examining how the work environment influences work behaviours. Here, the work motivation and extra-role behaviour (ERB) literatures are of particular relevance to the focus of my research.

This chapter commences with a discussion of the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort from the labour economics and OB perspectives. Here I consider the origins of this concept and the commonalities and differences in its conceptualisation. This is followed by a discussion of the different views on the determinants of discretionary work effort within these two literatures. Here I consider prior research in each of these literatures and identify the limitations of some of the discretionary work effort theories. From this I identify the gaps that my research aims to fill. This examination of the literature provides the underlying theory on which my model of discretionary work effort (see Section 1.2.4 in Chapter 1) was developed and empirically tested in my research.
The final section of this chapter examines two concepts which are central to my model of discretionary work effort, namely perks and irks. In the absence of clear conceptual definitions, specification of their domains or existing measures for these variables, a definition of these terms is firstly provided. Then, a review of pertinent economics, OB, workaholism and corporate entrepreneurship research is undertaken to identify potential factors to include in my investigation. This section also includes a discussion on the relationship between monetary rewards, perks and irks in influencing discretionary work effort.

One challenge in undertaking a multi-disciplinary investigation of any phenomenon is the variation in terminology used for what are essentially the same or very similar concepts in the different literatures. Therefore, in my review of the literature across these disciplines, I acknowledge such differences and then identify a representative term that I will proceed to use throughout the remainder of my thesis.

2.2 CONCEPTUALISING DISCRETIONARY WORK EFFORT

The notion of discretionary work effort appears in both the OB and economics literatures. It is recognised in both these disciplines that work effort is a complex concept. In the economics literature, the idea of work effort being discretionary to some degree can be traced back to the works of economists Jevons (1871 [1970]), Marshall (1890 [1910]) and Robertson (1921) as well as Leibenstein (1966) and Marxist economists Weisskopf, Bowles and Gordon (1984; 1983). In the OB literature, the concept of discretionary work effort has been attributed to Barnard (1938), Katz (1964), and Katz and Kahn (1978), as well as Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983). Nonetheless, perhaps with the exception of only Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983), to this day there has been limited acknowledgment of the parallel consideration of this concept across these two disciplines.

The Economists’ Conceptualisation

In the labour economics literature, the concept of work effort, and its sub-component discretionary work effort, is considered within the context of labour supply. Early theories of labour supply (Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Marshall, 1890 [1910]; Robertson, 1921) identified work time and work intensity as important and distinctive elements of labour provided. Jevons (1871 [1970]) was first to make the distinction between the hours employees work and the intensity with which employees work during their time at work (Spencer, 2003; 2004a). Similarly, Marshall (1890 [1910]) and Robertson (1921) differentiated work time from what they termed the ‘efficiency of labour’. Robertson’s notion of the efficiency of labour encompassed the natural quality (related to heredity and background) and skill of the worker, as well as the intensity with which the employee worked. The emphasis of Jevons’
theory of work effort was on the qualitative content of work and its logic was underpinned by the intrinsic costs and benefits associated with work activities (Spencer, 2004b).

The standard neoclassical theory of labour supply that appears in most economics textbooks today was founded in the Austrian School of thought (Green, 1894; Hicks, 1932 [1968]; Robbins, 1930; Wicksteed, 1910). This approach portrayed the work effort decision as a time allocation decision, in that work time is a simple means to a desired end (i.e. the employee makes an income-leisure trade-off) (Spencer, 2003). Thus, this perspective conceptualised work effort only in terms of work time (Spencer, 2004a). This conventional view of work effort considered that only work time was under the individual’s control. Individuals could choose their hours of work at the wage offered by firms but the intensity of work effort exerted during the time at work was assumed to be enforced under the employee’s employment contract (Bowles et al., 1984; Fairris, 2004; Leibenstein, 1977; 1978). The effect of this conceptualisation was that the level of work intensity displayed by the employee was treated as not problematic. This view came to dominate conventional economic theory and eclipsed the insights provided by the earlier theories of labour supply (Spencer, 2004a, 2004b).

This traditional conception of work effort was subsequently challenged by Leibenstein (1966) and Bowles, Gordon and Weisskopf (1984). In his discussions on X-efficiency theory, Leibenstein asserted that due to the incomplete nature of employment contracts and supervisory surveillance, there are no assurances that employees will work at the maximum level possible. He maintained that firms cannot totally control the level of work effort of employees and that, unless adequately motivated, employees typically deviate substantially from their optimal level of work effort. Thus, he described work effort as a complex and significant variable that has some degree of discretion (Leibenstein, 1966, 1977, 1979). While Leibenstein did not formally define discretionary work effort, he identified areas in which an employee can exercise discretion in their work effort. These included the choice of pace at which work is done (i.e. intensity), the time duration over which activities are undertaken (i.e. time), choice of activities (i.e. direction), and the quality of these acts (i.e. skill and ability) (Leibenstein, 1977). His implicit conceptualisation of discretionary work effort resembled Robertson’s (1921) conception in that both authors incorporated ability and skill as a component of discretionary work effort. Bowles et al. (1984) refocused the economists’ attention on work intensity as a component of discretionary work effort. These authors argued that employment contracts specify the hours an employee will work but they don’t typically prescribe how much work must be done in that time. Thus, the employee is given the opportunity to vary his/her level of work effort by varying work intensity.
Thus, modern neoclassical economic theory of work effort extended the traditional view of work effort to again recognise work intensity as a significant component. It is conceived that work intensity is to some extent discretionary due to incomplete employment contracts, the divergence of employer and employee interests, the inability to perfectly observe work effort and the costs associated with monitoring employee work effort (Akerlof, 1982, 1984; Akerlof & Yellen, 1990; Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Fairris, 2004; Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984).

Within the theoretical frameworks of discretionary work effort in economics, skill and ability are generally viewed as being distinct from work effort but interact with work effort to affect employee productivity. Bowles et al. (1984), for example, noted that for each hour worked, skill and experience make employees more productive. Thus, when greater skill and ability are combined with a given level of work effort (work time and work intensity), they enhance productivity rather than the level of discretionary work effort. Hence, it is more appropriate to treat skill and ability as determinants of employee performance separate from discretionary work effort. This view is well supported in the OB literature (Barnard, 1938; Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Pinder, 1984).

From the preceding discussion, it is clear that the standard neoclassical economics approach has been to conceptualise work effort in terms of hours of work supplied. According to this view, work time is discretionary. However, both the early writings in economics and some of the more recent literature (see for example Fairris, 2004) have acknowledged that work intensity is also a discretionary element of work effort. Leibenstein (1979) also considered the direction of effort (i.e. choice of activities) to be a facet of discretionary work effort. It could be argued, however, that Marshall’s (1890 [1910]) and Robertson’s (1921) conceptions of the efficiency of labour supply might also incorporate this concept through the choice of activities into which employees channel their efforts. Also, in his writings on Jevons’s early contributions to the theory of labour supply, Spencer (2003) extended Jevons’s (1871 [1970]) arguments on work intensity (what Jevons labelled the quality of labour) to include employee decisions to work with greater or less enthusiasm, dedication, diligence and creativity which points to a direction facet of work effort.

**The OB Conceptualisation**

In the OB literature, work effort is commonly conceptualised as comprising the dimensions of duration, intensity and direction (Blau, 1993; Brown & Leigh, 1996; Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Kanfer, 1990; Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen, 1980). Duration (persistence of effort) concerns the time aspect of work effort. It involves “the choice to persist in expending effort over a period of time” (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976, p.65). Thus,
it reflects how long a person works or keeps trying on a task. Intensity relates to the level of effort. It involves how hard a person works and so reflects how much energy a person chooses to exert per unit of time. These two facets of work effort encapsulate the notion of working long and hard (Brown & Leigh, 1996). The direction of work effort considers what work behaviours or activities a person engages in and with what frequency. That is, it is directing work effort towards activities that promote the attainment of organisational goals rather than activities that do not contribute to these goals, and thus increase organisational effectiveness. This effort may be directed towards activities that are part of one’s job requirements (i.e. in-role) or beyond one’s job requirements (i.e. extra-role) (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991). It has been argued that time, intensity and direction are all important in affecting employee performance (Blau, 1993; Katerberg & Blau, 1983; Terborg, 1976).

As mentioned, the idea of employees having some discretion over their work effort can be traced back in the OB literature to Barnard (1938). This author viewed organisations as “associations of cooperative efforts” and he talked about the “willingness of persons to contribute efforts to the cooperative system” (Barnard, 1938, p.83, italics are those of the author). Barnard's ideas paralleled work on work effort discretion emerging in the economics literature (Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Leibenstein, 1966; 1979; Marshall, 1890 [1910]; Robertson, 1921), although he did not distinguish between time, intensity or the direction of effort. Consistent with the approach of many economists (Akerlof, 1982; Bowles et al., 1984; Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Marshall, 1890 [1910]), however, Barnard differentiated “willingness to cooperate” from employee ability, effectiveness and the value of employee contribution to an organisation. He emphasised that it varies both within and between individuals. Thus like these other researchers, Barnard identified that part of work effort is discretionary, that it can be differentiated from skill and ability, and that it interacts with skill and ability to determine employee productivity. While he did not explicitly use the term discretionary work effort, Barnard was perhaps the first to draw the attention of OB researchers to this notion.

Following on from Barnard, a new perspective on discretion in work effort was offered by Katz (1964) and Katz and Kahn (1978). These authors posited that organisational effectiveness requires an organisation to induce employees to not only join and remain with the organisation, and to dependably perform required tasks by meeting or exceeding the quantitative and qualitative standards of performance; but also to elicit from its employees “innovative and spontaneous” behaviour that goes beyond role requirements. While these authors also did not explicitly talk about discretionary work effort, they described an array of innovative and spontaneous behaviours that they contended sit outside what can reasonably be enforced by managers as they lie beyond formal job descriptions.
Katz (1964) identified five forms of innovative and spontaneous behaviour. These were cooperating with others, offering creative ideas for organisational improvement, acting to protect and promote the organisation internally and externally, maintaining a favourable attitude towards the organisation, and self-training. Katz and Kahn (1978) argued that the willingness of employees to perform these discretionary work behaviours is critical to organisational effectiveness. These authors extended our understanding of discretionary work effort by articulating a wider range of work behaviours than had been specified by Barnard (1938) that fall into the discretionary work effort domain. Furthermore, they distinguished between effort to perform required tasks to quantitative and qualitative standards that can exceed employer expectations, and their dimensions of innovative and spontaneous behaviours. This implied that discretion in work effort could be in both prescribed work activities and non-prescribed work activities.

Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983) further extended our understanding of discretionary work effort by formally naming and defining this construct. These authors are credited with coining the term “discretionary effort” which they defined as “the difference between the maximum amount of effort and care an individual could bring to his or her job, and the minimum amount of effort required to avoid being fired or penalized; in short, the portion of one’s effort over which the jobholder has the greatest control” (Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983, p.1). Their definition, however, describes potential discretionary work effort (i.e. the gap between the minimum required and the maximum possible level of work effort) rather than the actual discretionary work effort by an employee (i.e. the gap between the minimum required and the actual level of work effort). Also, by describing discretionary work effort in terms of minimum and maximum levels of work effort, these authors explicitly identified it as a sub-component of work effort.

Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983) acknowledged the parallels between the OB and the economics literatures, by likening their concept of discretionary work effort to Leibenstein’s (1966) discretionary view of work effort, and Bowles, Gordon and Weisskopf’s (1984) concept of work intensity in the economics literature. However, they broadened these prior conceptualisations of discretionary work effort to include dedication and creativity (Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983). In addition, they noted that discretionary work effort not only varies across employees but also across jobs according to how tightly the prescribed job requirements are defined. These authors refocussed the attention of researchers on discretion in work effort by highlighting the importance of that part of effort over which the employee has greatest control.
Implicit in Yankelovich and Immerwahr’s (1983) description of discretionary work effort being a portion of work effort, is the idea that discretionary work effort has the same fundamental dimensions as the work effort construct. That is, it is conceivable that the time, intensity and direction facets of work effort each have some degree of discretion associated with it. Specifically, employees may expend discretionary work effort by: i) contributing more than the minimum required amount of time to their job; ii) working harder or faster (i.e. at a higher intensity) than is required or expected; and iii) directing effort into work activities or behaviours that are not formally required as part of the job but contribute to organisational effectiveness. For my research, I call these facets of discretionary work effort discretionary work time, discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort.

This prior work on discretion in work effort in the OB literature, especially that by Katz and Kahn (1964; 1978), led to the identification of new constructs; specifically, organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) (Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983) and extra-role behaviour (ERB) (Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean-Parks, 1995). As defined, these constructs represent forms of discretionary work effort. Organ (1988, p.4) defined OCB as “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”. Van Dyne, Cummings and McLean-Parks (1995) subsequently placed OCB within the broader framework of ERB. ERB is defined as “behaviour which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond role expectations” (Van Dyne et al., 1995, p.218).

Over the 25 year period since the OCB concept was first mooted (Smith et al., 1983), a growing body of literature on ERB and similar concepts (e.g. OCB, contextual performance, prosocial behaviour) has emerged. These concepts represent a variety of work behaviours that are discretionary and are indicative of discretionary work effort. These constructs represent the most prominent conceptualisation of discretionary work effort in the OB literature. For the purpose of subsequent discussion, I will use the term ERB to represent this body of discretionary work effort literature as it largely subsumes these other constructs.

ERB is a complex and multi-dimensional construct. There is no general agreement, however, on its dimensionality. Organ’s original conceptualisation of OCB described these discretionary behaviours as “small, mundane acts that when added up contribute to organisational effectiveness” (Van Dyne et al., 1995, p.266). Van Dyne et al. (1995) subsequently developed a nomological framework that classified ERB along a continuum of affiliative-challenging behaviours according to whether they solidify and preserve relationships amongst organisational members, or risk damaging these relationships.
Affiliative behaviours involve acts of cooperation, helping, support and promotion that may be directed towards individuals or the organisation to maintain the status quo. In contrast, challenging behaviours involve challenging the status quo by engaging in acts that question the efficiency of current procedures and aim to bring about constructive change in one’s own job, work area or the organisation.

Accordingly, Van Dyne et al. (1995) contended that since OCB focuses on non-controversial, cooperative, spontaneous behaviours that reinforce the status quo, these behaviours fit the affiliative class of discretionary behaviours. In contrast, challenging ERB is characterised by a “constructive expression of challenge with an intent to improve, rather than criticize a situation” (Van Dyne et al., 1995, p.252). These behaviours “proactively challenge the status quo and make constructive recommendations for change” (Van Dyne et al., 1995, p.266).

Within these two broad classes of ERB, at least 30 different forms of ERB have been identified (Organ et al., 2006). Many of these overlap and so are difficult to distinguish conceptually and empirically. In a critical review of the ERB literature, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) condensed these forms of ERB into seven fundamental dimensions. These are helping, sportsmanship, organisational loyalty, organisational compliance, civic virtue, self-development and individual initiative. The first six forms belong to the affiliative class of ERB while the seventh better fits the challenging class of ERB as it includes discretionary behaviours like voice behaviour, voluntary acts of creativity and innovation, and taking charge at work (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2000) which challenge the status quo and are largely change-oriented. Some discretionary behaviours included in the individual initiative dimension proposed by Podsakoff et al. (2000), however, fall under the affiliative class of ERB.

Individual initiative is defined as “engaging in task-related behaviours at a level that is so far beyond minimally required or generally expected levels that it takes on a voluntary flavour” (Podsakoff et al., 2000, p.524). This includes affiliative discretionary behaviours like persisting with enthusiasm, personal industry and job dedication. These discretionary behaviours are conceptually similar to the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. This conceptualisation of individual initiative cuts across the nomological network of affiliative and challenging forms of ERB proposed by Van Dyne et al. (1995). Morrison and Phelps (1999), maintained that the affiliative-challenging ERB distinction is important. They claimed that challenging behaviours are more effortful and reflect a “calculated, deliberate decision process” (Morrison & Phelps, 1999, p.405), and so, are likely to have different determinants to affiliative discretionary behaviours.
Thus, within the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort that I have proposed for my research, the individual initiative dimension may be better conceptualised as being limited to challenging behaviours and subsuming the affiliative individual initiative behaviours into the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. This conceptualisation of individual initiative would not only help to overcome the difficulty noted by Podsakoff et al. (2000) of theoretically and empirically distinguishing this form of ERB from the performance of prescribed job activities (i.e. in-role behaviour), but also provides consistency with Van Dyne et al.’s (1995) nomological framework.

Nevertheless, the ERB literature extended our understanding of discretionary work effort by building on Katz and Kahn’s (1964; 1978) research to greatly expand the range of work behaviours into which employees may voluntarily channel their effort. This concept can be incorporated within the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort that I have developed thus far, since it specifies various directions in which work effort can be voluntarily channelled without being specifically concerned with time devoted to work or the intensity of effort.

Entwistle’s (2001) analysis of discretionary work effort similarly positioned ERB within a discretionary work effort framework. He noted that ERB represents only one element of discretionary work effort. He differentiated between discretionary work effort devoted to prescribed job activities (i.e. in-role) and that devoted to non-prescribed job activities (i.e. extra-role). He conceived in-role discretionary effort as a voluntary level of effort that is necessary to meet the full requirements (beyond the minimum requirements) of a job. This involved putting in more work effort than is required to avoid being disciplined or fired, working at or near one’s capacity, and working as effectively as possible on prescribed job tasks. As such, his notion of in-role discretionary effort is conceptually similar to the personal industry/job dedication aspect of the individual initiative dimension proposed by Podsakoff et al. (2000). Entwistle (2001) further clarified our understanding of the discretionary work effort construct by “articulating the ‘connectedness’ between OCB and discretionary effort” (Entwistle, 2001, p.56) and making a clear distinction between extra-role discretionary effort and in-role discretionary effort.

Entwistle’s (2001) notion of in-role discretionary effort is supported by other OB researchers (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1966 [1978]; McAllister, Kamdar, Morrison, & Turban, 2007; Spreitzer, 1995; Stewart, 1982). It also harmonises with Katz and Kahn’s (1964; 1966 [1978]) notion of exceeding the quantitative and qualitative standards of performing required tasks. In addition, it is congruent with the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort propounded in the economics literature (Bowles et al., 1984;
Green & Weisskopf, 1990; Leibenstein, 1966; 1979; Weisskopf, 1987; Weisskopf et al., 1983). Thus, Entwistle’s concept of discretionary in-role behaviour is also conceptually similar to the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. This further reinforces the idea of treating this form of discretionary behaviour as part of the intensity facet of discretionary work effort.

In summary, research on discretionary work effort in the OB literature has emphasised ERB. As such, it has been conceptualised in terms of the direction that employees choose to channel their work effort (Terborg, 1977), or more specifically, the decision to direct effort toward behaviours or activities that are not prescribed (in addition to prescribed behaviours). Accordingly, ERB clarifies our understanding of discretionary work effort principally by tapping the discretionary directed effort dimension of this construct.

**Bringing Together the Economics and OB Perspectives**

As discussed in Chapter 1, Section 1.1, work motivation manifests itself through work effort. This involves allocating one’s resources in the form of time and intensity (physical and mental exertion) to work and deciding how much of one’s effort is directed towards prescribed (i.e. in-role) and non-prescribed (i.e. extra-role) work activities.

Within the labour economics literature, work effort is described as varying according to two dimensions, namely, time and intensity. Thus, discretionary work effort is defined as the amount of time and intensity per unit of time that employees choose to allocate to work that is beyond what is the minimum level required or expected (Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Kohli, 1988; Leibenstein, 1979; Marshall, 1890 [1910]; Robertson, 1921; Weisskopf, 1987; Weisskopf et al., 1983; Wickens, 1974; Wicksteed, 1910). This conceptualisation is narrower than what was envisaged by some economists including Jevons (1871 [1970]), Marshall (1890 [1910]), Robertson (1921) and Leibenstein (1979). Amongst these more radical theorists the types of activities (i.e. direction), and for some the quality of activities (reflecting skill and ability), were also conceived as elements of discretionary work effort.

Within the OB literature, work effort is defined in terms of time, intensity and direction, but when investigating discretionary work effort, researchers have concentrated on the direction of effort by describing different forms of behaviour that employees might adopt in demonstrating discretionary work effort. The extant ERB research has attracted some prior criticism over the narrowness of its scope (Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; Entwistle, 2001; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Thus, it is evident that there are shortfalls in the conceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct in both disciplines.
Thus, while it is recognised that the part of work effort that is beyond what is minimally required is discretionary, in neither the economics nor the OB literatures have researchers conceptualised this construct to capture all of the work effort dimensions. Therefore, one gap in the literature that my research addresses is to bring together these two perspectives on discretionary work effort to clarify and elaborate on this construct and its assessment. Specifically, I include discretionary work time, discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort in the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort. Furthermore, I draw upon existing definitions which collectively define discretionary work effort in terms of the following core features: (i) effort that is under the control or discretion of the individual (Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Leibenstein, 1966; Smith et al., 1983; Van Dyne et al., 1995; Weisskopf et al., 1983; Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983); (ii) effort that involves the contribution of time, intensity and acts that are beyond what is minimally required or expected hence are above the norm (Akerlof, 1982; Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Leibenstein, 1966; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Smith et al., 1983; Van Dyne et al., 1995; Weisskopf et al., 1983); and (iii) effort that benefits, or is intended to benefit, the organisation (Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984).

Thus, for the purpose of my research I define discretionary work effort as the individual’s voluntary contribution of time, intensity and effort directed into work activities beyond what is minimally required, expected or enforceable by the organisation in a manner that is consistent with the organisation’s goals and is intended to have a beneficial impact on the overall effectiveness of the organisation.

2.3 WHAT MOTIVATES DISCRETIONARY WORK EFFORT

2.3.1 Overview

The labour economics literature provides established conceptual models that relate to two core facets of discretionary work effort, that is, time and intensity. The conventional neoclassical model of labour supply appears to be essentially a theory of discretionary work time. In contrast, the group of models that fall under the rubric of efficiency wage theory (Akerlof, 1982, 1984; Akerlof & Yellen, 1990; Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984) provides a theory of discretionary work intensity. In addition, other more radical theories of discretionary work effort such as those propounded by Leibenstein (1966; 1979), Weisskopf and colleagues (Bowles et al., 1984; Weisskopf, 1987; Weisskopf et al., 1983), Tomer (1981, 1998) and Frey (1997) provide additional insights to potential determinants of discretionary work effort, especially discretionary work intensity. In contrast, the theories from the OB literature mainly seek to explain discretionary directed effort (see section 2.2).
In many of these models of discretionary work effort, an implicit assumption seems to be that encouraging employees to supply discretionary work effort is desirable. In examining this research issue, I acknowledge that there will be some point beyond which additional discretionary work effort can have detrimental effects on the individual and the firm. The negative consequences of high or excessive investment in discretionary work effort has been reported in the workaholism and OB literatures (see for example Beehr, Walsh & Taber, 1976; Bonebright, 2001; Buelens & Poelmans, 2004; Burke, 1999a; 1999c; 2001; Burke, Richardsen & Mortinussen, 2004; Kanai & Wakabayashi, 2001; McMillan & O’Driscoll, 2004; Michie & West, 2004; Ng, Sorenson & Feldman, 2007). While I recognise the potential detrimental consequences of excessive levels of discretionary work effort, the focus of my thesis will be on the determinants of discretionary work effort. Consideration of negative consequences is beyond the scope of my research.

Collectively, the economics and OB models suggest three broad classes of factors that should influence the level of discretionary work effort. These are individual characteristics, monetary incentives and non-monetary work environment characteristics. In these literatures, researchers have called monetary incentives and non-monetary work environment characteristics by various names. Financial compensation, financial incentives, pecuniary rewards/income/compensation, pay, income, wages and earnings, as well as more specific terms like bonuses, piece rates, gainsharing, profit sharing and so forth (see for example Drago, 1991; Mosca et al., 2007; Opsahl & Dunnette, 1966; Pritchard, Campbell, & Campbell, 1977; Ross, 1996; Terborg & Miller, 1978; Wickens, 1974) all belong to a class of factors that I call monetary rewards. Working conditions, work environment, organisational environment, organisational culture, organisational climate, contextual/situational factors, motivators and hygiene factors, positive incentives and negative sanctions, non-monetary compensation, non-financial benefits and non-pecuniary income/compensation (see for example Choi, 2007; Drago, 1991; Green & Weisskopf, 1990; Herzberg, 2003 [1968]; Karambayya, 1990; Mathios, 1988; Mosca et al., 2007; Organ et al., 2006; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000; Wickens, 1974) all belong to what I call non-monetary work environment characteristics.

Non-monetary work environment characteristics refer to the non-pecuniary things that employees associate with their jobs that can motivate (or demotivate) discretionary work effort. I call the positive non-monetary work environment characteristics ‘perks’ (from the word perquisites) and the negative non-monetary work environment characteristics ‘irks’ (from the word irksome). While these terms do not commonly appear in the academic literature as formal constructs (amongst the exceptions see Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Douglas & Morris, 2006; Douglas & Shepherd, 2000; Leibenstein, 1979), they can be found in the popular compensation
literature (Budman, 1994; Feig, 2004; Lissy, 1991). These terms are not commonly associated with any particular discipline and so suit the multi-disciplinary nature of my research.

The impact of the work environment on work behaviours is well documented in the OB literature (Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; 2004; Kacmar, Zivnuska, & White, 2007; Katzell & Thompson, 1990b; Lynch, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 1999; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Motowidlo, 2000; O’Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 1996a) and in the corporate entrepreneurship literature (Amabile, 1997; Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, & Kramer, 2004; Douglas & Shepherd, 2000; Eisenhauer, 1995; Hamel, 2000; Hornsby, Kuratko, & Montagno, 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002; Kanter, 1987, 1992; Kuratko, Montagno, & Hornsby, 1990; Morris & Douglas, 2004; Shinn, 2004), and perhaps to a lesser extent in the labour economics literature (Akerlof & Yellen, 1990; Bowles et al., 1984; Douglas, 1989; Drago, 1991; Fairris, 2004; Frey, 1993; 1997; Lazear, 1991; Leibenstein, 1966; Mosca et al., 2007; Weisskopf et al., 1983) and in the workaholism literature (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004; Burke, 1999c, 2000; Burke et al., 2004; Douglas, 1989; Douglas & Morris, 2006; Harpaz & Snir, 2003; Kanai & Wakabayashi, 2001; Mudrack & Naughton, 2001). These literatures provide a solid foundation for identifying potential perks and irks in the workplace which is considered in Section 2.4 of this chapter.

For the purpose of this research I limit my investigation of the determinants of discretionary work effort to consideration of the role of monetary reward, perks and irks as these are most pertinent to my research. My central research question is about identifying what monetary and non-monetary work environment variables can be manipulated to increase the level of discretionary work effort of employees, and so, individual characteristics and perks and irks that are external to the organisation are not examined. The internal work environment characteristics are very relevant to employers and managers as they are most directly under their control (Cordery, 2007). The aim of the following section of this literature review, therefore, is to identify those factors within the work environment that should be related to discretionary work effort.

2.3.2 The Organising Theoretical Framework

Theoretical frameworks of work motivation in the labour economics and the OB literatures suggest how factors in the work environment can affect the employee’s level of discretionary work effort. Two compatible theoretical approaches from each of these literatures are used as the guiding framework for my research. These are the utility theory from economics and the expectancy theory of work motivation from psychology. Together, these theories provide
an organising framework for describing and explaining employee work behaviour and explicate the underpinning assumptions on which this research is based.

Utility theory and expectancy theory are both cognitive rational choice models. That is, they view employee work effort as the consequence of rational decision-making based on a subjective assessment of the expected outcomes (extrinsic and intrinsic) associated with a chosen behaviour and the perceived attractiveness of the outcomes that are expected to result from it (Steel & Konig, 2006). In these frameworks, an employee assesses the anticipated benefits and costs associated with different levels of discretionary work effort. The employee’s decision is governed by two key judgements; an assessment of the likelihood that greater effort invested will lead to a given outcome, and an assessment of the value of the outcome to the employee (Haworth & Levy, 2001; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). My research does not empirically test these propositions as prior research already attests to their validity (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Drago, 1991; Goldsmith et al., 2000; Kanfer, 1990; Pinder, 1984). Instead, I used these assumptions as theoretical arguments and justifications for identifying work environment characteristics that will be associated with discretionary work effort.

Utility theory (Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Hicks, 1932 [1968]; Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Martinoia, 2003; Robbins, 1930) is a dominant theoretical framework in the economic analysis of individual behaviour in economic settings. It underpins most theories of work effort in labour economics. Within this framework, employees are modelled as weighing up the rewards that yield satisfaction expected from greater work effort, against the costs that create dissatisfaction expected from exerting this extra effort (Drago, 1991; Kahn & Sherer, 1990; Lazear, 1986). The rewards and costs and the resulting satisfaction or dissatisfaction associated with extra work effort, will vary for different employees due to the subjective nature of the assessments made. If the expected rewards exceed the anticipated costs, the utility maximising employee is induced to increase his or her work effort above the minimum level expected or required. The discretionary work effort expended may take the form of working longer (a time allocation choice), working harder during the time spent at work (a work intensity choice), or some combination of the two.

In the OB literature, expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) has been used extensively as a general motivational framework for investigating a variety of work behaviours including discretionary work effort (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999; Steers et al., 2004). Within this framework the employees’ judgements about the potential benefits (expected satisfaction) and costs (expected dissatisfaction) associated with investing more discretionary work effort are central to the employee’s decision to expend extra effort (Kanfer, 1987). According to this model, an employee’s motivation to expend discretionary work effort is governed by three factors. First is
the extent to which the employee believes that greater work effort will result in higher performance (an effort-performance link called expectancy). Second is the extent of the employee’s belief that performance of the given behaviour will be rewarded (a performance-outcome link called instrumentality). Third is the attractiveness of the reward or outcome (called valence). The attractiveness of a given reward will depend on the employee’s needs and values (Fudge & Schlacter, 1999; Steers et al., 2004; Vroom, 1964).

There are several points of commonality between the subjective utility and expectancy theories (Steel & Konig, 2006). First, the concepts of valence and utility are similar. Valence refers to the expected attractiveness of outcomes and is typically operationalised as the importance, attractiveness, desirability or expected satisfaction from the outcomes. Utility is the expected satisfaction derived from the outcomes of a given behaviour. In the happiness literature in economics, satisfaction is used as a proxy measure of utility (Blanchflower & Oswald, 1999; Clark & Oswald, 1996; Frey & Stutzer, 2002). Thus, Vroom’s notion of valence is analogous to the concept of subjective or experienced utility (Becker, 1962; Guest, 1990; Kahneman, Wakker, & Sarin, 1997; Kopf, 1992; Martinoia, 2003; Steel & Konig, 2006).

Second, both theories propose that the employee’s perceptions of the link between behaviour and rewards and the value attached to those rewards determines whether or not he or she is motivated to expend discretionary work effort (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Employee perceptions have a significant effect on work behaviour and positive work environment experiences increase the level of discretionary work effort (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Hackman & Oldham, 1980; James & James, 1989; Kahn, 1990). Thus, in this research it is appropriate to assess employee perceptions of the work environment rather than using objective measures of the work environment to assess the relationship between monetary rewards, perks and irks, and the level of discretionary work effort.

Third, both utility and valence may be positive or negative. This common aspect of the utility-expectancy framework especially suits an examination of perks (positive factors) and irks (negative factors) in the workplace, which is an important focus of my research. Morrison and Phelps (1999) emphasised the importance of including both expected benefits and costs in the discretionary work behaviour decision-making process. Thus in the utility-expectancy framework, an employee decides whether or not to expend discretionary work effort by weighing up the expected benefits like an increased chance of promotion with the anticipated costs such as disapproval from others. This suggests that both positive and negative work environment characteristics need to be identified to understand the factors underlying discretionary work effort. Also, it is suggested in the literature that positive and negative work environment factors may differ in their potency to influence employee behaviour (Amabile et al., 2004; Herzberg,
Thus if only positive or negative work environment characteristics are investigated, then potentially more powerful predictors of discretionary work effort may be overlooked.

Using utility and expectancy theories as the organising framework for my research is appropriate for several reasons. First, as both of these theories have parallel underpinning principles (Guest, 1990), they provide a useful bridge for linking the labour economics and OB literatures to investigate the determinants of discretionary work effort. Second, discretionary workbehaviours are contended to be characteristically deliberate and controlled rather than expressive and emotional (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Thus, the decision to expend discretionary work effort is sensitive to perceptions of the work environment and involves cognitive processes to assess the costs and benefits of the decision (Haworth & Levy, 2001; McAllister et al., 2007; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Since the subjective utility and expectancy theories focus on the cognitive processes underlying behaviour, they are particularly appropriate for explaining discretionary work effort. Third, since the 1990s, OB researchers have frequently used expectancy theory as a general organising framework to investigate specific workbehaviours like discretionary work effort. Its core propositions are well established empirically (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999; Van Erde & Thierry, 1996). Similarly, utility theory has been used as a general organising framework in labour economics research due to its ability to explain behaviour (Guest, 1990; Kahn & Sherer, 1990). Thus, these two theories provide a solid foundation for my research.

While these two theories provide a framework for understanding the cognitive processes underlying the decision to invest discretionary work effort, they do not go on to specify what work environment characteristics inform employees’ beliefs about the expected satisfaction and dissatisfaction associated with various workbehaviours. Thus, in the literature review on perks and irks that follows, I incorporate discussions on other specific theories of workmotivation to help identify what non-monetary work environment characteristics may constitute perks and irks, and how and why these should influence discretionary work effort.

2.4 CONCEPTUALISING THE PERKS AND IRKS DOMAIN

To empirically test my model of discretionary work effort presented in Chapter 1, a key requirement was to delineate what constitutes perks and irks so that these constructs can be operationalised. The purpose of this section of the literature review, therefore, is to examine the extant literature to see what non-monetary work environment characteristics could potentially tap the perks and irks domains. No single theory has identified a comprehensive set of work environment factors that determine discretionary work effort. Consequently, there is no general agreement on what factors matter most in motivating (or
demotivating) discretionary work effort and so might be categorised as perks and irks. Thus, I reviewed four main bodies of literature relating to discretionary work effort to assist with identifying potential perks and irks. These were the literatures on OB, labour economics, corporate entrepreneurship and workaholism.

These four fields differ in the extent of their focus on the overall level of discretionary work effort or particular dimensions of discretionary work effort (see the discussion in Section 2.2). Thus, to develop my model of discretionary work effort, I drew on work motivation theories and I examined works on the determinants of overall discretionary work effort as well as its three dimensions of time, intensity and direction (which is also multi-faceted). The labour economics literature and research on workaholism were particularly pertinent to identifying determinants of the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort as well as the overall level of discretionary work effort. The OB literature and research on corporate entrepreneurship were especially relevant to identifying determinants of various work behaviours that fall under the direction facet of discretionary work effort. Specifically, the literature on affiliative ERBs, challenging ERBs, personal initiative, and creative and innovative work behaviours provided insight into potential predictors of this facet of discretionary work effort. Those non-monetary work environment characteristics identified in these literatures to be positively related to discretionary work effort and/or any one of its dimensions are then posited to be potential perks. Similarly, non-monetary work environment characteristics identified in these literatures to be negatively related to discretionary work effort and/or any one of its dimensions are posited to be potential irks.

My examination of the research on workaholism mainly focuses on what motivates enthusiastic workaholics and work enthusiasts (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004; Burke, 2000; Spence & Robbins, 1992). These worker types are recognised as happy hard workers who are intrinsically and extrinsically motivated to invest high levels of discretionary work effort (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004). As work environment characteristics have motivating potential for these two worker types, these research findings were considered most relevant to my research aims. In my review of the direction of discretionary effort I looked toward research on affiliative and challenging forms of ERB (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Van Dyne et al., 1995), and related concepts like proactive behaviour (Ohly, Sonnentag, & Plunkte, 2006; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006), personal initiative (Frese, Garst, & Fay, 2006; Frese, Kring, Snoose, & Zempel, 1996), creativity and innovation (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron, 1996; Scott & Bruce, 1994) and corporate entrepreneurship (or intrapreneurship) (Hornsby et al., 2002; Kuratko et al., 1990).
Using an approach similar to that employed by other researchers (Amabile, 1996; Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Hornsby et al., 1999; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Parker et al., 2006), I sought to identify potential perks and irks based on their theoretical validity, their consistency across studies and their compatibility with the theoretical subjective utility-expectancy frameworks underpinning my research model. That is, I focussed on identifying specific non-monetary work environment characteristics that have been identified in the literature as predictors of either the overall level of discretionary work effort or specific facets of discretionary work effort. I then used the decision-making judgements associated with the subjective utility-expectancy framework as theoretical justifications for explaining why these variables should be related to the level of discretionary work effort. Here I considered if the work environment characteristic was likely to impede or support an employee’s increased effort, and whether an investment of discretionary work effort was likely to attract a positive response due to potentially beneficial or rewarding consequences expected or a negative response due to potentially harmful or costly consequences expected.

In the OB literature, Herzberg (2003 [1968]) identified a dichotomy of factors that he called motivators and hygiene factors. His two-factor theory of work motivation provided a useful starting point for identifying potential classes of perks and irks. Although some aspects of this theory has attracted considerable criticism (see for example Pinder, 1984), his framework was useful in my search for perks and irks because it focussed on both motivators and demotivators of employee work effort. That is, both positive and negative work environment characteristics were thought to be related to work motivation.

Based on qualitative interviews in which employees reported work experiences of extreme satisfaction and dissatisfaction, Herzberg (2003 [1968]) concluded that one set of factors that act as drivers of positive work attitudes and high work motivation could be differentiated from another set of work environment factors that act as drivers of negative job attitudes and low work motivation. The first set of factors (labelled intrinsic motivators) represented intrinsic job characteristics, including achievement, recognition for achievement, responsibility, advancement, challenging work that provided growth, and the nature of the work itself. The second set of factors (labelled hygiene factors) were principally extrinsic work environment factors such as company policy and administration, negative relationships with supervisors and co-workers, and poor working conditions (including physical conditions, pay and job security).

Although the motivators-hygiene distinction has not been supported by further research (King, 1970), Herzberg’s theoretical framework informed my search for perks and irks in three ways. Firstly, he drew our attention to the need to examine both positive and
negative features of the work environment in affecting work attitudes and behaviour. Secondly, in identifying two sets of factors, he separated the work environment into two parts, namely, “the job” and “the organisation”. Although he linked job characteristics to positive responses and organisational characteristics to negative responses, it has since been maintained that both parts have the potential to generate stimuli that may cause employees to respond positively or negatively (Katzell & Thompson, 1990a). Thus, “the job” and “the organisation” provided a starting point for identifying categories of perks and irks. Thirdly, within the job category (i.e. intrinsic motivators) Herzberg provided a list of core job attributes that may be perceived as a category of perks as these features were identified as things that provide satisfaction, and hence, motivation. Within the organisation category (i.e. hygiene factors), he listed organisational characteristics that may be perceived as one or more categories of irks as he identified these factors as sources of dissatisfaction-avoidance, and hence, demotivation.

A closer examination of Herzberg’s (2003 [1968]) organisational factors suggests that the hygiene factors might be further sub-divided into social-interpersonal characteristics (i.e. relationships with supervisors and co-workers) and organisational characteristics (i.e. company policy and administration, and working conditions). This classification is consistent with the main categories of determinants of discretionary work effort identified in the OB literature (Podsakoff et al., 2000) and the corporate entrepreneurship literature (Amabile et al., 1996; Hornsby et al., 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002), namely, job characteristics, leader and co-worker behaviours, organisational characteristics and personal characteristics (attitudinal and dispositional). Personal characteristics, however, lie beyond the scope of this study and so are not considered. Thus, incorporating these developments since Herzberg’s early work, I progressed my review by identifying potential perks and irks within the work environment categories of job characteristics, social-interpersonal factors (i.e. leader behaviour and co-worker behaviour) and organisational characteristics.

Herzberg also classified monetary rewards as a hygiene factor. In the economics literature, monetary and non-monetary incentives are clearly delineated as potential determinants of discretionary work effort (Arai, 1994; Drago, 1991; Lazear, 1986; Leonard, 1987; Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984; Wickens, 1974). Also, in the workaholism literature economic influences on workaholic behaviour are considered separately from other personal and work environment factors (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004; Harpaz & Snir, 2003). Therefore, I investigated monetary rewards as a separate predictor of discretionary work effort to perks and irks (non-monetary work environment characteristics).
Having identified these broad categories of determinants of discretionary work effort, in the following sections of my literature review I identify potential perks and irks within each of these categories. I consider positive factors that may induce a positive response (i.e. increased discretionary work effort) as well as negative factors that may generate a negative response (i.e. decreased discretionary work effort). To determine which variables within each of these categories are likely to function as perks and irks, I considered whether or not there is a sound theoretical argument and/or strong empirical evidence for them having a direct relationship with the overall level of discretionary work effort or at least one of its dimensions (i.e. time, intensity or direction).

2.4.1 Job Characteristics

Job characteristics are a central and important component of an employee’s work. These represent attributes that are inherent to the job due to either the nature of the work or the design of the job with motivation related effects on employees. This factor has been researched extensively in the disciplines under review.

Positive Job Characteristics

Herzberg (2003 [1968]) was perhaps the first researcher to draw attention to the motivating role of job content. He maintained that job characteristics can provide stimuli that enable the employee to experience psychological growth. The importance of job content as a determinant of discretionary work effort is supported by the ‘needs theories’ of work motivation (Herzberg, 2003 [1968]; Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1961) and by the job content model (Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1976, 1980) that built on Herzberg’s work.

According to the needs theories, challenging, interesting and meaningful work allows employees to attain higher order needs such as self-esteem and self-actualisation. Similarly, proponents of work design theory (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Parker, Wall, & Cordery, 2001) advocate that jobs that are meaningful, interesting and challenging motivate greater effort and enhance employee satisfaction. Hackman and Oldham (1975, 1976, 1980) identified autonomy and task variety, significance, identity and feedback as core job characteristics with motivating potential. Autonomy gives employees control and ownership, and thus, provides a greater sense of responsibility. Task variety, significance and identity provide a sense of meaningfulness, while task feedback provides knowledge of results (Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1976). These characteristics make the performance of job-related activities more rewarding (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Rainey, 2001; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Employees are thereby motivated to expend more effort to achieve their task objectives (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Rainey, 2001).
Parker, Wall & Cordery (2001) extended this list of positive job characteristics to include opportunities for skill acquisition and problem-solving which are linked with challenge. It has also been argued that autonomy can provide an active coping mechanism for employees with high job demands (Parker et al., 2001; Schaubroeck & Fink, 1998) and that individuals with a higher desire for challenge and personal development are more responsive to an enriched job design (Parker et al., 2001). Thus, managers can increase employee motivation, satisfaction and performance by designing more complex jobs with these characteristics (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

In addition to the effect of job characteristics on work motivation and discretionary work effort generally, there is evidence that job characteristics are related to specific facets of discretionary work effort. For example, Bolino and Turnley (2003) contended that when employees are given interesting and meaningful work they become more involved with their job and so are more likely to engage in ERB, which taps the direction facet of discretionary work effort (see Section 2.2). In a review and meta-analysis of ERB research, Podsakoff and colleagues (Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Podsakoff et al., 2000) noted that while job characteristics had not been emphasised as an antecedent of ERB, in those studies where it was examined it was consistently related to a wide variety of ERBs. Specifically, task feedback, task variety and intrinsically satisfying tasks (i.e. task characteristics with the capacity to stimulate job involvement and job satisfaction) were positively related to ERB (Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Similarly, in an extensive review of research on ERB, Organ et al. (2006) noted that no studies had investigated the individual effects of task autonomy, significance or identity on ERB, but these job content model (JCM) factors had been examined in combination with other job characteristics with motivating potential. For example, Fahr, Podsakoff and Organ (1990) and Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994) found the combined effect of the JCM factors had a significant relationship with several affiliative forms of ERB. Williams and Anderson (1991) also reported that motivating job characteristics measured by intrinsic job cognitions were significantly correlated with ERB that targeted individuals and the organisation. Similarly, Turnipseed and Murkison (2000) found job autonomy was significantly related to ERB directed at the organisation and individuals.

In addition to these studies that focus on affiliative forms of ERB, other research has emphasised nonconforming, challenging forms of discretionary work behaviour. Van Dyne, Cummings and McLean-Parks (1995), for example, posited that work environment factors that meet employee needs for achievement and control, and provide a sense of responsibility promote general satisfaction and commitment to excellence and good performance, and so are likely to encourage more challenging-promotive ERB like taking charge.
Autonomy and challenging work are well validated as determinants of a variety of work behaviours that are conceptually similar to challenging-promotive forms of ERB. This research has included studies on proactive behaviour and personal initiative (Bateman & Crant, 1999; Chiaburu & Baker, 2006; Crant, 2000; Frese et al., 1996; Frohman, 1997, 1999; Janssen, 2001; Karambayya, 1990; Ohly et al., 2006; Parker et al., 2006; Warr & Fay, 2001), proactive role orientations (Parker, Wall, & Jackson, 1997) and creativity and innovation (Amabile et al., 1996; Burnside, 1990; Cummings & Oldham, 1997). Thus, there is considerable theoretical and empirical evidence in the OB literature attesting to the positive effect of job characteristics on the direction of discretionary work effort.

Similarly, in the entrepreneurship literature, the willingness of entrepreneurs to work long hours and to work hard, regardless of the typically distant prospects of monetary gains (Bird & Jellinek, 1988) has been explained in terms of the specific working conditions associated with self-employment. In current entrepreneurship literature it is argued that foremost amongst the working conditions is the ability to satisfy a thirst for independence, or a desire to ‘be one’s own boss’ through high levels of autonomy (Barringer & Ireland, 2006; Shane, 2003). Further, Baumol (1990) suggested that historically, entrepreneurial activity has been motivated by the reward structure prevailing in the economy at the time. These include non-monetary rewards like autonomy, achievement, recognition, and pride. This depiction of the entrepreneur has been extended to employees working within organisations who are labelled as corporate entrepreneurs or intrapreneurs. Here, it is contended that entrepreneurial behaviour by employees can be promoted by providing employees with job autonomy, amongst other things (Hornsby et al., 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002; Hornsby et al., 1992; Kuratko et al., 1990).

Correspondingly, in the workaholism literature, the high commitment of discretionary work time and intensity by workaholics has been related to opportunities for self-development, achievement, autonomy, use of skills and intrinsic motivation (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004; Kanai & Wakabayashi, 2001; Machlowitz, 1980; McMillan, Brady, O'Driscoll, & Marsh, 2002; Mudrak & Naughton, 2001; Peiperl & Jones, 2001). Much of this research, however, has indirectly assessed job characteristics by investigating the relationship between needs for achievement and control that can be met through jobs that provide challenge and autonomy, and the excessive work effort of workaholics. Mudrack and Naughton (2001) found the tendency for MBA students to perform non-required work was significantly correlated with needs for achievement and autonomy. Further, Peiperl and Jones (2001) reported that employee perceptions of excessive levels of discretionary work effort were positively correlated with satisfaction with opportunities to use their skills. Galperin and Burke (2006) contended that employees who are involved in and enjoy their
work more are more likely to engage in innovative and challenging work behaviours that benefit the organisation. These authors found a modest but significant relationship between workaholism and constructive deviance which they defined as voluntary nonconforming behaviour like innovation that enhances overall organisational wellbeing. While they did not directly investigate the effect of job characteristics on constructive deviance, they theoretically linked the workaholism characteristics of work involvement and enjoyment to employee need for achievement and control. Kanai and Wakabayashi (2001) contended that workaholism is less likely amongst blue collar workers than white collar workers because the work environment of blue collar employees is more structured and controlled, and thereby provides less autonomy and responsibility.

The role of job characteristics in affecting discretionary work effort has also been considered, albeit to a limited degree, in the economics literature. Tomer (1981) identified autonomy, responsibility and opportunities for growth as important missing elements in Leibenstein’s (1979) economic model of discretionary work effort. Only a few empirical studies investigating job characteristics were found in the economics literature. These related to discretionary work time and intensity. Goldsmith, Vaum and Darity (2000), for example, reported a high level of challenge and autonomy as found in management professional and craft positions were positively related to discretionary work intensity. Drago (1991) investigated how task variety, task identity, use of skills and abilities, and challenge as positive working conditions related to the level of discretionary work effort that he operationalised using single item measures of discretionary work time and intensity. This author reported that task variety was positively correlated with discretionary work time while the use of skills and abilities was negatively correlated with discretionary work time. Although he explained the negative relationship for skill use in terms of more highly skilled employees being in a superior labour market position and so having less fear of job loss if caught shirking, this outcome might also be attributed to the quality of the measure used. Task identity was positively correlated with discretionary work intensity although this relationship disappeared when controlling for personal and work situation characteristics. Nonetheless, these two studies provide some evidence of job characteristics being related to the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort that is largely consistent with the workaholism research.

While the empirical studies from these different disciplines focussed on different facets of discretionary work effort and investigated a range of job characteristics, jointly they provide broad theoretical and empirical support for positive job characteristics being positively related to discretionary work effort. Challenge, autonomy, and interesting and meaningful work appear to be common job characteristics that have been examined across
these disciplines and seem to be most consistently related to discretionary work effort. As such, it is anticipated that these key job characteristics will be perceived as a category of perks.

**Negative Job Characteristics**

Negative job characteristics are a form of job-related stressor (Jex, Adams, Bachrach, & Sorensen, 2003). Research on job-related stressors in organisations has focussed on exploring their effects on employee well-being but there has been little systematic research on their effects on employee work behaviour (Jex et al., 2003). Thus, unlike positive job characteristics, research on the effect of negative job characteristics on discretionary work effort has been limited. Much of the prior research seems to have explored how either low JCM motivating potential scores (see for example Cummings & Oldham, 1997) or reverse JCM characteristics like task routinisation as opposed to task variety (Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Podsakoff et al., 2000) relate to specific forms of discretionary work effort. Given that I have already discussed job characteristics with motivating potential in the previous section, my review of negative job characteristics will focus on other job characteristics that might be perceived as a category of irks.

In my review of discretionary work effort research, the accumulated though limited research on negative job characteristics in the literatures examined seemed to point to pressures associated with job demands, workload and role overload which all involve having too much work to do in the time available (Beehr, Walsh, & Taber, 1976) and resource constraints (i.e. lack of equipment, facilities, materials, information and/or funds). While most studies identified in the literature explored the effect of time pressures brought about by the demands of the job, resource constraints are expected to function in a similar way since time is also a resource. Thus, I call this negative job characteristic workload pressures and resource constraints.

Most of the research on the relationship between negative job characteristics and discretionary work effort was found in the OB and corporate entrepreneurship literatures. This research focussed on specific forms of discretionary work effort rather than work motivation or discretionary work effort generally. These studies investigated affiliative forms of ERB like helping (Hui, Organ, & Crooker, 1994; Jex et al., 2003; Organ & Hui, 1995; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000) and related challenging discretionary behaviours like creativity, innovation, corporate entrepreneurship, personal initiative and proactive behaviour (Amabile et al., 1996; Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Burnside, 1990; Hornsby et al., 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002; Hornsby et al., 1992; Ohly et al., 2006; Scott & Bruce, 1994). Within my conceptualisation of discretionary work effort, these forms of discretionary work
behaviour fit the direction facet of this construct. Few studies examining the time or intensity facets of discretionary work effort were found (Beehr et al., 1976; Johnstone & Johnston, 2005; Kanai & Wakabayashi, 2001). Thus, most of my discussion on this negative job characteristic relates to the direction facet of discretionary work effort (i.e. affiliative and challenging forms of ERB). Below, I review the theory and the empirical evidence from the studies found in the literature to show how workload pressures and resource constraints relate to discretionary work effort, and hence, the basis for investigating it as a potential category of irks.

There are good theoretical reasons for job-related stressors like workload pressures and resource constraints decreasing discretionary work effort. Within an expectancy theory framework (Vroom, 1964), work motivation is a function of the expectancies that effort will lead to performance and performance will in turn lead to valued outcomes. If workload pressures and resource constraints are perceived as excessive, they can hinder the employee’s efforts to successfully perform tasks and thereby weaken these expectancies. In turn, this will lower work motivation. Thus, when a job is perceived as excessively demanding the situation is not conducive to motivating an employee to contribute discretionary work effort (Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000).

Jex et al. (2003) maintained that job-related stressors can also create negative affective states like job dissatisfaction, frustration and depression. Given that positive affective states have been shown to increase employee motivation to engage in ERB like helping, it is conceivable that negative affective states created by stressors will decrease employee engagement in ERB. While this argument implies that negative affective states like job dissatisfaction might mediate the effect of negative job characteristics on discretionary work effort, Fahr et al. (1990) asserted that positive job characteristics might directly affect ERB. This contention was empirically supported in their investigation of the relationship between JCM characteristics and discretionary directed effort as measured by two forms of affiliative ERB. Thus, it is plausible that negative job characteristics will also be directly related to this form of discretionary work effort. It has also been argued that job-related stressors may cause employees to narrow their focus into channelling effort into performing required tasks rather than non-required activities and using their effort to cope with the stress created by the stressors (Jex et al., 2003; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000).

Workload pressures and resource constraints have been identified as a substantial obstacle to the direction facet of discretionary work effort, notably, creative, innovative and entrepreneurial work behaviours (Amabile, 1999; Amabile et al., 1996; Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Burnside, 1990; Hornsby et al., 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002). Amabile et
al. (1996) asserted that perceptions of extreme pressures can have a psychological impact on employees by affecting their beliefs about the intrinsic value of the work they are doing and the contributions they are making to the organisation. Exploratory studies of work environment factors perceived to foster discretionary work effort directed into creativity, innovation and corporate entrepreneurship identified workload pressures and resource constraints as a significant factor (Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, & Tighe, 1994; Kuratko et al., 1990). It has also been maintained that time pressure will decrease affiliative ERB on the grounds that when overloaded, employees have less discretionary time available to channel effort into non-required tasks or activities (Hui et al., 1994; Jex et al., 2003; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000). Thus, workload pressures and resource constraints are likely to reduce employee willingness and ability to engage in affiliative ERB like helping others.

Although there are reasonable theoretical arguments for workload pressures and resources constraints being negatively related to discretionary work effort, the empirical findings are inconsistent. Some empirical studies testing the relationship of workload (time) pressures and/or resource constraints with a range of forms of discretionary directed effort (i.e. challenging and affiliative discretionary behaviours), have reported that this factor inhibits these forms of discretionary directed effort (Amabile et al., 1996; Andrews & Farris, 1972; Hornsby et al., 2002; Hui et al., 1994; Jex et al., 2003; Kuratko et al., 1990), while others found a non-significant relationship (Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Hornsby et al., 1999; Organ & Hui, 1995; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000) or a positive relationship (Andrews & Farris, 1972). Workload pressures have also been found to have a significant positive correlation with the intensity facet of discretionary work effort as measure by effort toward quantity defined as trying to do a lot of work for a group of US white-collar employees (Beehr et al., 1976) and increased the tendency for Japanese car manufacturing employees (Kanai & Wakabayashi, 2001) and New Zealand professionals (Johnstone & Johnston, 2005) to be driven to invest high levels of discretionary work time and intensity.

While these empirical findings suggest that workload pressures and resource constraints are not very reliably related to discretionary work effort, the inconsistent results may reflect the underlying assumption of a linear relationship between the variables investigated. Recent research disputes this assumption and suggests an inverted U-shape relationship between this job-related stressor and various forms of discretionary work effort (Baer & Oldham, 2006; Janssen, 2001; Ohly et al., 2006).

Amabile et al. (1996) proposed that workload pressures and resource constraints may have a positive and/or a negative effect on employee discretionary behaviour. These
authors argued that if this job-related stressor is balanced and is perceived as a necessary element of an urgent and important project that is intellectually challenging in nature, it is more likely to have a positive effect on discretionary work effort directed into creative and innovative work activities. At an excessive level, however, it is likely to have a negative effect. Andrews and Farris (1972) had previously found that time pressure had a positive effect on creative behaviour amongst scientists except when the pressure was excessive. Therefore, Amabile et al. (1996) distinguished between two types of job-related pressures, namely, excessive workload pressure and challenging work. This view is consistent with activation theory (Gardner, 1986) whereby employees are optimally stimulated and have positive affective, cognitive and behavioural responses when job-related pressures are at intermediate levels. At low and high levels of workload pressures and resource constraints, however, employee responses are likely to be less favourable or negative.

While the empirical evidence supporting workload pressures and resource constraints as a category of irks has generally been inconsistent, I propose to test if employees perceive an excessive level of this negative job characteristic as a potential irk. It has been identified theoretically as an important job characteristic with possible demotivating properties and recent theory and research on workload pressures and resource constraints appears to support the view that at excessive levels this negative job characteristic will decrease some facets of discretionary work effort.

The preceding discussions suggest that “positive work characteristics” (particularly work that provides challenge, autonomy, meaning and variety) should motivate employees to increase their level of discretionary work effort and so represent a potential category of perks. In contrast, the negative job characteristic of “excessive workload pressures and resource constraints” should decrease the level of employee discretionary work effort and so this represents a potential category of irks. Thus, the following propositions will be empirically tested in Studies 1 and 2 of my research.

**Proposition 1A:** The positive job characteristics of challenge, autonomy, meaning and variety will be perceived by employees as a category of perks.

**Proposition 1B:** The negative job characteristic of excessive workload pressures and resource constraints will be perceived by employees as a category of irks.

### 2.4.2 Social-interpersonal Factors

Humans are social beings and so generally value social interactions and the development of positive interpersonal relationships. In the context of work, relationships
form between managers and employees as well as between employees and their co-workers. Thus, social-interpersonal influence on employee work behaviour has two sub-components, leader (supervisor) behaviours and co-worker behaviours (Katzell & Thompson, 1990b).

Theoretical arguments for explaining social-interpersonal influences on employee discretionary work effort are commonly embedded in theories of social exchange, fairness and reciprocity (Blau, 1964; Deckop, Cirka, & Andersson, 2003; Van Dyne et al., 1994). The core elements of these theories are that voluntary actions are motivated by the expected intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that come from a social exchange between an employee and other members of an organisation, that there is an obligation by the receiving party to reciprocate in some unspecified manner and time, and that trust between the parties exists.

The belief in employees valuing positive interpersonal relationships is also consistent with needs theories of work motivation that identify the need for affiliation (McClelland, 1961) and the need for belonging (Maslow, 1954) as important human needs. The work environment represents a context where these needs can be fulfilled, depending on the nature of the work environment and the quality of the interpersonal relationships that develop between the employee and other members of the organisation.

The potential role of social-interpersonal factors in influencing discretionary work effort is recognised, albeit to varying degrees, in the OB literature (Amabile et al., 2004; Katzell & Thompson, 1990b; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Organ et al., 2006; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996b; Podsakoff et al., 2000) and in the more radical approaches in the labour economics literature (Akerlof, 1982; Akerlof & Yellen, 1990; Ash, 2000; Campbell III & Kamlani, 1997; Fairris, 2004; Gui, 2000; Kohli, 1988; Leibenstein, 1979; Mosca et al., 2007; Tomer, 1998).

In the OB literature, Katzell and Thompson (1990) argued that social-interpersonal factors can be used as levers for creating more motivating work environments. The quality of the relationships that supervisors form with their subordinates and that co-workers form with each other can have an important effect on employee motivation (Deckop et al., 2003; Organ et al., 2006).

Similarly, in the labour economics literature, Tomer (1998) developed a socio-economic model of what he called organisationally responsible behaviour by integrating economic theory with insights from ERB research. He described organisationally responsible behaviour as the extent to which an employee behaves in an organisationally responsible manner to advance long-term organisational interests over personal interests.
This type of behaviour includes a large component of citizenship behaviour (Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991), and so, like ERB, is part of the direction facet of discretionary work effort. Tomer posited that this discretionary work effort behaviour will be responsive to the network of social relationships formed by members of an organisation (what he called organisational capital). Similarly, Kohli (1988) argued that discretionary work effort would be affected by a variety of social forces and relationships. Also, while Fairris (2004) did not specifically incorporate social-interpersonal factors into his economic theory of discretionary work intensity, he contended that supervisors can have an enormous influence on work intensity. Thus, he called for economists to extend the range of factors investigated to include this factor in the future.

In the following sections, I firstly consider the role of positive and negative leader behaviours in influencing the level of employee discretionary work effort to identify potential categories of leader behaviour perks and irks. I then explore the relationship between positive and negative co-worker behaviours and the level of employee discretionary work effort to identify potential categories of co-worker behaviour perks and irks.

Positive Leader Behaviours

Leadership behaviour refers to the ability of a leader to influence subordinates to perform at a high level to achieve organisational goals (Robbins, 2001). The critical role that leaders can play in shaping the work environment and influencing employee attitudes, perceptions and work behaviour is widely acknowledged in the OB and corporate entrepreneurship literatures (Amabile et al., 2004; Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; Gupta, MacMillan, & Surie, 2004; Katzell & Thompson, 1990a; Kotter, 1990; O'Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). Leaders determine what tasks employees perform and how these are done, the relationships formed with subordinates and amongst members of the work group, and the general conditions under which employees work. Thus, through their behaviour and decisions leaders influence the ability, motivation and opportunity of employees to engage in discretionary work effort (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1996b). They have the power to leverage the untapped talents and energies of employees to evoke superordinate performance by creating a work environment that supports positive performance (Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; Gupta et al., 2004; Katzell & Thompson, 1990b; Kotter, 1990; O'Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000). In this section of the review, I focus on what positive leader behaviours will increase the willingness of employees to contribute discretionary work effort, and so form a potential category of perks.

Positive leader behaviours can take many forms. Transformational leader behaviour is one form of leader behaviour that has been embraced by both leadership researchers and
practitioners for its ability to induce employees to do more than what they are required to. This involves leader behaviours that transform followers’ attitudes, beliefs and values rather than gaining compliance. They induce employees to transcend self-interest for organisational benefit (Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1989). Transformational leader behaviour is conceptually similar to two leader behaviours cited in the corporate entrepreneurship literature as motivating employees to perform above and beyond expectations by building a climate that creates a mind-set and collective spirit of conscious creativity and innovative behaviour (Amabile, 1996; Gupta et al., 2004). These are promoter managerial behaviour (Stevenson, 1983) and entrepreneurial leadership behaviour (Gupta et al., 2004).

Kotter (1990) maintained that transformational leader behaviour holds the most promise for unleashing discretionary work effort. Nonetheless, several types of leader behaviours identified in the literature are reported to be positively related to discretionary work effort. Most studies that tested the relationship between positive leader behaviours and discretionary work effort were located in the OB literature and corporate entrepreneurship research, and thus, represent the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

Several meta-analyses and substantive reviews of prior research on ERB concluded that there is general support for positive leader behaviours affecting affiliative forms of ERB (LePine et al., 2002; Organ et al., 2006; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Podsakoff et al., 2000). In their recent review of ERB research, Organ et al. (2006) identified four positive leader behaviours as most consistently related to ERB. These were leader behaviours that display concern for employee well-being (i.e. supportive leader behaviour), make it clear to employees what is expected of them and how they are to accomplish it (i.e. instrumental leader behaviour), reward employees based on their performance (i.e. contingent reward behaviour), instil values, goals and aspirations that inspire and energise employees (i.e. transformational leader behaviour) and establish a high quality interpersonal relationship with employees. Organ et al. (2006) noted the conceptual similarity and overlap of some of these leader behaviours such as supportive leader behaviour and the individualised support dimension of transformational leader behaviour.

While these leader behaviours may influence employee perceptions, attitudes and behaviours through different mechanisms, they have generally been reported to enhance trust and respect in the leader and job satisfaction. Several of these leader behaviours also serve to provide role clarity. Thus, they are likely to increase the employee’s liking of the leader and create a sense of obligation in the employee to reciprocate that support through an increased level of discretionary work effort (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff et al., 1996a). Generally these types of leader behaviours have been reported to have direct and
indirect effects on several forms of ERB, and so suggest a potential category of perks. An underlying theme of these leader behaviours appears to be that they signal to employees that the leader is supportive and willing to facilitate them in accomplishing work tasks.

In addition to the ERB research cited above which focuses on affiliative forms of ERB, there is a sizable body of research on specific challenging forms of discretionary behaviour that further supports positive leader behaviours being positively related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort. This research used measures of generalised leader/supervisor support for the discretionary behaviour of interest rather than a specific type of leader behaviour. The leader/supervisor support measures used in these studies included leader behaviours like serving as a good role model, setting appropriate goals, valuing individual contributions, encouraging and supporting new ideas and improved work methods, and being flexible.

In other OB research, leader or supervisor support was reported to be positively related to various forms of proactive behaviour like personal initiative and taking charge (Frohman, 1999; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Ohly et al., 2006; Parker et al., 2006; Scott & Bruce, 1994). Only a small number of studies found reported a non-significant relationship (Choi, 2007; Frese, Teng, & Wijnen, 1999). Similarly, strong management support has been identified as a key internal condition for fostering creativity and innovation (Amabile et al., 1996; Amabile et al., 2004) and corporate entrepreneurship (Hornsby et al., 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002). Taken together, research on affiliative and challenging forms of discretionary behaviour provide considerable evidence supporting positive leader behaviours influencing the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

Unlike the direction facet of discretionary work effort, the role of positive leader behaviours in influencing the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort appears to have received little attention. Only two studies were located in the OB literature and a further three were found in the workaholism and labour economics literatures. Each of these studies examined general leader/supervisor support behaviour.

As part of a study investigating the relationship between psychological climate and work effort (which included time and intensity), Brown and Leigh (1996) included a measure of supportive management as a dimension of psychological climate. These authors reported a significant positive correlation between management support and work intensity for one sample of US salespeople but a non-significant correlation for a second sample. The time facet, however, had a non-significant inter-correlation. Using Brown and Leigh’s work intensity and supportive management measures, Yoon, Beatty and Suh (2001) found
empirical support for a positive relationship between management support and work intensity amongst bank employees in South Korea.

In two workaholism studies, supervisor support was significantly related to workaholic behaviour which involves a high investment of discretionary work effort (time and intensity) amongst Australian employees (Russo & Waters, 2006) and New Zealand professionals (Johnstone & Johnston, 2005) who derive high enjoyment from work. Johnstone and Johnson (2005) concluded that strong supervisor support is an important element in building a socially supportive work climate and a key factor in creating “happy workaholics” (2005). Harpaz and Snir (2003) explored the relationship between total hours worked (while controlling for financial need) by Israeli employees and their valuing of interpersonal relationships at work and found a non-significant relationship. While this study did not directly explore the effect of positive leader behaviours on discretionary work time, the finding is consistent with the non-significant inter-correlation between supportive management and work time reported by Brown and Leigh (1996).

In the labour economics literature, Mosca, Musella and Pastore (2007) indirectly tested the effect of positive leader behaviours on discretionary work effort. They posited that the non-profit sector can motivate its employees by providing greater non-monetary compensation in the form of relational goods, that is, intangible outcomes that are inherent in or arise from relationships (Ash, 2000; Gui, 1996, 2000; Uhlaner, 1989). Relational goods like trust, acceptance, respect and so forth can result from positive manager-employee interactions. Higher investment of effort into these work relationships by participants creates more relational goods, and thus, motivates employees to increase their discretionary work effort. Using self-reported satisfaction with 15 work dimensions (including employer-employee relationship) to proxy non-monetary rewards, they reported that non-profit employees had higher job satisfaction than their private and government sector employees for relational goods including employer-employee relationship. From this they concluded that relational goods play an important role in motivating employee work effort amongst non-profit sector employees. This study provides further indirect evidence that positive leader behaviours can increase discretionary work effort and is consistent with much of the empirical evidence already presented.

Given the small number of studies on the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort, it is difficult to generalise the findings. Taken together, however, there is some evidence suggesting that positive leader behaviours are positively related to intensity (in addition to direction) but not time. Thus, it seems plausible that positive leader behaviours will form a potential category of perks.
In the leadership literature, Avolio, Waldman and Yammarino (1991) maintained that different leader behaviours are not necessarily alternatives but can be combined to enhance leader effectiveness. The exploration of leader support as a general construct that includes a mix of different types of leader behaviours supports this view. Thus, I will use the label leader support to represent positive leader behaviours that promote discretionary work effort.

**Negative Leader Behaviours**

Like positive leader behaviours, negative leader behaviours may also affect discretionary work effort but possibly in different ways (Organ et al., 2006). Leader behaviour theories and research, however, have primarily focussed on positive rather than negative leader behaviours (Amabile et al., 2004). Amabile et al. (2004) suggested that negative leader behaviours may have an even more important effect than positive leader behaviours on some discretionary work effort behaviours like creativity. In an exploratory study of the effect of leader behaviours and the work environment on creativity in seven US companies, these authors reported that negative leader behaviours appear to be quite common, may be more extreme than positive leader behaviours, and create negative affective states that may have a “disproportionate salience and impact” (Amabile et al., 2004, p. 28). These authors subsequently argued for the need to incorporate negative leader behaviours into leadership models and empirical studies.

One potentially negative form of leadership is directive leadership. Flamholtz (1990) depicted directive leadership as a continuum ranging from autocratic to laissez-faire. The autocratic leader distorts organisational goals, abuses the use of resources for self-interest and gains subordinate support through threats and force. The autocratic leader’s source of power used to influence employee behaviour is associated with the formal position held. Autocratic leader behaviour may include a high level of control over subordinates, taking over or interfering in the subordinate’s work, focussing on mistakes, not communicating important information to subordinates and being negative towards suggestions from subordinates for improving the way things are done (Ligos, 2000). It may also involve non-contingent punishment whereby the leader administers punishment for reasons other than poor performance (Organ et al., 2006).

Aranson (2001) described autocratic leader behaviour as unethical and so is likely to affect employee perceptions of fairness. These behaviours do not create favourable perceptions to earn the confidence and loyalty of subordinates, and thus, would not inspire employees to strive towards greater efficiency and effectiveness. Because negative leader behaviours like non-contingent punishment are likely to be perceived as unfair by subordinates, a diminished liking of the leader, reduced trust in the leader, decreased job
satisfaction and increased role ambiguity can result (Organ et al., 2006). These outcomes are likely to lower employee motivation and willingness to engage in discretionary work effort.

In the OB literature, in a meta-analysis involving the effect of non-contingent punishment by leaders on ERB, Podsakoff et al. (1996a) reported to have a strong negative relationship between this negative leader behaviour and affiliative ERBs. Similarly, it has been asserted that abusive supervision (i.e. hostile verbal and non-verbal leader behaviours excluding physical contact) is negatively correlated with co-worker ERB (Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004). In a longitudinal study of employee reactions to abusive supervision, Tepper et al. (2004) found that when members of a work group were subjected to abusive supervision, employees reported that their co-workers engaged in lower levels of ERB. Further, it was found under abusive supervision an employee was more likely to perceive the help and support received from co-workers as self-serving and not well-intentioned. Thus, in a work environment with abusive leader behaviour an employee would be less likely to be motivated to direct discretionary work effort into helping others.

Close monitoring and control of employees are likely behaviours of autocratic leaders. In the labour economics literature, there are two opposing views on the effect of close supervision on discretionary work effort. According to the principal-agent theory (Alchian & Demsetz, 1972) and the worker discipline model (Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984), employers can increase discretionary work effort through more intensive supervision and control. This increases the chance of shirking being detected and so increases the risk of dismissal (Frey, 1993; Kohli, 1988; Leonard, 1987; Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984). Alternatively, according to the efficiency wage theory gift-exchange model, close supervision represents a negative working condition that should decrease discretionary work effort (Akerlof, 1982; Drago, 1991; Frey, 1993; Tomer, 1981).

Drago (1991) tested whether work behaviour was in agreement with the worker discipline or gift exchange model of discretionary work effort amongst Australian employees. He found that monitoring intensity was negatively related to discretionary work effort (based on a self-report measure of willingness to work an extra twenty minutes to finish a task even if unpaid). He concluded that this supported the gift exchange hypothesis. This finding is consistent with Frese, Kring, Soose and Zempel’s (1996) argument in the OB literature that increased monitoring and external control as responses to low employee initiative will only further reduce personal initiative, a form of discretionary directed effort.

Overall, these literatures suggest that positive leader behaviours (Amabile et al., 2004; Kotter, 1990) make it clear to the employee what is expected and establish the norms for what is appropriate work behaviour. Concern for employee well-being, respect and
confidence that creates perceptions of fairness, a liking of the leader and trust are hallmarks of a high quality leader-employee relationship. This, in turn, is likely to increase discretionary work effort. These behaviours are particularly apparent in people-centred or relationship-oriented approaches like supportive leadership, transformational leadership and Fleishman’s (1953) consideration dimension of leader behaviour. I will use the term “leader support” to describe this group of leader behaviours.

In contrast, negative leader behaviours characteristic of what I will call “autocratic leadership” are likely to be perceived as unfair and contribute to feelings of mistrust, dislike for the leader and dissatisfaction (Organ et al., 2006). This is especially likely if the negative leader behaviours are unrelated to employee performance as with non-contingent punishment and abusive supervision, since the employee’s understanding of his/her job role and expected behaviour becomes ambiguous (Organ et al., 2006). This, in turn, should decrease discretionary work effort.

Thus, the preceding discussion suggests that “leader support” is a potential category of perks, and that “autocratic leader behaviour” is a potential category of irks. Thus, the following propositions will be empirically tested in Studies 1 and 2 of my research.

Proposition 2A: Leader support will be perceived by employees as a category of perks.

Proposition 2B: Autocratic leader behaviour will be perceived by employees as a category of irks.

Positive Co-worker Behaviours

The second sub-component of social-interpersonal influence on discretionary work effort is co-worker behaviours. The behaviours of co-workers in the workplace can influence the way an employee perceives and experiences the work environment. Thus, these behaviours should influence the level of discretionary work effort of employees (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997; Tepper et al., 2004). This influence is underpinned by the same theoretical rationale and operates through similar mechanisms as the effect of leader behaviours. Nonetheless, Bishop, Scott and Burroughs (2000) argued that employees distinguish between support that comes from different sources and respond by directing their attitudes and work behaviours accordingly. Amongst the potentially important work group factors likely to impact discretionary work effort are perceived team support, the quality of co-worker relationships (i.e. team-member exchange) and the level of group cohesiveness (Organ et al., 2006). These three factors are closely related.
Perceived team support is defined as “the degree to which employees believe that the team values their contributions and cares about their well-being” (Bishop et al., 2000, p.1114). Organ et al. (2006) argued that greater work effort stems from an employee’s heightened level of team commitment that is caused by their perception of the team’s supportiveness towards himself/herself.

Group cohesiveness helps employees to better recognise interdependencies between their own and co-worker tasks. This encourages an employee to maintain contact with co-workers on matters affecting these colleagues (Podsakoff et al, 1996b). Furthermore, when they believe that work group members value their contributions and care about their welfare, this creates feelings of acceptance and belonging to the group. This builds commitment towards the group and encourages the employee to reciprocate (Bishop et al., 2000; Organ et al., 2006). Reciprocity, embedded in social exchange theory (Deckop et al., 2003; Van Dyne et al., 1994), reflects the mutual support co-workers provide each other in a supportive team environment.

High quality co-worker relationships exist when the resource and support exchanges between team members extend beyond what is minimally required for task performance (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000). Some co-worker behaviours that create a high quality team-member exchange strongly resemble affiliative ERB like helping. Thus, there is likely to be a reciprocal relationship between the group level of help and support provided by co-workers that creates a high quality team-member exchange, and the level of affiliative ERB displayed by individual employees who are members of that group. Therefore, it is theoretically plausible that a high-quality team-member exchange relationship will be correlated with the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) suggested that employees enjoy working in a positive work environment with a cohesive work group. They argued that affiliative co-worker ERB can make an organisation a more attractive place to work by enhancing group cohesiveness and employee morale. They also proposed that these positive co-worker behaviours may influence the attitudes and behaviours of other employees. As a target of positive co-worker behaviours, an employee can reciprocate any obligation felt towards other group members. By reciprocating the employee expects the rewards of maintaining group acceptance and a sense of belonging.

Thus, social norms built on trust, valuing individual contributions, sharing of knowledge and helping each other characterise a work environment with strong co-worker support. Employees who are members of this type of work group should be motivated to contribute discretionary work effort for the attainment of group goals. The empirical research
reviewed below generally supports these theoretical arguments for a positive relationship between supportive co-worker behaviours and discretionary work effort.

In reviews of ERB research in the OB literature, Podsakoff and colleagues (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Podsakoff et al., 2000) identified perceived team support and group cohesiveness as significant positive antecedents of ERB. Organ et al. (2006) noted that while there are sound theoretical reasons for team-member exchange to be related to ERB, there has been no systematic research testing how team-member exchange affects ERB. In a US study of manufacturing company employees, Bommer, Miles and Grover (2003) found higher levels of co-worker ERB were significantly related to higher levels of individual ERB for both supervisor and employee ratings. Furthermore, they reported that the more consistent the ERB by work group members, the higher the level of individual ERB. Similarly, Deckop, Cirka and Andersson (2003) found that the amount of ERB received from co-workers was positively correlated with affiliative ERB (helping) and challenging ERB (voice), although it only had a significant unique effect on helping behaviour. Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie and Williams (1993) reported marginally significant correlations between group cohesiveness and conscientiousness but not with helping behaviour. Thus, in the OB literature, there is some evidence for a positive relationship between co-worker behaviours (that I call co-worker support) and affiliative forms of ERB that come under the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

While the focus of the ERB research has been on affiliative forms of discretionary directed effort, the corporate entrepreneurship literature and research on proactive behaviour and related concepts in the OB literature offer insights to how co-worker behaviours might relate to challenging forms of discretionary directed effort (i.e. creativity, innovation, proactive behaviour). In the corporate entrepreneurship literature, entrepreneurial firms are often recognised for their teamwork. Thus, work group support has been identified as a key stimulant of creative and innovative discretionary behaviours (Amabile, 1999; Amabile et al., 1996; Burnside, 1990). Amabile et al (1996) reported that perceived work group support was positively related to work group creativity. Consistent with this finding, in the OB literature Parker, Williams and Turner (2006) found individual proactive behaviour of employees in a UK manufacturing company was significantly correlated with co-worker trust. As previously noted, supportive behaviours by co-workers help to create social norms built on trust.

In contrast to these studies, an investigation of individual innovative work behaviour amongst US engineers, scientists and technicians, Scott and Bruce (1994) failed to find a significant correlation between the quality of team-member exchange and discretionary
innovative behaviour by employees. Likewise, Morrison and Phelps (1999) failed to find support for co-worker support as measured by work group norms being positively correlated with taking charge behaviour for a sample of US white collar employees. These authors suggested that this may have been because they needed to control for group cohesiveness. Thus, the evidence supporting co-worker support affecting challenging forms of discretionary directed effort is less consistent than that reported for affiliative forms of discretionary directed effort. This might be because co-worker support is more proximal to affiliative ERB behaviours like helping than it is to challenging ERB behaviours that challenge the status quo. Alternatively, the more inconsistent findings for challenging forms of discretionary behaviour may reflect a measurement problem. Current measures of co-worker support reflect helping behaviour by co-workers and so may need to be expanded to include support for more challenging behaviours to better capture this relationship.

In addition to these studies in the OB literature that related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort, two empirical studies on interpersonal relationships were located in the workaholism research from which relationships with the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort might be inferred. Johnstone and Johnson (2005) reported a significant moderate correlation between co-worker cohesion and workaholics with a high enjoyment of work. They concluded that fostering co-worker cohesiveness was important in fostering a socially supportive work environment. Harpaz and Snir (2003), however, found total hours worked by employees while controlling for financial need was unrelated to interpersonal relationships. Thus, the inconsistency of this limited research makes it difficult to draw any generalisations on the effect of positive co-worker behaviours on the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort.

Taken together, this body of research suggests that co-worker support has a more consistent and stronger effect on the direction of discretionary work effort than on the time and intensity facets. Nonetheless, the fact that positive co-worker behaviours are related to at least one of the facets of discretionary work effort means that it is plausible for this factor to be a potential category of perks.

**Negative Co-worker Behaviours**

Co-worker behaviours also have the potential to have a negative impact on discretionary work effort (Mulvey & Klein, 1998; Tepper et al., 2004). Economists Alchian and Demsetz (1972) contended that employees have more incentive to display low discretionary work effort in team or work group situations. There is a relatively extensive body of literature in both the economics and OB literatures addressing the concept of withholding effort. This includes the related concepts of shirking, free-riding, social loafing
and job neglect, all of which I include within the term “perceived co-worker shirking”. The theory and empirical research reviewed below suggests that this form of co-worker behaviour may have a negative effect on discretionary work effort.

The OB literature focuses on the effects of co-worker shirking (in particular, perceived loafing) on the perceptions, attitudes, work behaviour and performance of other group members (Comer, 1995; George, 1992; Mulvey & Klein, 1998). Perceived loafing is the perception that one or more other group members contribute less work effort to the work group than they could (Comer, 1995). According to the equity theory of motivation (Adams, 1963), perceptions of the rewards an individual receives for the effort contributed compared to referent others impacts the individual’s work behaviours. Thus according to this theory, if a co-worker is perceived as contributing less effort than others and yet receives similar rewards, this creates feelings of inequity and unfairness, lowers satisfaction (especially satisfaction with co-workers) and negatively affects work motivation.

This motivation loss effect on other group members due to another group member consistently contributing less than he/she is capable to a group task is called the “sucker effect” (Kerr, 1983). Kerr (1983) maintained that individuals are averse to playing the “sucker” because this violates the norms of equity, social responsibility and reciprocity. Therefore, they respond by reducing their own level of effort to restore what they perceive as equity (Blau, 1995; Eder & Eisenberger, 2008; George, 1992; Kerr, 1983; Mulvey & Klein, 1998; Schnake, 1991; Williams & Karau, 1991).

In an experimental design involving university students, Kerr (1983) reported that when individuals perceived a capable group member consistently withholding effort, they reduced their own effort. The motivation loss effect was, however, less when the offending group member/s was perceived to lack ability. The “sucker effect” proposed by Kerr was also supported in two studies of university students by Mulvey and Klein (1998). Co-worker lateness/tardiness has also been found to be significantly related to individual lateness/tardiness in samples of manufacturing, retail and service industry employees (Blau, 1995; Eder & Eisenberger, 2008). Similar effects have been reported for other forms of perceived co-worker shirking involving job neglect, taking undeserved breaks and engaging in social chat (Eder & Eisenberger, 2008).

In contrast to these studies which involved group tasks and group performance evaluation, Schnake (1991) examined whether the “sucker effect” occurred in co-acting groups whereby individuals undertake tasks without needing to interact with or rely on co-workers for their performance. In an experimental study of university students, Schnake found perceived co-worker shirking was negatively related to employee discretionary work
effort in co-acting group settings where non-contingent rewards were administered. He argued that the reward systems of many organisations are non-contingent. Thus, all employees in comparable positions or roles receive the same reward so long as they maintain a minimal level of performance. This creates conditions conducive to the “sucker effect”. Schnake’s findings suggest that co-worker shirking will represent an irk (i.e. have a negative effect on discretionary work effort) even if employees are not in a work team structure.

The concept of the “sucker effect” is consistent with Akerlof and Yellen’s (1990) fair wage-effort hypothesis in labour economics. A wage is perceived to be fair if the perceived value of the employee’s input at least equals the perceived value of the reward received for this input relative to referent others. The fair wage is, therefore, subjectively determined. Thus, according to the fair wage-effort hypothesis an employee will reduce his/her work effort if the actual wage received falls short of the perceived fair wage. Employees may use the input of effort by co-acting members as the point of reference for determining their fair wage. Thus, if each employee receives the same pay regardless of the level of effort provided, an employee contributing greater work effort than one or more co-workers is likely to perceive that his/her actual wage is less than the perceived fair wage. The outcome should be that the employee decides to lower his/her own discretionary work effort.

In work situations where employees experience co-worker shirking, interpersonal relationships between co-workers are likely to be affected. Group members are likely to perceive the work group as less cohesive and so are less likely to help and support other members of the work group, particularly those perceived to be shirking. While the ERB research has not specifically considered the impact of co-worker shirking on affiliative behaviours targeting other members of the organisation, this expectation is consistent with the findings on the relationship between group cohesiveness and ERB and between co-worker ERB and employee ERB already discussed. Thus, co-worker shirking may affect the direction facet as well as the intensity facet of discretionary work effort.

Counter to the “sucker effect” research, Williams and Karau (1991) suggested that in situations of perceived co-worker shirking a “social compensation effect” may exist. That is, in the presence of perceived co-worker shirking other group member/s may feel obligated to compensate for the weaker member. In three experiments involving groups of university students, participants were reported to display social compensation as long as the task and the evaluation of its performance were considered meaningful. These authors argued that based on an expectancy-value model, the potential for a poor group performance evaluation may counteract the sucker effect. Concern for a favourable evaluation of their own performance, which is tied to the group performance, means the employee has something to
gain and little to lose from compensating for an underperforming co-worker. Williams and Karau suggested that social compensation is most likely when the group size is small, the group members cannot exit the group, and the group is in the early stages of the collective task being undertaken. They conceded, however, that the “sucker effect” or the exit option becomes more likely over time if perceived co-worker shirking continues.

From the preceding discussions, therefore, it seems reasonable to argue that “co-worker support” would be a potential perk and “co-worker shirking” a potential irk. Thus, the following propositions will be empirically tested in Studies 1 and 2 of this research.

Proposition 3A: Co-worker support will be perceived by employees as a category of perks.

Proposition 3B: Co-worker shirking will be perceived by employees as a category of irks.

2.4.3 Organisational Characteristics

Organisational characteristics are a final category of work environment characteristics to consider as potential categories of perks and irks. There are sound theoretical reasons why organisational characteristics should be related to discretionary work effort (Organ et al., 2006). Organisational factors set boundaries for employees’ actions and determine the context within which they function and undertake their work. These characteristics can allow considerable flexibility in or impose substantial impediments on employee work behaviour (Amabile et al., 1996). Thus, the following section explores organisational concepts that have been investigated in the literature as determinants of discretionary work effort. It discusses the theoretical reasons why these factors should be related to discretionary work effort and the empirical evidence regarding these relationships in order to identify potential categories of organisational perks and irks.

Positive Organisational Characteristics

Much of the discretionary work effort literature has emphasised the importance of creating a supportive work environment to unleash the talent, skills and energy of employees (Amabile, 1997; Amabile et al., 1996; Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; Hamel, 2000; O’Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000; Overell, 2003; Skinner, 2000). The question is, however, what constitutes a supportive work environment. Amongst the different organisational concepts in the literature that have been connected with discretionary work effort are the related constructs of organisational culture, work climate, and organisational support. These organisational concepts are not always well differentiated in the literature, have sometimes been used interchangeably and have various terms used for the same concept.
Organisational culture is an organisational level attribute measured by observable activities, interactions, communications and artefacts in an organisation. It has been measured using different frameworks. (see for example Cooke & Rousseau, 1988; Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990; Parker & Bradley, 2000). Work climate relates to how employees perceive and interpret their work environment. This construct has been conceptualised as an organisational level attribute called organisational climate and has been measured using both objective and perceptual measures, as well as an individual level attribute termed psychological climate which is a perceptual measure (James & James, 1989; James & Jones, 1974). Researchers have investigated work climate as a holistic measure and as specific types of climate based on social or situational referents in the work environment. Schneider called these specific types of climates “climates for something” (Schneider, 1975). Examples include climates for support (Gonzalez-Roma, Peiro, & Tordera, 2002; Tordera, Gonzalez-Roma, & Peiro, 2008), innovation (Crespell & Hansen, 2008; Gonzalez-Roma et al., 2002; Hornsby et al., 2002; Scott & Bruce, 1994), creativity (Amabile et al., 1996), psychological safety and initiative (Baer & Frese, 2003). Organisational support involves the formation of a global perception by employees of the extent to which an organisation is concerned with the welfare of its employees and values their contributions (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, it can be considered a situational referent category of work climate (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999; Yoon et al., 2001). Here I consider each of these organisational constructs and its relationship with discretionary work effort in an effort to identify what organisational characteristics might be most important in inducing employees to invest in discretionary work effort, and thereby form a potential category of organisational perks.

While there is no consensus about how organisational culture is best defined, it is commonly described as the shared values and beliefs learned through a process of socialisation that guide and shape employee attitudes and behaviours (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988). Cooke and Rousseau (1988) defined culture as “the ways of thinking, behaving, and believing that members of a social unit have in common” (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988, p.248). Schein (1985) proposed that culture has three dimensions. These are assumptions (i.e. accepted and widely held, ingrained subconscious views about human nature and social relationships), values (i.e. preferences for outcomes and means of achieving them), and artefacts (i.e. tangible representations). Being the most visible manifestation of organisational culture, organisational values have been a key focus of much culture research (Parker & Bradley, 2000). Alvesson (2002) contended that an organisation’s culture is certain to impact many employee work behaviours because it can facilitate goal alignment and have a positive, motivating effect on employees.
In the literature reviewed, only a few systematic investigations on the influence of a positive organisational culture or positive cultural values on discretionary work effort were found. In a review of research on proactive behaviour which is part of the direction facet of discretionary work effort, Crant (2000) developed an integrated model of antecedents of proactive behaviours in which he identified organisational culture and norms as a common variable. Most empirical studies, however, have examined the effect of specific types of organisational culture or a limited set of organisational values on a particular facet of discretionary work effort.

For example, Karambayya (1990) investigated the relationship between a satisfaction culture and affiliative and challenging forms of ERB which come under the direction facet of discretionary work effort. A satisfaction culture is characterised by norms and expectations for participative and people-centred management, constructive interpersonal relationships, achievement and self-actualisation (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988; Karambayya, 1990). This author found no significant relationship between a satisfaction culture and any of the forms of ERB investigated. In contrast, using Hofstede et al.’s measure of organisational culture, Stamper and Van Dyne (2001, 2003) found that a less bureaucratic culture which is conceptually similar to a satisfaction culture (i.e. more flexible, employee-oriented) had a significant positive correlation with a form of affiliative ERB but not with challenging ERB. In a study of the role of organisational values in affecting ERB, Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994) reported organisational values that included respect, participation, innovation, cooperation, quality, employee growth, recognition and reward had a significant positive relationship with several forms of discretionary work effort that represented the intensity facet (i.e. employee commitment and hard work) and the direction facet (i.e. change oriented behaviour, and interpersonal and affiliative behaviours). The values and norms examined in this study were similar to those in the supportive and less bureaucratic organisational cultures explored by Karambayya (1990) and Stamper and Van Dyne (2001, 2003).

In addition, there have been a handful of studies looking at the relationship between organisational cultural values and workaholism which involves a high investment of discretionary work effort. Burke and his colleagues (Burke, 2000, 2001c; Burke et al., 2004) conducted two studies exploring the relationship between organisational cultural values supporting work-life balance and workaholism validated by the work behaviour of a high investment of discretionary work time. Workaholic worker types were reported to contribute significantly larger amounts of discretionary work time to the job but they found no significant difference between workaholic and non-workaholic employee perceptions of organisational cultural values supporting work-life balance. Further, Buelens and Poelmans
(2004) investigated differences in workaholic and non-workaholic employee perceptions of an organisational culture that provides opportunities for personal growth. These authors reported that two workaholic employee types (i.e. enthusiastic workaholics and work enthusiasts) perceived their organisations to have a strong growth culture but two other workaholic types (i.e. work addicts and reluctant hard workers) perceived their organisations to have a low growth culture. Thus, these empirical findings do not appear to reveal any consistent pattern of relationship between organisational culture (or cultural values) and the time facet of discretionary work effort. Taken together with the research findings on the direction facet of discretionary work effort, the evidence supporting positive organisational culture (or cultural values) having a direct effect on discretionary work effort seems too inconsistent to warrant being a potential category of perks.

In addition to specific types of organisational culture, some discretionary work effort research has explored how specific types of organisational climates promote various forms of discretionary directed effort like creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship and personal initiative. Kanter (1987) maintained that innovative behaviour is fostered by a work environment that encourages rational risk-taking, provides open communication and constructive feedback, recognises creative work, provides access to resources for creative problem solving and provides participative and collaborative management. In addition to specific job characteristics and supportive supervisor and co-worker behaviours that were discussed in earlier sections of this review, two key organisational characteristics identified as important in creating a climate for creativity, innovation and corporate entrepreneurship are: 1) the organisation’s encouragement of and support for desired work behaviours; and 2) the organisation’s provision of constructive feedback, recognition and reward for these efforts (Amabile, 1997; Amabile et al., 1996; Burnside, 1990; Hornsby et al., 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002; Kuratko et al., 1990). These factors are perceived to operate broadly across the organisation to support and encourage these discretionary behaviours by employees.

To date, however, there seems to have been little empirical testing of whether these organisational factors actually do affect these forms of directed discretionary work effort. In one longitudinal study of Korean employees, however, Choi (2007) found a strong vision and an innovative climate were significantly related to change oriented ERB of employees.

The organisational concept that seems to have attracted the most research attention as a determinant of discretionary work effort is organisational support. Social exchange theory supports the notion that relationships form between employees and their organisations in a similar fashion to the formation of supervisor-subordinate and employee-co-worker relationships. Thus according to organisational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986;
Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), employees form global beliefs about the extent of an organisation’s concern for and commitment to them. How an organisation treats its members, the working conditions and rewards (e.g. pay, promotion, and opportunities for personal growth) provided, and observed policies and procedures act as indicators of the organisation’s concern for employee welfare. Employees evaluate a wide range of factors associated with their treatment to determine the willingness of the organisation to reward greater effort and to meet their socio-economic needs. The evaluative judgements attributed to the organisation include: (i) the organisation’s concern for employee needs, values, opinions, satisfaction and well-being; (ii) the organisation’s recognition, appreciation and value given to extra effort, good performance and employee contributions; (iii) the support provided to facilitate job performance; and (iv) the organisation’s overall judgement of the employee (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

The beliefs formed determine the employee’s judgement of how the organisation will react to various situations. The frequency, extremity and sincerity of the organisation’s reactions across a wide variety of situations influence the formation of the employee’s effort-performance-outcome expectancy and affective attachment to the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Organisational support can also foster a sense of trust in employees that the organisation will recognise and reward the efforts they make on its behalf (Organ & Konovsky, 1989).

According to social exchange theory and the norms of reciprocity, employees will exchange work effort, loyalty and commitment to the organisation for tangible and intangible rewards from the organisation. Employee perceptions of organisational support are, therefore, purported to affect their willingness to reciprocate through higher levels of discretionary work effort (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Employees will make judgements about the organisation’s readiness to recognise and reward extra effort, and its reactions to various work behaviours such as working long and hard, challenging the status quo, initiating change, making mistakes and taking risks. In an environment where the organisation is perceived to value extra effort and good performance, provide the support needed for effective job performance, and to support members’ socio-emotional needs in times of stress, employees should reciprocate this support with increased discretionary work effort.

There is substantial empirical support for a significant positive relationship between employee perceptions of organisational support (called perceived organisational support) and the direction facet of discretionary work effort in the form of affiliative ERBs (Bishop et al., 2000; Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001; Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberge, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; Lynch et al., 1999;
Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Van Dyne et al., 1994). In a meta-analysis of more than 70 empirical studies, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) reported perceived organisational support to have a significant positive relationship with ERB. Also, consistent with the processes in organisational support theory assumed to underlie this association, Eisenberger et al. (2001) found employees felt obligation towards the organisation mediated this relationship. Settoon, Bennett and Liden (1996) noted that although many studies report a positive correlation between perceived organisational support and ERB, when they investigated perceived organisational support and leader-member exchange simultaneously, leader-member exchange dominated the relationship with ERB. Nonetheless, the general pattern of research findings supports a significant relationship between perceived organisational support and affiliative forms of ERB (Organ et al., 2006).

In addition, organisational support has been linked to various challenging forms of discretionary work behaviour that also come under the direction facet of discretionary work effort. These include proactive behaviour, personal initiative, creativity and innovation (Amabile et al., 1996; Choi, 2007; Crant, 2000; Frohman, 1997, 1999; Hornsby et al., 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002; Janssen, 2001). Furthermore, this positive organisational characteristic has been related to workaholics who are recognised for their high investment of discretionary work time and intensity (Burke, 2000, 2001c; Burke et al., 2004; Peiperl & Jones, 2001; Russo & Waters, 2006), as well as discretionary work effort generally (Dubinsky & Skinner, 2004; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Skinner, 2000; Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983). Thus, the empirical evidence supporting a positive relationship between employee perceptions of organisational support and discretionary work effort is quite extensive.

Overall, the positive organisational characteristic with the strongest and most consistent evidence supporting a relationship with discretionary work effort is organisational support. Thus, this positive organisational characteristic is expected to be perceived as a category of perks.

Negative Organisational Characteristics

It seems that most prior research on organisational characteristics has had a bias toward factors that appear to motivate discretionary work effort to the relative neglect of factors that inhibit or undermine it. Thus, there is comparatively less research evidence on the effect of negative organisational characteristics. Here I examine the limited research uncovered in the literature in an effort to identify the most important variables that might form a potential category of organisational irks.
Negative organisational characteristics are potential organisational impediments or constraints, that is, conditions within the organisation that make it difficult for employees to undertake their jobs (Jex et al., 2003), or impede employee engagement in certain types of work behaviour or activity by decreasing opportunities (Amabile, 1997; Organ et al., 2006). Thus, organisational impediments are likely to decrease work motivation and induce employees to focus on meeting the requirements of their job at the expense of engaging in discretionary activities (Jex et al., 2003; Organ et al., 2006).

In the literature a number of organisational characteristics asserted to stifle discretionary work effort have been identified. The negative phenomenon that seemed to dominate the research related to aspects of bureaucracy (i.e. high levels of formalisation and/or centralisation) and to a lesser extent workplace politics (Amabile, 1997; Amabile et al., 1996; Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Bateman & Crant, 1999; Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997; Desmond, 2004; Frohman, 1997; Kanter, 1985; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Organ et al., 2006; Randall et al., 1999; Raub, 2008). While there are two conflicting views on whether bureaucracy has a positive or negative effect on employee work behaviour (Adler & Borys, 1996; Organ et al., 2006), the emphasis in this research has been on the constraining and alienating aspects of bureaucracy. Thus, in the following discussion I focus on the theoretical arguments and prior research relating to how these two negative organisational characteristics affect discretionary work effort.

Bureaucracy is usually associated with rigid hierarchies, centralised control, tight-fisted resource allocation, functional silos, formalised rules and regulations, cumbersome approval processes, inflexibility, impersonal relations, narrow job descriptions and reward systems that promote conservative decision-making, maintain the status quo, and encourage the avoidance of risk and failure (Adler & Borys, 1996; Amabile et al., 1996; Bateman & Crant, 1999; Desmond, 2004; Kanter, 1985). Its core features are formalisation, inflexibility, centralisation, and compartmentalisation of responsibilities (Adler & Borys, 1996; Desmond, 2004; Kanter, 1985). Formalisation refers to the extent to which there are well-defined written rules, procedures, instructions and communications governing employee activities and for handling various contingencies (Adler & Borys, 1996; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Organ et al., 2006). Inflexibility is the degree to which an organisation rigidly adheres to these rules and procedures (Organ et al., 2006). Centralisation relates to the distribution of power in an organisation. It is the degree to which the locus of decision-making authority and control is concentrated at the top of the organisation (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Raub, 2008). Compartmentalisation refers to the extent to which there are clearly established centres of command or departments with specialised functions and responsibilities (Kanter, 1985). These are often called functional silos (Bateman & Crant, 1999) as every person and
every function has its place. Kanter (1985) called this feature of bureaucracy “segmentalism” as it is an approach to organising and managing activities that discourages interaction, integration and change.

Katz and Kahn maintained that because bureaucratic organisations rely heavily on rules and regulations to ensure reliable behaviour, they foster “rigidity of behaviour” and are “designed to make differences irrelevant” (1978, p.264-5). They argued that heavy reliance on rule enforcement not only destroys discretionary spontaneous innovative actions by employees but also creates minimum acceptable standards of employee work behaviour that soon become the common pattern of behaviour and subsequently maximum standards. Thus, bureaucracies reduce variability in work effort and performance of employees. Amongst the unintended outcomes of bureaucracy are a lack of cooperation, communication, coordination and flexibility for problem-solving.

Others have similarly argued that excessive bureaucratic rules and procedures overly constrain employees giving them less opportunity to engage in discretionary behaviours and undermining their commitment to the organisation and their motivation to engage in discretionary tasks (Organ et al., 2006). Thus, to engender more discretionary work effort, organisations need to relax the over-controlling policies and procedures endemic in many bureaucratic organisations otherwise they will choke the energy out of employee action (Bateman & Crant, 1999; Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Frohman, 1999). It has also been suggested that when work environments are perceived to be highly controlling, this decreases discretionary work effort by undermining intrinsic motivation (Amabile et al., 1996; Frey, 1993; 1997).

One theoretical argument for linking bureaucracy to work motivation and discretionary work effort is its capacity to restrict the decision-making power of employees, and thereby, create a sense of powerlessness amongst employees in lower hierarchical positions (Adler & Borys, 1996; Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Raub, 2008). Hierarchical structures and centralisation create an asymmetry of power between managers and employees which allows managers to play a dominant role (Adler & Borys, 1996). This power comes from knowledge and skills, information, support and control over resources (Adler & Borys, 1996; Kanter, 1985). The asymmetry of power increases opportunities for people in higher positions to shift the attribution of responsibility for negative outcomes and to engage in opportunistic behaviour that might create political problems (Adler & Borys, 1996).

The empirical research on the effect of bureaucracy on discretionary work effort has been quite diverse and mainly related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort.
Some studies explored manager perceptions of obstacles to various forms of the direction facet of discretionary work effort (e.g. creativity, innovation). Other studies investigated if a bureaucratic culture or specific features of bureaucracy (e.g. centralisation, formalisation) are related to various forms of the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

In the corporate entrepreneurship literature, for example, various bureaucratic constraints have been identified as key inhibitors of creativity, innovation and corporate entrepreneurship (Amabile, 1997; Amabile et al., 1996; Burnside, 1990). Amabile and colleagues (Amabile, 1997; Amabile et al., 1996) found that a focus on the status quo, political problems, negative criticism, inappropriate feedback systems and behaviours aimed at protecting territory were perceived as a category of obstacles to creativity. Similarly, Hornsby, Kuratko and Zahra (2002) reported that organisational factors like formalisation and inflexibility of policies and procedures are perceived to stifle middle managers’ willingness to foster corporate entrepreneurship activities. This research, however, did not establish if a relationship actually exists between bureaucratic features and actual creative, innovative and entrepreneurial behaviours.

In major reviews of prior ERB research (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Podsakoff et al., 2000), the results on the relationship between bureaucratic constraints (i.e. formalisation and inflexibility) and ERB were found to be inconclusive. In their meta-analysis of leader behaviours and leadership substitutes as antecedents of ERB, Podsakoff et al. (1996a) found that generally formalisation had a significant direct negative relationship with ERB while inflexibility was positively related. In contrast, Podsakoff et al. (2000) reported no significant correlations between these variables, while Organ et al. (2006) reported that a re-analysis of data collected for a prior study showed a direct negative relationship between both formalisation and inflexibility and some ERB.

Organ et al. (2006) argued that it may be difficult to predict the effect of formalisation and inflexibility on discretionary work effort due to opposing forces at play. On the one hand, these factors may motivate employees to focus on prescribed tasks to the exclusion of discretionary work activities. Strict adherence to formalised and inflexible rules and procedures may limit opportunities for employees to engage in ERB. Even well intended deviance may attract disapproval. On the other hand, formalisation and inflexibility may increase certainty, role clarity and perceptions of fairness. This should increase employee satisfaction, commitment and trust, and thereby increase ERB. These authors concluded that the relationship between organisational formalisation and inflexibility and ERB is complex and needs more research.
In addition to these studies on specific features of bureaucracy, three studies looking at bureaucratic culture also presented inconsistent empirical results. Karambayya (1990) investigated the relationship between a security culture and ERB. A security culture is conservative, conventional, and has centralised decision-making with severe sanctions placed on failure and non-conformity (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988; Karambayya, 1990), and thus, is indicative of a bureaucracy. This author reported a significant negative relationship between a security culture and one form of ERB which is conceptually similar to Entwistle’s (2001) notion of discretionary in-role performance and overlaps with my intensity facet of discretionary work effort (see Section 2.2). These outcomes suggest that while bureaucracy may demotivate employees to work intensively, it does not appear to affect the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

In another study of US services sector employees, Stamper and Van Dyne (2001, 2003) investigated the relationship between organisational culture (described as more or less bureaucratic), work status and ERB. While the intent of their research was to test if organisational culture moderated the work status and ERB relationship, they reported a significant correlation with a more bureaucratic culture decreasing affiliative ERB but being unrelated to challenging ERB. In a further study by Turnipseed and Murkison (2000) no evidence of a relationship between bureaucracy and ERB was found. Taken together, this empirical research fails to provide any clear indication of the nature of the relationship between bureaucracy and the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

Nonetheless, Adler and Borys (1996) reconciled the conflicting views and inconsistent assessments of bureaucracy as alienating or enabling by proposing a typology of organisations that characterises them along two dimensions, degree and type. The degree of bureaucracy takes account of the extent of formalisation, centralisation and so forth. The type of bureaucracy takes account of the extent to which it is coercive or enabling. A coercive bureaucracy is one that enforces reluctant compliance and extracts unwilling effort suggesting an excessive level of bureaucracy for the type of job involved. An enabling bureaucracy is one designed to facilitate employees to deal more effectively with tasks and inevitable contingencies. This typology contrasts with the conventional organic/nonbureaucratic and mechanistic/bureaucratic framework used in prior research. These authors maintained that negative outcomes like decreased commitment and motivation to make discretionary contributions to the organisation are most likely in coercive bureaucracies with excessively high bureaucratic constraints.

Therefore, even though the empirical findings on the relationship between bureaucracy and discretionary work effort are inconclusive, there seem to be reasonable
theoretical and conceptual grounds for a coercive type of bureaucracy, as proposed by Adler and Borys (1996), being negatively related to discretionary work effort. This idea confers with the arguments presented earlier that excessive bureaucracy impedes discretionary work effort.

In addition to bureaucracy, organisational politics has featured in some research on discretionary work effort. This research has viewed organisational politics as a negative organisational characteristic. This perspective is consistent with the understanding commonly held by employees that organisational politics involves actions that are perceived as manipulative and self-serving (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Gandz & Murray, 1980). Based on this perspective, organisational politics is defined as a subjective state in which organisational members are perceived to be using unsanctioned influence to promote self-interest at the expense of others or organisational goals (Gandz & Murray, 1980; Randall et al., 1999).

In a political work environment people gain rewards through power and competition that may be destructive. Thus, a political work environment is less predictable and more ambiguous, and so, is likely to be seen to be more threatening and potentially harmful (Cropanzano et al., 1997). It creates uncertainty about whether greater effort will be consistently and duly rewarded. Therefore, the effort-performance-outcome expectancy of employees is likely to be decreased which should lower work motivation and reduce their willingness to contribute discretionary work effort.

Empirical research testing this relationship, however, has been limited and the findings are yet to establish a consistent pattern of relationships. Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey and Toth (1997), for example, reported organisational politics to have no significant relationship with supervisor reported levels of subordinate ERB. However, they subsequently found it to be significantly positively related to self-reported levels of psychological withdrawal, that is, the psychological disengagement of employees such that they are physically but not mentally present at work. Psychological withdrawal behaviours include daydreaming and engaging in social chat with colleagues, and so is conceptually similar to the concept of shirking. Thus, it is indicative of the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. That is, an employee who psychologically withdraws is not working as intensively in the time spent working. Thus, this study suggests that organisational politics may impact on the intensity but not the direction of discretionary work effort. Contrary to these findings, however, Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann and Birjulin (1999) reported that organisational politics was significantly negatively related to supervisor reported levels of
employee ERB suggesting a possible relationship with the direction facet of discretionary work effort as well.

While this research has tested organisational politics as a discrete organisational characteristic, Amabile et al. (1996) treated internal political problems as part of their organisational impediments category of obstacles to discretionary creative behaviour. They described organisational impediments as “an organizational culture that impedes creativity through internal political problems, harsh criticism of new ideas, destructive internal competition, an avoidance of risk, and an overemphasis on the status quo” (Amabile et al., 1996, p.1166). This conceptualisation combines features of Adler and Borys’s (1996) coercive type of bureaucracy with features of organisational politics. Empirical testing of this construct has demonstrated that it is uni-dimensional with good psychometric properties (Amabile et al., 1996).

The uni-dimensionality of this construct is not surprising given that two key features of bureaucracy (i.e. centralisation and formalisation) have been found to be related to perceptions of organisational politics (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992). These variables, however, have opposing influences. While centralisation has a strong negative correlation with perceptions of organisational politics (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001), a high degree of formalisation has a moderate positive relationship (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992). Following Adler and Borys’s (1996) line of argument on different types of bureaucracy, however, it seems conceivable that the centralisation and formalisation characteristics of bureaucracy can be enabling or coercive. Coercive centralisation and formalisation are intended to enforce compliance and extract greater effort from employees. This is likely to create distrust and an increased sense of powerlessness amongst employees at lower levels in the organisation, and thus, might be expected to increase perceptions of organisational politics. Thus, it seems plausible for political power play to be not only consistent with, but an element of, a coercive bureaucracy. Thus, I propose to explore this as a single category of irks that I call “excessive bureaucracy”. This negative organisational characteristic should decrease discretionary work effort of employees, and therefore, form a potential category of irks.

Collectively, this literature suggests that a “supportive organisation” that displays concern for the needs and well-being of its employees and encourages and recognises extra effort should be a potential perk and that an organisation that is “excessively bureaucratic” in degree and type should be a potential irk. Thus, the following proposition will be empirically tested in Studies 1 and 2 of this research.
Proposition 4A: A supportive organisation that cares about the welfare and needs of its employees will be perceived as a category of perks by employees.

Proposition 4B: Excessive bureaucracy (i.e. coercive and political) will be perceived as a category of irks by employees.

It could be argued that some of the potential perks and irks represent opposite ends of a single construct ranging from motivating to demotivating (e.g. leader support and autocratic leader behaviour). However, there seem to be reasonable theoretical grounds to believe that the potential perks and irks identified are conceptually different. For example, in the leadership literature the differentiation between positive and negative forms of leadership behaviour seems well accepted. Amabile et al. (2004, p.8) contended that in leadership theory “the one-sided focus on positive leader behavior limits the breadth of theoretical conceptualizations of leadership, because there may be important ways in which negative leader behaviors operate on subordinate perceptions and performance differently from the absence of positive behaviours”. Barrow (1976) for example, distinguished between positive leader behaviour styles (task-emphasis and supportive-consideration) and negative leader behaviour styles (punitive-performance and autocratic-emphasis). Likewise, Gould-Williams (2007) conceptually differentiated high/low leader member exchange (i.e. the extent of trust, mutual liking and respect) from negative leader exchange and found empirical support for a differential effect for these two forms of leader behaviour on discretionary work effort. In a similar vein, Flamholtz (1990) depicted directive leadership on a continuum from autocratic (a negative form) to laissez-faire (i.e. non-leadership) as opposed to conceptualising it as the converse of positive leader behaviour. In addition, negative leader behaviours like abusive supervision (Ayree et al., 2007; Tepper et al., 2004; Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002) and petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1994) appear as distinct constructs. However, in consideration of the potential for some perks and irks to represent two ends of a single construct, the discriminant validity of all the perks and irks constructs will be tested as part of my research.

2.5 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MONETARY REWARDS, PERKS AND IRKS IN INFLUENCING DISCRETIONARY WORK EFFORT

What motivates employees to contribute discretionary work effort may be affected by many factors. Much of the contention between economics and psychology researchers is connected to the roles of monetary rewards, perks and irks in motivating discretionary work effort. While there is recognition in both disciplines that both factors play a part, labour economists typically emphasise monetary rewards while OB researchers emphasise perks and irks.
In the OB literature, monetary rewards are often assumed to affect discretionary work effort independently of the impact of perks and irks. According to the theory of self-determination (Deci, 1977), however, it is posited that intrinsic motivation, and hence discretionary work effort, is decreased when an employee feels that external intervention (via extrinsic rewards) by the employer reduces their feelings of self-determination and self-evaluation. Thus, Deci and others have argued that monetary rewards undermine intrinsic motivation and so are predicted to lower discretionary work effort.

In contrast to this view, in his crowding theory of work motivation (Frey, 1997) in the labour economics literature, Frey proposed that this crowding-out of intrinsic motivation will only occur under certain conditions. He contended that an external intervention such as the employer offering more monetary reward to induce higher employee work effort will cause a crowding-out effect only if employees perceive it to be controlling. That is, under this condition this external intervention will lower intrinsic motivation and so decrease discretionary work effort. However, if employees perceive the external intervention by the employer as supportive, employee work effort will not be crowded out. Instead, a crowding-in effect may occur. That is, the employer’s offer of more monetary reward could interact with employee perceptions of supportive work environment conditions to create a synergistic effect on discretionary work effort.

Frey’s (1997) crowding theory suggests that perks and irks may moderate the monetary reward-discretionary work effort relationship. The presence of high perks should cultivate employee satisfaction, commitment and trust. Thus, an increase in monetary reward offered by the employer to induce greater discretionary work effort should be perceived as a supportive action by the organisation. Under such conditions, no crowding-out effect should occur and the monetary reward-discretionary work effort relationship may actually be strengthened. If so, there would be a positive relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort for employees in a high perks work environment. In contrast, the presence of high irks is likely to create dissatisfaction and distrust resulting in employee perceptions of a controlling work environment. Thus, an increase in monetary reward by the employer to motivate greater discretionary work effort is likely to be perceived as a controlling intervention creating a crowding-out effect. If so, there should be a weaker or no significant relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort. This contention on the moderating effects of perks and irks on the monetary reward-discretionary work effort relationship will be investigated as part of Study 3 (see Chapter 6).
2.6 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This cross-disciplinary literature review examined four fields of literature that have addressed work motivation and discretionary work effort. These were OB, labour economics, workaholism and corporate entrepreneurship. The purpose of undertaking a multi-disciplinary review of the literature on discretionary work effort was to identify the commonalities and differences across these fields of research. By bringing these literatures together, it was not so much my intent to fully integrate them as to draw from them to gain a more comprehensive view of the discretionary work effort, perks and irks constructs. This review highlighted that economists and OB researchers have approached the investigation of discretionary work effort from different vantage points.

Economists have typically conceptualised discretionary work effort in terms of the time and intensity facets. They have also emphasised monetary rewards and investigated a very narrow range of non-monetary work environment characteristics as determinants of these facets. This perspective neglects the direction facet of discretionary work effort and many non-monetary work environment characteristics that may affect the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort. On the other hand, OB researchers seem to have conceptualised discretionary work effort mainly in terms of the direction facet and have examined a fairly broad range of non-monetary work environment characteristics as determinants of this facet. This literature, however, has largely overlooked the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort and given less attention to monetary rewards as a motivator of discretionary work effort.

This review reveals that the economics and organisational behaviour disciplines have different emphases rather than contradictory approaches. Both disciplines provide useful but incomplete insights to the meaning of discretionary work effort and its determinants. Thus, there are two clear gaps that my research aims to fill to advance the literature on discretionary work effort. The first contribution is to bring together the OB and economics conceptualisations of discretionary work effort to develop a consistent and more complete theory-based definition and conceptualisation of this construct. The second is to produce a more comprehensive set of perks and irks to test their association with discretionary work effort.

Our ability to measure and study a phenomenon to advance our knowledge and understanding of it is often impeded by imprecise or inconsistently defined terms (Scott et al., 1997). In my review of the literature on discretionary work effort below, I outline the problems with the most commonly used definition of this construct that was developed by Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983). I then identify the commonalities and differences in
how this important construct is defined and conceptualised from the OB and economics perspectives. By tying together work motivation concepts and the key defining criteria for the discretionary work effort construct from these two fields, I develop a concise theory-based definition and a more complete conceptualisation of discretionary work effort. Thus, by bringing together the OB and economics conceptualisations of discretionary work effort my research advances the literature by providing greater definitional and construct clarity for discretionary work effort.

Sharing, considering and building on the knowledge accumulated on what motivates discretionary work effort from different fields is a useful approach in that it progresses the development of what Locke and Latham (2004, p.392) call a “boundaryless science of work motivation”. By drawing on a broader body of literatures on discretionary work effort and its facets, I generate an inventory of potential perks and irks for subsequent empirical testing in a new motivational model of discretionary work effort. The inventory of potential perks and irks generated from this review is by no means exhaustive. However, it identifies those factors that emerge most strongly from the four literatures examined. Therefore, this is an important first step towards delineating the perks and irks domains to enable me to operationalise these constructs.

In summing up, this multi-disciplinary review informed my research questions in two ways. Firstly, it broadened my view of the discretionary work effort construct to provide a more complete conceptualisation that is consistent with the work effort construct of which discretionary work effort is a component. Secondly, it expanded the range of predictors beyond what is covered by any individual literature that I can consider in my research. The extent to which each of the factors identified through this review is actually perceived by employees as a perk or an irk will be tested in Studies 1 and 2 of my research (see Chapters 4 and 5). Then, the relationship between these factors and discretionary work effort will be tested in Study 3 (see Chapter 6).
Chapter 3
Research Design

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the research design for my thesis. I begin by providing an overview of the research strategy for my program of research. This section discusses the research paradigm on which my research is based and a justification for my approach. Here I describe the three studies that comprise my program of research and how, together, they address my research questions. Next, I present the research context of my investigation into discretionary work effort. This provides insight into the industry selected for my research and a rationale for my choice of research site. This is followed by an overview of the research methods which outlines the broad research framework. A more detailed description of the research techniques used in each study is provided in Chapter 4 (Study 1), Chapter 5 (Study 2) and Chapter 6 (Study 3) where the specific methods, findings and research limitations for each study are considered. In the present chapter I describe the participating organisations and outline the methods used to gather the data and the statistical techniques employed to analyse the data.

3.1 RESEARCH STRATEGY

To address the research questions underlying my research program (see Section 1.2.4), I used a multi-paradigm approach. Over the last decade or more there have been requests and growing support for multi-paradigm approaches to organisational research (Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Lee, 1991; McGrath & Johnson, 2003; Schultz & Hatch, 1996). These researchers refuted the view that the differences between the positivist and interpretive paradigms are irreconcilable and argued that these opposing approaches can in fact be mutually supportive. They urged researchers to use multiple paradigms and their complementary quantitative and qualitative methods simultaneously in social science research to advance our understanding of phenomena related to human behaviour.

The perspective from which my research was grounded was principally a post-positivist approach, leaning towards a functionalist position along a functionalist-interpretivist paradigm continuum. In taking a post-positivist approach, I assume that an underlying reality exists but that it cannot be directly observed or measured, and so, requires a process of estimation or approximation using indicators of latent variables (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007). In leaning towards a functionalist position, I used a predefined analytical framework to examine the relationships between the variables of interest. My choice of a suitable approach was guided by principles identified by Schultz and Hatch (1996) in contrasting paradigms. The specific strategy used for
my research is what these authors called a sequential strategy. That is, I used insights from an interpretive study as input to subsequent functionalist studies.

Combining qualitative and quantitative research methods can be very effective (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This mix can yield rich data that is complementary and strengthens the results through a process of triangulation. It often results in findings that would not have been possible using one method alone. Qualitative research provides depth and richness of data. When combined with quantitative survey results, this enables greater generalisability of the findings, extraction of key issues and provision of greater validity through triangulation (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

My research program suited a multi-paradigm approach for the following reasons. Firstly, the post-positivist-functionalist approach was considered appropriate as its central purpose was to empirically test a model of discretionary work effort based on a predetermined theoretical model developed from extant literature. The established body of knowledge relating to work motivation and discretionary work effort provided a reasonable basis for grounding a deductively driven research project. Close examination of the extant empirical research, however, revealed that the perks and irks constructs were not well defined and had no suitable established measurement scales. Thus, as suggested by Morse and Richards (2002), prior backgrounding research was needed to provide better insight into these constructs and their domains to facilitate the development of suitable measures.

This deficiency in the literature meant that it made sense to commence the study using an exploratory research design involving qualitative research methods, and then to proceed with a conclusive descriptive and explanatory research design using quantitative research methods (Malhotra, Hall, Shaw, & Crisp, 1996). This enabled the meanings of these constructs to be clarified and a better understanding of their content domains gained. The quantitative approach then followed to develop suitable measures of these constructs and to test the hypothesised relationships in my research model.

By combining the qualitative and quantitative methods in this way, I was able to capitalise on the strengths of each approach. Techniques associated with a qualitative approach are highly flexible and provide rich, detailed and expressive data that enables researchers to better explore ill-defined and poorly understood phenomena. The researcher delves into people’s experiences through text from which themes emerge, and knowledge and understanding of the phenomena of interest is gained. A quantitative approach gives the researcher the ability to work with larger representative samples, to statistically test relationships between variables and to generalise the research findings for a population.
Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods is not uncommon in research, especially where interesting research questions exist. These often require several strategies for generating the necessary data for analysis (Morse & Richards, 2002). Thus, my research program seemed to suit a multi-paradigm approach.

As a result of the circumstances outlined above, I decided to break the larger research program into three distinct yet interrelated studies. Study 1 was a combination deductive-inductive study that involved exploratory qualitative research to identify, define and inform the operationalisation of perks and irks. Study 2 was a deductive study that used quantitative methods to develop measurement scales for perks and irks. Study 3 was also a deductive study that utilised quantitative methods to test the hypothesised relationships proposed in my research model of discretionary work effort.

The first two studies address research question 1, viz: “what non-monetary work environment characteristics do employees commonly perceive as perks and irks?” Study 3 deals with research questions 2 and 3, viz: “how do perks, irks and monetary reward relate to an employee’s level of discretionary work effort?” and “do perks and irks moderate the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort?” The literature review in Chapter 2 revealed several non-monetary work environment factors that could potentially fit the perks and irks domains. The exploratory research in Study 1 identified core themes of commonly perceived perks and irks and provided the backgrounder research for Study 2. It gave an improved understanding of the perks and irks domains and it assisted in generating suitable items for developing measures for the perks and irks via the Study 2 questionnaire. Study 2 provided the vehicle for testing and refining the measures of perks and irks. It also pre-tested the discretionary work effort scales drawn from the literature. Each of these measures were then used in Study 3 where they were further refined before testing the discretionary work effort model.

Figure 3.1 provides an overview of the broad processes employed in undertaking this three-study program of research. It plots the path taken in conducting this investigation as well as identifying the specific research questions associated with each study, how the studies are interrelated, the broad approaches taken, and the timing for each study.
The research context and an overview of the research methods used will now be discussed.

3.2 THE RESEARCH CONTEXT

Rousseau and Fried (2001) and Johns (2006) strongly argued for contextualising organisational research. Johns defined context as “situational opportunities and constraints that affect the occurrence and meaning of organizational behaviour as well as functional relationships.
between variables” (2006, p.386). Organisational characteristics provide the context for employee behaviour and the external environment provides the context for organisations (Johns, 2006). Johns maintained that context can have a main effect on behaviour or interact with other variables to influence behaviour.

These authors contended that researchers have given insufficient recognition and appreciation to context as an important influence on individual behaviour within organisations. They argued that contextual differences can be a major source of conflicting findings in the literature. These differences can affect the base rate of variables, cause range restriction and sign reversal, change the causal direction of relationships, bring about curvilinear relationships and threaten the validity of research findings (Johns, 2006; Rousseau & Fried, 2001).

Rousseau and Fried (2001) argued that contextualisation has become even more important as the nature of work and work settings have become increasingly diversified. Therefore, they encouraged greater use of contextualisation in formulating research questions, in site selection and data measurement, and in the interpretation and reporting of research findings. Johns (2006) encouraged researchers to describe the occupational and demographic context, the research site, the absolute and relative timing of the research and the rationale for conducting the research. He contended that this contextualisation can assist with explaining and better understanding the research findings. As a minimum, these authors recommended that researchers provide a rich description of the research setting to assist our understanding of the factors that may give rise to our observations.

### Industry Sector Choice and Rationale

For the purpose of answering my research questions, I needed a research context where high discretion exists so that employee motivation would be relevant to inducing discretionary work effort, and thereby affect employee and organisational performance. High discretion is prevalent in the rapidly growing services sector (Skinner, 2000) which includes both private and public organisations. Thus, I looked for suitable agencies in a services setting where customer service and knowledge jobs are plentiful as these are known to offer high discretion (Skinner, 2000; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2003). With this in mind, I chose the local government sector in Western Australia. This choice of research context should have high relevance to discretionary work effort researchers and offers the potential to make a unique contribution to the discretionary work effort literature for the following reasons.

Firstly, as a service provider, local government provides a high discretion job environment. While local government has governance, advocacy and regulation roles to perform, service delivery to local communities, including professional planning and community
development functions, is a key focus (Commonwealth of Australia, 2006). Thus, within this service delivery context, there is considerable scope for motivating discretionary work effort.

Secondly, to test the universality and range of applicability of discretionary work effort theory and to stretch its boundaries, research should be undertaken in diverse and complex organisational settings (Monson, 2005). The local government sector provides a diverse and complex organisational environment. Furthermore, it is noted that there is merit in choosing a context in which greater variability in the range of observed values for the variables under investigation might be expected as this can help reduce the likelihood of range restriction (Johns, 2006; Rousseau & Fried, 2001). Local government organisations are a highly diverse group. This diversity extends beyond rural-metropolitan differences and reflects differences in circumstances, opportunities, responses and choices of individual local government bodies (Commonwealth of Australia, 2006; Commonwealth Government Commission, 2001). At the time of conducting my program of research, there were 142 local government bodies in Western Australia of which 80% were located in rural and regional areas (Government of Western Australia, 2006). They varied in population size and geographic area serviced (143 to 181,000 people in areas from 1.5 to 372,000 square kilometres in 2004-05), organisation size (9 to 818 employees), scope and scale of functions, community expectations, complexity and fiscal position. Just prior to the time of data collection in 2005 this sector employed some 173,000 people in more than 600 different roles (Government of Australia, 2006; Craven, 2006) ranging from unskilled/semi-skilled outside maintenance staff, to customer service, clerical and administrative staff, to highly qualified professionals. This diversity of work environments and occupational roles should not only limit the likelihood of range restriction of variable values but also enhance the generalisability of the research findings.

Thirdly, the current local government environment in Western Australia provides a potentially interesting context in which to conduct this research. At the time of this research, this sector in Western Australia was under pressure on four main fronts; structural reform, intensifying fiscal pressures, unprecedented economic growth, and heightened community expectations. A national public sector reform agenda aimed at making local government more businesslike, performance oriented and focussed on high quality service delivery (Aulich, 1999a, 1999b; Commonwealth of Australia, 2006; Worthington & Dollery, 2002), exposed this sector to an environment of dramatic and continuous change (Worthington & Dollery, 2002). Within this reform process, local government managers were encouraged to adopt a new public management philosophy. It was maintained that knowledge of effective private sector management could be used to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public sector management (Bradley & Parker, 2001; Teo, Ahmad, & Rodwell, 2003).
Under the reform agenda local governments were given greater authority, autonomy and flexibility enabling them to broaden the services offered. Simultaneously, it was exposed to greater uncertainty, competition, industry environment turbulence and financial and sustainability challenges (Aulich, 1999a; Commonwealth of Australia, 2006; Commonwealth Government Commission, 2001; Craven, 2006; Worthington & Dollery, 2002). Fiscal pressures intensified with declining revenue transfers and cost shifting by Federal and State governments. Heightened community expectations for a broader range of services added to these pressures. At the time of data collection there was unprecedented economic growth that exacerbated an already acute national labour and skills shortage creating critical shortages in technical and professional staff who are central to local government roles. Wages were driven up rendering local governments even less competitive against the private sector due to regulatory and tight financial constraints. Poaching behaviour amongst local governments favoured those Councils better equipped to reward and support their employees (Craven, 2006). This environment created major challenges for local governments (Craven, 2006). Historically, the pace of structural reform and change in Western Australia was slower than in most other states. At the time of conducting this research, however, local governments in this state had come under growing pressures for more extensive structural reform (Worthington & Dollery, 2002). In 2007, two rural/regional councils voluntarily underwent amalgamation and another two had agreed to progress down this pathway. In 2009 the Western Australian government introduced measures to more rapidly progress the local government reform agenda.

Fourthly, local government is an important industry sector in Australia. It plays a vital role in providing essential local services and makes a significant contribution to the Australian economy (Aulich, 1999a; Commonwealth Australia, 2005; Commonwealth of Australia, 2006). It accounts for approximately 2.3% of the nation’s GDP (ABS, 2007; Commonwealth of Australia, 2006). The Western Australian local government is the third largest employment sector in Western Australia. Between 2000 and 2005, employment in this sector grew 27% (Commonwealth of Australia, 2006; Craven, 2006). Despite its relative size and importance, the public sector has attracted much less discretionary work effort research attention than the private sector (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Chiaburu & Baker, 2006; Drago, 1991; Janssen, 2001; Lynch et al., 1999; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Schaubroeck & Fink, 1998; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 1994). There is, however, a small and growing body of discretionary work effort research in public sector settings (Albrecht, 2005; Alotaibi, 2001; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2002; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Noblet, McWilliams, Teo, & Rodwell, 2006; Noblet, Teo, McWilliams, & Rodwell, 2005; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998; Tepper et al., 2004; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000). Consequently, the existing literature offers only limited insights into how discretionary work effort of public sector
employees can be stimulated. It has been argued that greater attention needs to be given to theory development, systematic empirical research and improving our understanding of work motivation in public sector organisations (Perry & Wise, 1990; Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999; Wright, 2001). Thus, the findings of this research program are expected, a priori, to have high potential for making a unique and valuable contribution to the existing literature in this domain.

A final reason for selecting local government for this research was a pragmatic one, viz: data availability via access to organisations and research participants. My established network in the local government sector provided an avenue for gathering data from suitable participants.

Like many organisations today, local governments are under pressure to change and be innovative. Part of the formula may be to better motivate employees to contribute greater discretionary work effort. Having many high discretion jobs, local governments can expect to have considerable scope for achieving this. To improve its competitiveness and meet the challenges it faces, it has become crucial for local government managers to create a work environment that is not only attractive to its employees but also creates a passion for ensuring efficient and effective service delivery to the community. This means that identifying key motivators of discretionary work effort is highly relevant with potentially important implications for this industry. It was in this environment of structural reform pressures, strong economic growth, tight labour market conditions and increasingly tight fiscal conditions that I collected my data during 2005 and 2006.

Research Context Implications

In choosing a the public sector context for conducting my research, two questions that arise are how this context might affect my own research findings and how my research findings might be expected to differ from other research findings in the literature.

Rousseau and Fried (2001) maintained that the meaning given to a construct can vary with the research setting. They proposed that researchers should consider if constructs have the same meaning in the chosen research setting and from whose perspective (i.e. managers, co-workers or employees) the construct is being examined. Similarly, Morrison (1994) found that employees differ from supervisors in what work behaviours they perceived as discretionary. She argued that the conceptual boundary between formal job requirements and discretionary work behaviours is unclear and subjectively constructed, and so is open to multiple interpretations. She also contended that it is important to determine what employees perceive as discretionary since this will affect their work behaviour.
Research on discretionary work effort in the public sector has commonly employed the same measures as prior studies in private sector settings (Alotaibi, 2001; Blakely, Andrews, & Fuller, 2003; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Noblet et al., 2006; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Tang & Ibrahim, 1998). This approach assumes that this construct has the same meaning for public sector and private sector employees although this assumption does not appear to have been tested. It seemed relevant, therefore, to consider how local government employees perceive discretionary work effort. This would help to assess if public sector employees conceive discretionary work effort in a manner that is consistent with its conceptualisation in the literature, and thus, its relevance in this research setting. As I propose to examine the relationship between self-reported discretionary work effort and several work related variables, it is pertinent to establish how this concept is viewed from the employee’s perspective. Thus, an additional research question that needed to be examined in my program of research was: “To what extent is the way that local government employees perceive discretionary work effort consistent with how this construct is conceptualised in the literature and was defined for the purpose of my research?”

In additions to what meaning local government employees give to discretionary work effort, the effects of combined pressures outlined in the previous section need to be considered. These pressures have contributed to work intensification and rising job demands (Noblet et al., 2006; Noblet et al., 2005). These outcomes are likely to have implications for minimum work effort expectations of local governments as well as employee perceptions, attitudes and work behaviour. Employee perceptions of minimum work effort requirements, and of the nature of the work environment, may have been raised by these events. These factors could potentially compress the observed variability in discretionary work effort between individuals and thereby affect the detection of significant relationships between discretionary work effort and the predictor variables under investigation.

Countering this effect, however, the tight labour market may have lowered employee perceptions of the threat of dismissal if caught shirking. This outcome could be attributed to alternative employment being more readily available even if dismissed, and possibly a greater reluctance by local governments to dismiss shirking workers for fear of not being able to secure suitable replacements. Hence, the effectiveness of supervisor monitoring as a worker discipline device as proposed in the economist’s efficiency wage theory (see Chapter 2) should be lessened under the tight labour market conditions that existed. If this is the case, in the event of close supervision being perceived as an irk, the negative working condition effect of close supervision would be expected to outweigh any positive effect it might have on work effort. Thus, the timing of this research has the potential for increasing the effect of autocratic leader behaviour as a potential irk and negative predictor of discretionary work effort.
The public sector commonly uses incentive schemes that are modelled on those found in the private sector. This approach implicitly assumes that employees in both sectors are similarly motivated (Crewson, 1997). While many similarities have been identified between employees in both sectors (Wittmer, 1991), it is often maintained that the public sector differs from the private sector in many respects and that public sector employees may have different needs, values and motives than private sector employees (Crewson, 1997; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Guyout, 1962; Houston, 2000; Perry & Wise, 1990; Wittmer, 1991).

Public sector organisations are often depicted as fitting the traditional Weberian bureaucratic model (Katz & Kahn, 1978). They are characterised as hierarchical with formal rules and procedures, rule enforcement and compliance, formalised decision making, constrained autonomy of managers, and stability and predictability. Also, they are subjected to political and regulatory controls rather than to competitive market forces (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Parker & Bradley, 2000; Teo et al., 2003). Thus, encouraging greater discretionary work effort may be especially challenging for public sector organisations.

It has been posited that there are more obstacles to linking pay with performance in the public sector. Government regulations and strict job classifications that limit and tightly structure pay scales (Wittmer, 1991) may prohibit or constrain the use of monetary rewards to motivate higher employee discretionary work effort. Also, strong union power can effectively prohibit income gains to one employee without this also being made available to all employees. These effects can be further exacerbated by a declining financial capacity to offer competitive salaries and packages. This lack of competitiveness is likely to have worsened under the tight labour market conditions that existed at the time of this research. According to the expectancy and subjective utility theory frameworks that underpin my research, these factors would weaken the performance-reward linkage in the public sector, and thereby weaken the motivational influence of monetary rewards (Frank & Lewis, 2004). In the public administration literature, it is suggested that public sector employees are more altruistic, and that they value intrinsic rewards over extrinsic rewards, place less value on monetary rewards, and are motivated by a need to serve the public interest. In contrast, private sector employees are expected to be more strongly motivated by pay and other extrinsic rewards (Crewson, 1997; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Guyout, 1962; Houston, 2000; Perry & Wise, 1990; Wittmer, 1991). Thus in combination, these arguments suggest that by conducting my research in a public sector context, the salience of perks and irks may be increased and monetary rewards weakened as motivators of discretionary work effort.

In the face of the pressure for structural reform and other external pressures, however, a cultural shift towards becoming more business-like and market-oriented should
be evident amongst local governments. Some post-reform agenda studies of local government in Australia revealed that the organisational culture preferred by local government managers is one that is less bureaucratic, more transparent, market-oriented, results-oriented and externally focussed, and emphasises flexibility, innovation, teamwork and cooperation (Bradley & Parker, 2001; Parker & Bradley, 2000; Teo et al., 2003). Nonetheless, the traditional bureaucratic culture appears to be quite resilient in many local governments (Bradley & Parker, 2001; Parker & Bradley, 2000) although there is other evidence that organisational cultures are transitioning with a shift toward the desired cultures (Teo et al., 2003). To the extent that this transition has occurred, fewer differences will exist between the private and public sectors. If this is the case, my research findings should also be relevant in the private sector setting.

3.3 RESEARCH METHOD

3.3.1 Participants

The participants in my research were employees from 12 of the 142 Western Australian local governments that existed at the time of my research which represented 8.5% of local governments in the state. I elected not to randomly select organisations to participate in my research. Western Australia is geographically very large and so it would have been extremely costly to visit many of the local councils if they had been randomly selected. Therefore, I chose to stratify my sample to include diversity across some key selection criteria. Informal discussions with industry experts, personal industry knowledge and organisational characteristics were used to select the sample of organisations invited to participate in my research. The key selection criteria used were location, size of organisation (defined in terms of local area population, number of employees and revenue base), remoteness (defined in terms of distance from the capital and geographic size), local government classification and reputation within the industry. This approach aimed to ensure diversity more than representativeness for the reasons outlined in Section 3.2.

My sample included three metropolitan and nine rural/regional organisations, which was roughly proportional to the population mix. It included organisations with central and fringe metropolitan, small and medium urban regional, medium and large rural agricultural and strong growth rural classifications. There were, however, no organisations with either very small rural agricultural or very remote classifications. These two classes of local governments commonly face special sustainability issues. Due to the special nature of the issues experienced, it was decided not to include any of these organisations in the research.

While the sample organisations were not entirely representative of the population of local governments in the state, the participating group provided a reasonable cross-section and
represented a high level of diversity. This diversity was desired in order to limit range restrictions in the observed values for the variables under investigation (see Section 3.2). Some key characteristics of the participating local governments are presented in Table 3.1. These are compared against selected statistics for the Western Australian local government sector overall to provide an indication of the relative representativeness of the sample.

Table 3.1 Characteristics of Participating Local Government Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Number of Employees 2004-05</th>
<th>Total Revenue ($m)</th>
<th>Local Area Population 2004-05</th>
<th>Distance from Capital City CBD (kms)</th>
<th>Land Area (Km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1,541.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>11,563</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>518.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>10,030</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>7,028.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>21,338</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>22.16</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>42,450.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>21.22</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>27,540</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,454.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>31,981</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>4,315.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>30,865</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>45.96</td>
<td>29,684</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>95,228.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td>90,096</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>127.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>65.06</td>
<td>92,969</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,043.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Statistics

| Smallest | 51 | 6.93 | 4,800 | 7 | 20.6 |
| Largest  | 470| 65.06| 92,969| 725| 95,228.5 |
| Average  | 206.6 | 29.20 | 32,114 | 275.75 | 13,049.1 |
| Median   | 186.5 | 26.61 | 24,439 | 216.5 | 1,497.5 |

Sector Statistics

| Smallest | 9 | 1.4 | 143 | 0 | 1.5 |
| Largest  | 818 | 121.4 | 181,079 | 3200 | 371,696 |
| Average  | 97.3 | 13.6 | 14,277 | 378.4 | 17,902.9 |
| Median   | 38 | 5.6 | 3,000 | 250 | 2,223 |


Study 1 involved a small, non-random sample. Participants for the individual interviews and the first focus group interview were selected from four of the participating local governments located in the South West of Western Australia: one small (51 employees), one medium (94 employees) and two large (over 200 employees). These four organisations formed a convenience sample in that they were readily accessible and willing to provide access to employees who were prepared to participate in the qualitative research. Nonetheless, these organisations represented a reasonable cross-section with characteristics that reflected the range of organisations in the overall sample. The second focus group interview was conducted with a new convenience
sample of employees from a fifth organisation. This organisation differed from the other four in that it was a more geographically remote location and had offices in two different towns.

For Studies 2 and 3, ‘whole of organisation’ surveys were undertaken with all 12 participating local governments. The CEOs of these organisations, however, were not included as part of the target population. This approach enabled a diverse range of employees to be captured in the sample including supervisory and non-supervisory staff, full-time and part-time employees, and professional, clerical/administrative and blue-collar categories of workers. A wide range of occupational groups was represented including engineers, town planners, building surveyors, financial personnel, human resource management personnel, community services personnel, recreational services officers, librarians, parking inspectors, health officers, horticultural and parks maintenance staff, construction and maintenance workers, management and other administrative personnel. This diversity of occupational groups in the sample further increased the generalisability of the research findings. Profiles of the participants in each of these studies are reported in the next three chapters.

3.3.2 Data Collection

Because of the very different nature and purpose of each of the studies comprising my program of research, different approaches were used to gather the data. The following discussion provides an overview of the procedures employed in the three studies that formed my program of research.

Qualitative Data

Study 1 was the vehicle for conducting my exploratory research. To provide a greater understanding of the nature and scope of the domains of perks and irks, qualitative research methods were employed. No overarching definition exists for qualitative methods due to the diversity of methods and strategies it incorporates. Use of this term, however, reflects accepted practice within the research community (Symon & Cassell, 2004). Broadly, qualitative methods refer to “research that does not use numbers” (Seale, 1999 p.119) and usually involves an inductive study. Morgan and Smircich (1980) described qualitative research as an approach rather than a specific set of techniques and argued that its appropriateness depends on the nature of the phenomena being explored.

In choosing appropriate qualitative methods to use, it is important to be explicit about the epistemological and ontological positions from which the research is being undertaken, as the research is steered by the underlying assumptions (King, 2004a; Steyaert & Bouwen, 2004). These philosophical assumptions guide the approach taken in conceptualising and operationalising the research problem (Steyaert & Bouwen, 2004). Qualitative methodologies can be classified along a continuum of epistemological positions
from realist approaches at one end to radical constructionist approaches at the other (Madill, Jordan, & Shirley, 2000).

Epistemologically, I lean towards the realist end of the spectrum. This position is compatible with the post-positivist framework and functionalist paradigm on which the broader research program is based. Further, it suits the exploratory stage of my research where the focus was on having participants describe and make sense of specific aspects of their workplaces and working lives. Specifically, the focus was on their perceptions of perks and irks, what they experienced as perks and irks, and their perceptions of discretionary work effort.

The assumptions underpinning this study were:

1. The accounts provided by participants reflect their real work experiences and psychological states (attitudes/beliefs);
2. The participants’ accounts provide insight to the phenomena of interest, namely, perks, irks and discretionary work effort; and
3. The data collected may be systematically compared and analysed with that obtained through other methods (i.e. quantitative survey data) enabling a process of triangulation.

In Study 1 it was important to gain a deeper understanding of what factors employees perceived to be perks and irks in their workplace and which of these they find most satisfying and dissatisfying. It was also important to assess what work activities or behaviours the local government employees perceived as discretionary and the extent to which there was a common understanding of discretionary work effort. This understanding was central to specifying the domains of these key constructs to inform their operationalisation for the subsequent studies.

The data collection technique chosen for Study 1 was qualitative interviews. Qualitative interviews are defined as interviews “… whose purpose is to gather descriptions of the life-world of the interviewee[s] with respect to interpretation of the meaning of the described phenomena” (King, 2004a p.11). Qualitative interviews are amongst the most common method of data gathering in qualitative research and this method suits exploratory research. Qualitative interviewing can be used as one of several methods to provide an extra dimension that enables the researcher to examine the research question/s from a different perspective. When used in conjunction with other methods, it provides for methodological triangulation (Mason, 2002). This technique is especially useful when the aim is to develop depth and roundness of understanding. Thus, qualitative interviews were considered appropriate for this study.
As this study was grounded in a principally post-positivist approach, a realist interview technique was adopted. From a ‘realist epistemological position’, it is assumed that the accounts provided by the interviewees reflect the participants’ real world outside the context of the interview, and thus provide insight to their actual experiences and beliefs.

In qualitative interviewing it is important to have a fluid and flexible structure. This flexibility enables additional themes or topics to emerge. It allows the interviewing process to inform the design of the research (Morse & Richards, 2002). Thus, to ensure this flexibility, I conducted semi-structured interviews using loosely structured interview guides.

I used the existing literature (reviewed in Chapter 2) to inform the design of my interview guides and questions for this study (see Chapter 4), the operational definitions of the key constructs, and to specify the domains for the constructs of interest. A combination of deductive and inductive methods was used for the domain specification and the subsequent questionnaire items generated for the Study 2 survey.

In Study 1, I conducted 35 individual face to face in-depth interviews. In addition, two focus group interviews were carried out with samples of employees from two different organisations that took part in this study. The first focus group discussion was undertaken halfway through the individual interviewing process. Its aim was threefold. Firstly, to test and confirm the themes emerging from the analysis of the individual interviews already conducted. Secondly, to see if the synergy that group interview sessions create revealed any new ideas that had not yet emerged. Thirdly, to assess the extent to which individuals used a common language when discussing the variables of interest. The second focus group discussion was conducted after the individual interviewing process was completed. The purpose of this focus group discussion was to test the level of agreement with the main themes that emerged from the analysis of all the individual interviews and the first focus group interview. While the focus group participants formed a convenience sample and came from just two organisations taking part in my research, they provided a reasonable cross-section of employees in terms of gender, age, job status, organisational status and job type. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. The sample selection, the interview guides created and the interviewing procedures used are explained further in Chapter 4.

Quantitative Data

Quantitative methods are well suited to research situations in which the research concepts and phenomena of interest are well defined and the relationships between variables are established. They are especially appropriate where the research can be embedded in existing theory so that an analytical model and/or hypotheses can be identified a priori and tested through the research. Quantitative methods are also suited to developing and empirically testing
quantifiable measures of new variables. Given the aims of Study 2 and Study 3 (see Section 3.1), these two studies were well suited to a quantitative approach and required the collection of quantitative data. Study 2 was the vehicle for developing measurement scales for perks and irks. In this study I used a combination of exploratory and descriptive quantitative research. Study 3 was the vehicle for testing my research model of discretionary work effort. In this study I used a combination of descriptive and explanatory quantitative research.

In contrast to qualitative research, quantitative research refers to the group of inquiry methods that involves the use of numeric representations of the world (Yoshikawa, Weisner, Kalil, & Way, 2008) and a deductive approach. This form of research is embedded in the post-positivist-functionalist paradigm. The post-positivist approach uses procedures associated with inferential statistics, hypothesis testing and mathematical analysis, all of which require the collection of quantitative data. The epistemological assumption underpinning this approach, therefore, is that the world can be numerically represented and analysed using quantitative techniques.

Quantitative methods are more formal, objective, structured and scientifically based than qualitative methods (Malhotra et al., 1996). They usually involve larger, more-representative samples than those used in qualitative research. The data collected are subjected to quantitative analysis from which inferences can be drawn about the population. Thus, the research findings are generally conclusive in nature.

Surveys are amongst the most common technique used to collect data in quantitative research. Studies 2 and 3 collected quantitative data using a ‘whole of organisation’ questionnaire. This technique has the advantage of being less costly and time consuming than qualitative data collection techniques like interviews, and so is useful for research involving large samples. The data collection techniques for these two studies were pre-planned and highly structured.

In both Study 2 and Study 3, the data collected involved self-report measures for discretionary work effort (criterion variable) and for perks and irks (predictor variables). Baldamus (1969) maintained that work effort contains many subjective elements and so cannot be objectively measured (Guest, 1990). Yet, economists have commonly questioned the reliability of direct, subjective measures of variables and so resisted their usage in research (Asch, 1990; Drago, 1991; Ehrenberg & Bognanno, 1990; Freeman, 1978; Leibenstein, 1979). Nonetheless, some economics studies of discretionary work effort have used subjective, self-report measures (Drago, 1991; Goldsmith et al., 2000), and there appears to be a growing acceptance of such measures in economics research (Clark & Oswald, 1996; Freeman, 1978;

In contrast, subjective and self-report measures of work effort are predominant in OB research (Biberman, Baril, & Kopelman, 2003; Brown & Leigh, 1996; Chang, 2003; Chiaburu & Baker, 2006; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Gakovic & Tetrick, 2003; Janssen, 2001; Noblet et al., 2006; Orpen, 1994; Parker et al., 2006; Srivastava, Strutton, & Pelton, 2001; Turney & Cohen, 1976; Yoon et al., 2001). Nonetheless, the trustworthiness of self-report data has also been questioned here (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). It is claimed that subjective, self-report measures can be vulnerable to systematic overestimation due to problems of common method bias, social desirability and the consistency motif. Artefactual rather than true covariations between measures may result (Avolio, Yammarino, & Bass, 1991; Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Conversely, it has been argued that the potential effects of self-reports and monomethod studies are often exaggerated, oversimplified and limited to a small number of variables (Spector, 2006).

Using self-report measures has been justified on several grounds. These include arguments that managers often lack the relevant information needed to accurately assess the more subtle aspects of their employees’ discretionary work effort (Janssen, 2001); individuals are the best judge as they hold the knowledge needed (Drago, 1991; Turney & Cohen, 1976); an observer needs to infer work effort from observable behaviour and this has limited validity (Guest, 1990); and in anonymous situations employees will provide relevant data (Drago, 1991). These arguments reflect the observational opportunities assumption in which the ratings of a target individual by a third party are posited to be a function of the opportunities the rater has to observe the target in revealing situations (Goffin & Gellatly, 2001; Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988). If self-ratings are free of bias, they should converge with those of independent raters who most closely share the observations and experiences of the self-rater (Goffin & Gellatly, 2001).

Some empirical support has been shown for using self-report measures of work outcomes (Goffin & Gellatly, 2001; Guest, 1990). Comparing self, supervisor and peer ratings of organisational commitment, Goffin and Gellatly (2001) reported that observation opportunities provided a better explanation of the correlations between ratings than defensiveness response explanations (i.e. tendency for all or some types of individuals to inflate their own ratings). These authors concluded that self-reports may, therefore, be free from self-serving biases. Guest (1990) similarly claimed that self-report measures represent valid and reliable indicators. In a meta-analysis of multiple rater performance data, however,
Harris and Schaubroeck (1988) reported a greater convergence between observer ratings than self-observer ratings and the possibility of defensiveness amongst managerial/professional employees.

In support of using self-ratings, Guest (1990) asserted that subjective measures of discretionary work effort are consistent with the expectancy theory framework of work motivation. He argued that at all points in the effort-performance-reward linkage, the emphasis is on employee perceptions which implies the use of self-reports.

Ideally, to avoid the potential biases that self-report data can introduce it is recommended that measures of the most crucial concepts should come from multiple sources using multiple methods. This approach, however, can present significant logistical challenges and added cost that need to be considered. In my research I opted to use subjective, self-report measures of discretionary work effort. Then, as suggested by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Lee (2003), I employed a mixture of procedural and statistical strategies to address the potential problem of common method variance.

The main procedural techniques used were: (i) to create a psychological separation by making it appear that the measurement of the predictor variables was unrelated to the measurement of the criterion variables; (ii) to protect participant anonymity to reduce evaluation apprehension; and (iii) to carefully construct my measurement items (Podsakoff et al., 2003). I also ordered the items for my criterion variables to follow the items measuring the predictor variables (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). These procedural strategies were incorporated into the questionnaire design (see Chapter 6).

In addition, I employed Harman’s one factor test using confirmatory factor analysis as a statistical procedure to determine if single-source bias might be a problem in my sample data (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). This is one of the most common statistical techniques used to address common method variance from this source. It is based on the assumption that substantial common method variance would contribute to the presence of a single general factor that accounts for the majority of variance in the data. A factor analysis of all study variables is conducted to see if a single factor solution emerges. While this procedure cannot eliminate single-source bias and it does not ensure the data is free from bias, it provides a diagnostic tool to assess the likelihood of it presenting a problem.

The qualitative findings from Study 1 provided input to Study 2. Using qualitative evidence to develop quantitative measurement scales is a common approach in mixed method research (Yoshikawa et al., 2008). Study 2, therefore, gathered quantitative data on perceptions of
perks, irks and discretionary work effort from a sample of 586 participants. The data collected was used to empirically test the themes that emerged from Study 1 by developing quantitative measures of perks and irks. Study 3 gathered quantitative data on the level of perks and irks present in the workplace and self-reported discretionary work effort from a sample of 508 participants. These measures were used to empirically test the relationships between the variables in my research model. Chapters 5 and 6 provide a detailed description of the sampling technique, questionnaire design and the procedure used to distribute and collect the questionnaires for each of these latter two studies.

3.3.3 Measures

To answer my research questions (see Section 3.1), I needed quantifiable measures for perks, irks and discretionary work effort.

Perks and Irks

No suitable scales were found in the literature to adequately capture the domains of perks and irks. Thus, new measurement scales were developed as part of my program of research. The literature review (see Chapter 2) revealed several work environment factors as potential perks and irks. These were investigated in Study 1 and core themes of perceived perks and irks identified. This study provided the backgrounding research for Study 2. Drawing on information from the literature review and empirical evidence from Study 1, suitable scale items were generated for each of these themes to develop measures for perks and irks via the Study 2 questionnaire (see Chapter 5 for a full explanation of the scale development procedure followed).

Discretionary Work Effort

In the OB and economics literatures, there was no single approach to measuring discretionary work effort identified that adequately encompassed the conceptualisation of this construct described in Chapter 2. Therefore, I used a combination of different scales taken from the literature to tap the different facets of this multi-dimensional construct (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Podsakoff et al., 1990). The discretionary work effort scales were pre-tested in Study 2 (see Chapter 5) and then used in Study 3 to test my research model (see Chapter 6).

Monetary Rewards

A single item was used to measure monetary rewards. This was described as the total yearly income before tax (including overtime pay, bonuses or allowances, paid time off and other direct payments) received from the present job. This question provided a range of monetary values (e.g. under $30,000; $30,000 - $39,999; $40,000 - $49,999) from which participants could indicate the level of monetary reward received.
Individual and Work Situation Characteristics

Following common practice, information on several individual and work situation characteristics was gathered in the surveys. These included participant gender, age, tenure with the organisation, job status, job type, the department in which they worked and organisational status. It was anticipated that these variables may be related to the phenomena under investigation (see Chapter 6).

3.3.4 Data Analysis

Qualitative Data

The individual and focus group interviews from Study 1 were audio-taped, transcribed and imported into NVivo, the statistical software used for the analysis procedures. The qualitative data were analysed using a combination of interrelated qualitative analysis procedures. A constant comparison analysis method (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007) using thematic analysis of text with a template analysis technique (King, 2004b) was employed. Constant comparison analysis is perhaps the most common method of qualitative data analysis. It uses the entire data set to code text and identify underlying themes. Four main steps are involved: (i) reading carefully through the entire set of transcripts; (ii) breaking the data into smaller meaningful chunks; (iii) labelling each chunk of text with one or more codes; and (iv) systematically grouping similarly coded chunks of coded text together to form categories and core themes (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). The template analysis provided the coding framework for labelling units of text and the thematic analysis provided the procedure for reducing the coded data into categories and core themes. The analysis was conducted through the process of constant comparison of the text.

Template analysis refers to a group of techniques used to thematically organise and analyse text (King, 2004b). Thematic analysis refers to the identification of core themes and sub-themes in qualitative data. The text from open-ended interview questions is analysed using a coding procedure and reduced into a set of themes through a process of data reduction.

Template analysis requires the development of a template which is a list of codes that represent possible themes to be identified in the data. The template forms the coding framework for conducting the constant comparison of text and moving towards the identification of core themes and sub-themes (i.e. the thematic analysis). A template commonly has a hierarchical structure to reflect expected relationships between themes. This technique uses a combination deductive-inductive analytical approach. Some codes are determined prior to commencing the analysis (i.e. deductively). Then, through successive readings of the text, codes are added, deleted, combined and refined as other themes emerge from the progressive and iterative analysis of the text (i.e. inductively). This technique has several advantages. It is highly flexible, less time
Thus to analyse the data for Study 1, I created an initial template using pre-determined codes derived from the literature review and the interview guides developed for this study. The main interview questions/themes formed the core themes or higher level codes and the discussion points within these themes formed the sub-themes or lower level codes (see Chapter 4). I then systematically read through the full set of transcripts. During this reading I broke the text into units based on its content. Each unit was delineated by a change of subject, usually determined by a question from the interviewer. Using the initial template, each chunk of text was given one or more codes. Working through the transcripts a second time, I identified any inadequacies in the template and modified the codes as required. Extra codes were inserted as new themes were identified, codes not used were deleted, codes that overlapped excessively were collapsed, and code levels were modified to better reflect their relationship with other codes. The text was scrutinised a third time to check for consistency and logic of coding. This progressive, iterative interrogation of the data enabled similar codes to be grouped into categories and progressively collapsed into sub-themes and core themes within the template. For each sub-theme, a provisional definition was developed and supporting examples drawn from the text. These sub-themes and their descriptions were then tested in a focus group discussion.

Quantitative Data

The quantitative data gathered in Studies 2 and 3 were analysed using several techniques. Prior to undertaking any substantive analyses to address the research questions associated with Studies 2 and 3, missing data analysis and tests of normality were conducted. Factor analysis and reliability analysis were used to verify the internal consistency and factor structure of the scales used to measure the constructs of interest. In Study 2 exploratory factor analysis and Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities were used to initially develop measures for the perks and irks constructs (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Hinkin, 1995). Although Cronbach’s alpha reliability is the most commonly used measure of internal consistency (Field, 2006), it is recognised that this measure can be problematic as it is susceptible to the number of items in a scale. Thus, in Study 3 the more rigorous CFA technique (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988) was combined with construct (or composite) reliability which is considered a better estimate of internal consistency (Hair et al., 2010) to confirm the factor structure of the measurement scales developed in Study 2 and their internal reliabilities. Correlation analysis was also employed to assess the strength of relationships between the variables. ANOVAs and t-tests were used as secondary techniques in Study 2 to explore relationships between the study variables and the individual and work situation characteristics of the study participants. Correlation and regression analyses were the
primary techniques used for testing the hypothesised relationships in the model of discretionary work effort which was the focus of Study 3.

A more detailed discussion of the research participants, data collection and data analysis techniques, and the supporting rationale for these techniques is provided in Chapters 4 (Study 1), 5 (Study 2) and 6 (Study 3) where the research methods and findings for each individual study are presented.

### 3.4 SUMMARY

My program of research involved three studies that sequentially built on each other. The nature of the research problem and the associated research questions pointed to the need for a multi-paradigm approach. Thus, qualitative and quantitative research methods were combined to answer the research questions. This involved an exploratory study using semi-structured individual and focus group interviews followed by two structured whole of organisation questionnaires. The research was undertaken in the local government sector in Western Australia.

This chapter outlined the research strategy, the research context and the research methods used in my program of research. The research strategy aimed to identify the broad approach taken in conducting this program of research and why this was considered suitable for the research problem under consideration. The research context aimed to provide some insight into contextual factors affecting the local government sector at the time that this research was conducted that could influence perceptions and organisation expectations and thereby affect relationships with employee discretionary work effort. These factors may be helpful in understanding and interpreting the research findings. The research methods section provided a broad overview of the research participants, the type of data collected and the techniques used, the measures used in the quantitative research, and the data analysis procedures employed. The next three chapters elaborate on each of the three studies.
Chapter 4

Study 1 – A Qualitative Study of Perks and Irks

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Study 1 was the first of three studies comprising my program of research (see Section 3.1 in Chapter 3). This qualitative exploratory study investigated my first research question concerning what non-monetary work environment characteristics employees perceive to be perks and irks. From this core question flowed four related questions: (1) Do employees perceive particular job characteristics as perks and irks? (2) Do employees perceive particular leader and co-worker characteristics as perks and irks? (3) Do employees perceive particular organisational characteristics as perks and irks? (4) Do employees believe the non-monetary work environment characteristics identified affect their level of discretionary work effort?

This chapter commences by outlining the aims of Study 1, defining the important constructs, and discussing the outcomes expected from the study and how these outcomes extend the existing literature. Then in Section 4.2, the method used for this study is explained. This section describes the research participants and how they were recruited, the research instruments used, how the data were gathered and analysed, and the reliability and validity considerations of the research. Next, Section 4.3 presents the Study 1 results. This section is divided into two parts; the first part outlines the findings regarding what non-monetary work environment characteristics the sample participants perceived as perks and irks and how they believed these related to their level of discretionary work effort. The second part presents the findings regarding how the participants perceived discretionary work effort. The presentation of results is followed by Section 4.4 which provides a discussion of the main findings and how these informed the conceptualisation of these key constructs for Studies 2 and 3. Section 4.5 then considers the limitations of Study 1. Next, Section 4.6 summarises how Study 1 informed the next stage of my program of research and finally Section 4.7 provides a brief conclusion.

4.1.1 Study 1 Aims

The ultimate goal of my program of research was to test the relationships between perks, irks, monetary reward, and discretionary work effort. To test these relationships, suitable measures of these constructs were required. In the academic literature, however, there was little discussion of the terms perks and irks and no inventory of perks and irks
items that could be employed for my research was found. Thus, as part of my research I needed to compile an inventory of perks and irks items. I used the literature review to identify potential categories of perks and irks (see Chapter 2). Then, where existing measures that reflected the definitions of these categories of perks and irks could be found, they were incorporated into this inventory. The categories of perks and irks compiled, however, needed to be validated. That is, I needed to ensure that they actually relate to discretionary work effort. Thus, these potential perks and irks needed to be validated empirically. Study 1 was the first step towards this.

The aim of Study 1 was to inform the conceptualisation of the perks and irks constructs to help delineate the perks and irks domains. The emerging themes and sub-themes from this study provided the framework for developing the quantitative measures of these constructs. Hinkin (1995) argued that constructing good measurement devices is perhaps the most difficult yet most important part of any research. He asserted that quality research must start with quality measurement. He identified five steps to achieve this end. The first step is domain specification. Study 1 addressed this initial step, and thus, formed a crucial phase of my research.

Furthermore, it became apparent from the literature review that there are different conceptualisations of discretionary work effort (see Section 2.2 of Chapter 2). Also as discussed in Chapter 3 (see Section 3.2), the discretionary work effort construct may have a different meaning for local government employees than employees in different work settings. Thus, a final aim of Study 1 was to examine what meaning local government employees give to discretionary work effort to see whether they conceive it in a manner that is consistent with the literature and how I defined this construct for my research.

4.1.2 Construct Definitions

To effectively operationalise a construct, it is important to clearly define it. The following definitions were used for the three central constructs in my research, namely, perks, irks and discretionary work effort.

Perks and Irks – No established definitions of perks and irks were found in the academic literature. In the entrepreneurship literature, Douglas and Shepherd (2000) used the terms perquisites (or ‘perks’) and irksome elements (or ‘irks’) to describe the non-monetary working conditions of a job (although they had already separated out autonomy, risk and work effort demands). In the populist management and compensation literature, the term perquisites is commonly used to describe non-monetary benefits such as a company car, laptop computer, professional memberships and so forth. These perks were conventionally the domain of employees in senior positions and so were called ‘executive perks’ or ‘status
perks’ (Budman, 1994). This view contributed to perks taking on a specific vernacular meaning. However, the concept of perks has been progressively broadened to include ‘soft perks’ such as flexible hours, child care and elder care assistance, working from home, casual dress days and so forth. These types of perks are being provided to employees at all levels and are aimed at increasing mainstream employee productivity (Budman, 1994). My conceptualisation of perks and irks extends beyond the type of factors described by Budman to also include less tangible things such as positive or negative relationships with co-workers (e.g. co-worker shirking) or supervisors (e.g. leader support) and so forth. Perks and irks also potentially include those factors that Douglas and Shepherd separated out from the ‘other working conditions’. Thus, for the purpose of my research, I defined perks as the positive non-monetary work environment characteristics an employee associates with his/her job. Similarly, irks were defined as the negative non-monetary work environment characteristics an employee associates with his/her job. Perks are expected to increase the level of discretionary work effort while irks are expected to decrease it.

Discretionary work effort – As identified in the literature review (see Section 2.2 in Chapter 2), discretionary work effort has been conceptualised in various ways (see for example Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Bowles et al., 1984; Brown & Leigh, 1996; Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Katz, 1964; Naylor et al., 1980; Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983). For the purpose of my research I integrated these different perspectives, defining discretionary work effort as the individual’s voluntary contribution of time, intensity and effort directed into work activities beyond what is minimally required, expected or enforceable by the organisation, in a manner that is consistent with the organisation’s goals and has, or is intended to have, a beneficial impact on the effectiveness of the organisation.

4.1.3 Expected Outcomes and Contributions

The principal outcomes sought from Study 1 were:

1. An improved conceptualisation of perks and irks gained from an increased understanding of what the research participants perceive as perks and irks at work.
2. A set of themes, sub-themes and associated statements that could be combined with the literature to develop quantitative measures of perks and irks in Study 2.
3. Clarification of how local government employees perceive discretionary work effort.
4. A refined model of discretionary work effort that specifies potential dimensions of perks and irks for testing in Study 2.

In attaining these outcomes, Study 1 extended the existing discretionary work effort literature by clarifying and improving our understanding of the perks and irks constructs. From this study, exemplars of what non-monetary work environment characteristics
employees perceive as common perks and irks were identified. This study provided a first attempt at specifying the domains of these two constructs. It also extended our understanding of the consistency with which discretionary work effort is conceived across different research contexts.

4.2 METHOD

Study 1 was grounded in a post-positivist-functionalist paradigm and employed a realist interview technique (see Sections 3.1 and 3.3.2 in Chapter 3). A combination of individual interviews and focus groups was used. Chapter 3 outlined my rationale for using a post-positivist-functionalist research paradigm, the assumptions and biases underlying Study 1, and the justification for using an interview technique to gather the qualitative data.

This section, therefore, focuses on describing the procedures used to collect and analyse the qualitative data gathered in this study. Study 1 followed the qualitative interview process suggested by King (2004a). This involved: (1) defining the research question; (2) creating an interview guide; (3) recruiting participants; and (4) conducting the interviews. Having already defined the research question (see Chapter 1 and Section 4.1 of this chapter), this section describes the interview guides created, the participants and how they were recruited, and how the interviews were conducted. It then describes the data analysis procedures used and the reliability and validity considerations of the research. Prior to commencing Study 1, ethical approval to conduct the research was obtained from the university. Agreement was also gained from the CEOs of the participating organisations to recruit and conduct qualitative interviews with members of their organisations.

4.2.1 Interview Guides

Qualitative interviews typically use an interview guide rather than a formal, highly structured set of questions. This ensures greater flexibility and allows extra topics and issues to emerge during the interviews (King, 2004a; Mason, 2002; Morse & Richards, 2002). Realist interview guides, however, tend to be more detailed and structured than radical constructionist interview guides (King, 2004a). Thus, in line with the realist interviewing position that I took for Study 1, I chose to conduct semi-structured interviews using loosely structured but reasonably detailed interview guides.

An interview guide provides a list of key topics or themes to be covered and a list of possible probes for following up on participant responses and eliciting additional information should this be required. The key topics and probes were designed before the interviews were conducted. In designing these guides, I was cognisant of not making them too prescriptive to ensure reasonable flexibility was maintained. Initially, I created a list of open-ended topics
that I wanted to explore, covering perks, irks and discretionary work effort. The choice of key topics was informed by my review of the literature and some informal preliminary discussions with local government employees. The interview guide was composed of information-seeking questions that were intended to elicit information about employee experiences of high and low discretionary work effort and their beliefs about what non-monetary work environment factors contributed to these experiences. It also aimed to gain information about how the participants perceived discretionary work effort.

Separate, but similar, interview guides were developed for the individual interviews and the first focus group. To obtain a rich and more complete picture of what were perceived to be perks and irks, the questioning in the individual interviews took several different tacks. This included asking participants: (1) to reflect on and relate any past experiences of maximum or very high work effort and minimum or very low work effort, the circumstances surrounding these incidences and what they believed contributed to their experiences; (2) what aspects of the current job and work environment are viewed as positive, rewarding and motivating or negative, irksome and demotivating, and their beliefs about how these factors affect their approach to their work; and (3) what changes they would like to make to their current job or work environment to make it more motivating and rewarding.

The first focus group covered essentially the same key topics. However, this guide was more general and had fewer probes than the individual interview guide. Figure 4.1 provides a flow chart depicting how the individual interviews were structured, albeit fluidly. The first focus group followed the same basic structure except for three main differences. Firstly, the introductory explanation for the focus group included an outline of the facilitator and participant roles during the interview. Secondly, the participants’ characteristics and background were not discussed (although some basic demographic information had already been collected from the participants when they registered their interest in participating in the research). Thirdly, the first two probes under non-monetary work environment characteristics that related to individual experiences of maximum and minimum work effort were not covered. The differences between the two guides reflected the slightly different aims of these two types of interviews (see Section 3.3.2 in Chapter 3) and the time constraints for conducting the focus group interview.
A structured interview guide was not created for the second stage focus group discussions. This interview stage was used to test agreement with the main themes and sub-themes revealed in the analysis of the individual and first focus group interviews (Hinkin, 1995). A list of the perks and irks themes and sub-themes, together with a brief description of each of these, was provided for the second stage focus group participants to read, respond to, and discuss. A definition of perks and irks was also provided. The participants were asked whether there were any key factors with which they disagreed as being important or felt had been omitted. In addition, they were asked to provide a rating on a 7-point scale of how positive (a perk) and negative (an irk) they personally viewed each theme descriptor.
4.2.2 Participants

Coming from a realist interview position, I aimed to recruit a sample of interview participants with a diversity of viewpoints and distinctively different levels of discretionary work effort (King, 2004a). Thus, I employed a relevant range or maximum variation sampling technique. This involved selecting participants with a diversity of personal characteristics, experience, job level, work context, motivation level and job satisfaction. This sampling technique helped to ensure the diversity of perspectives sought was represented in the data generated.

However, time and resource constraints were also a factor in deciding who to recruit for the interview sample. As a result, I opted to target employees from a convenience sample of organisations (whilst ensuring that the organisations sampled provided the diversity of perspectives sought for the research). Thus, employees from four organisations in relative geographical proximity to each other were invited to participate in the individual interviews and the first focus group interview. The sample of participants worked in two large-sized, one medium-sized and one small-sized local government organisation. Each of these organisations employed a wide range of occupational groups, although the two large organisations also employed people in some more specialist functions like economic development, marketing and public relations, and law and risk management. Two organisations were located in urban regional centres (one being a very strong growth area), one in a medium sized rural community and one in a small rural community. One of the organisations was known to be experiencing substantial internal issues that could have a negative effect on employee motivation and another was reported to be having some motivational issues with employees in one section of the organisation. Employees from a fifth organisation were invited to take part in a follow-up focus group. This organisation had two small branches in two small remote communities with a mining and tourism base. Its employees worked in a wide variety of job types.

Employees from the first four organisations were provided with information about the research project, its purpose and aims, the benefits expected from participation and an invitation to volunteer for an individual interview or a focus group interview. Participants were told that a summary of the findings of the research would be provided to the participating organisations in return for their participation. This information was distributed via an organisational newsletter or similar medium. Interested employees were asked to contact the researcher directly, either by telephone or email. Volunteers were then provided with additional information about the requirements of participation. Each volunteer was given a participant information sheet (see Appendix 1). On making contact with the researcher, some personal details were gathered from the volunteers during the contact. This
included information on their gender, age, work area, job status (full-time/part-time), job level (management/non-management) and tenure. Also, during the individual interviews participants were asked to complete a self-report measure on work motivation and job satisfaction. These measures were used to check that the sample of participants included representation from employees with both high and low levels of work motivation and job satisfaction. This was important to ensure that the study captured the range of irks and perks contributing to low and high levels of discretionary work effort.

However, these measures revealed that relatively few of the initial volunteers reported a low level of work motivation in their current job. Thus, the recruitment procedure was modified and a more targeted approach was employed to recruit participants with relatively low discretionary work effort. Following discussions with senior managers and CEOs, two different work areas in two separate organisations were identified as potentially having employee motivation concerns. The work area managers were then asked to sort their staff into high, moderate and low work motivation groups. Individuals identified in the low work motivation group were then approached to participate in an interview. This attracted three additional participants. This response rate was lower than desired. However, because participants who had reported current moderate and high levels of motivation generally had no difficulty in reflecting on prior low work effort experiences, some of which were quite recent, this was not deemed to be overly problematic. This belief was reinforced by the fact that an analysis of the interviews with the low motivation participants revealed no new themes or information.

The individual interviewing process ceased once a point of saturation seemed to have been reached. That is, no new themes or different information appeared to be emerging from additional interviews (Mason, 2002). Overall, 9% of the individual interview participants self-identified as having low motivation, 37% reported having a moderately low or moderate level of motivation and 54% reported having a high or moderately high level of motivation.

In total, 35 individual interviews were conducted and six employees participated in the first focus group. Initially, one follow-up focus group was planned involving 11 participants. For logistical reasons, this had to be broken into two smaller focus groups (5 and 6 participants respectively) as the participants were at different geographic locations within the organisation. The combined results of the follow-up focus group discussions are reported. Overall, the interview participants represented a reasonably broad cross-section of employees. A diversity of work areas were represented including administration, finance, rates, customer service, corporate services, building, planning, engineering, construction and maintenance, parks and gardens.
ranger services, community and economic development, libraries and aged care. Table 4.1 summarises the key demographic and work situation characteristics of the interview participants.

**Table 4.1: Study 1 Participant Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual Participants (n = 35)</th>
<th>Focus Group Participants (n = 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Status:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/supervisor</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Status:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time/Casual</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worker Type:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/community based workers</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside workers</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services &amp; Administration</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services &amp; Development</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory &amp; Technical Services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works &amp; Operations</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure with Organisation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual interview participants were predominantly male (63%), aged between 40 and 59 years (65%), in non-supervisory roles (69%), working full-time (89%), in white collar or professional jobs (66%) and had been with the organisation five or more years (54%). The focus group interviews had approximately equal numbers of males (53%) and females (47%). Nearly half (47%) were aged between 40 and 49 years and 76% were in non-supervisory roles. More than half (59%) were in white collar or professional jobs and 82% worked full-time. Information on tenure was not collected from the follow-up focus group participants and so could not be reported for this group as a whole. Five of the six participants in the first focus group had been with the organisation less than five years. As Table 4.1 shows, all categories of each demographic and work status characteristic were represented in the data set. I was unable to determine if this sample was representative of the local government employee population as my endeavours to obtain industry information on employee demographics from local government bodies and official statistical publications failed to provide the information required to make this assessment.
4.2.3 Conducting the Interviews

In conducting the interviews, flexibility was the single most important factor to consider (King, 2004a). Thus, while I used a standard introductory topic to open the interviews, the subsequent order of the topics and probes varied with how the participants responded to questions, and the direction in which the interview flowed. In addition to flexibility, participant confidentiality, confidence and comfort with the subject matter were important considerations to ensure open and honest responses were elicited. Therefore, the individual interviews were conducted at a location of the participant’s choice. Most participants opted to be interviewed in a private venue at their place of work. Some chose to meet at my office. To minimise disruption to the organisation, the focus group interviews were conducted on site at the participants’ workplace but at a venue that provided a high degree of privacy to protect participant confidentiality. The interviews were conducted between January and November 2005. All interviews occurred during normal working hours.

Each individual interview lasted one to one and a half hours. Prior to starting each interview, participants were asked if they understood the purpose of the study and if they wanted any extra information or clarification. An assurance of anonymity and confidentiality of information was provided along with an explanation of how the data would be stored. Approval was then sought for the interview to be audio-taped.

Participants were then asked to outline their prior work experience. I commenced with a familiar topic (their work background and experience) to help alleviate any anxiety the participants might have felt and to help build a rapport with them prior to introducing the more important topics. From this point, the interviews progressed using the interview guide as a loose framework. The interview discussion was concluded by asking the participants if they had any additional comments relevant to the subject that they would like to make. They were also asked to provide a self-report of their current level of work motivation and job satisfaction. At the completion of each interview, participants were asked to sign a consent form stating that they understood the purpose of the research and the conditions of their participation (see Appendix 2). The assurance of all information provided remaining confidential was repeated. All participants seemed comfortable with the interview process and at ease in responding to the questions.

The first focus group interview lasted approximately 2 hours. As the interviewer, I saw my role as one of facilitation rather than participation. This approach was consistent with the realist interview position I took in my research. As a result, I had minimal input but performed the roles of introducing the themes and discussion points, keeping the discussion on track, managing the involvement of each group member to ensure no individuals
dominated the discussion and that everyone had an opportunity to provide input, and maintaining the momentum of the discussion.

At the start of the session I provided assurances of confidentiality of the information gathered, explained how it would be stored and sought approval from the group for the interview to be audio-taped and for an independent observer to take notes on the major points being made. I then outlined my role as facilitator and their role as participants. The focus group interview guide was then used flexibly as the discussion progressed. At the end of the discussion all participants were asked to ensure the confidentiality of individual participants was respected and maintained. I also repeated my assurance of the information provided by individuals being kept confidential. Finally everyone was asked to sign the consent form. I noted that all participants seemed at ease and comfortable with providing input during the focus group discussions.

After the data from the individual interviews and first focus group had been analysed, the follow-up focus group interviews were conducted. These aimed to review and confirm the categories of perks and irks that had emerged from the analysis of the preceding interviews and to identify any gaps. This was a more structured discussion than the previous interviews.

At the beginning of each session I outlined the purpose of the focus group, my role as facilitator and their role as participants. Each participant was then given a sheet with a list of the main categories of perks and irks that had been identified from the analysis of the qualitative interviews, with a brief description of each. The participants were asked to read through these carefully for clarity of meaning and to provide a rating of how positively or negatively they personally perceived each factor to be. They were encouraged to make notes as they read through and provided their ratings. This was then followed by a discussion in which participants were asked whether any of the work environment characteristics items that they had rated were unclear, or weren’t considered to be a perk or irk. They were also asked to identify any non-monetary work environment factors that did not appear on the list, which for them represented important perks or irks. Next, they were asked to provide ratings for items relating to their perceived level of discretionary work effort and job satisfaction, and to provide some personal details. This was followed by a brief discussion on the clarity and relevance of the discretionary work effort items. This aspect of the focus group interview aimed to pre-test the clarity of the discretionary work effort items in preparation for their inclusion in the Study 2 questionnaire. The participants then completed and returned a consent form. Each of these sessions lasted approximately 45 minutes.
4.2.4 Data Analysis

As recommended in the qualitative methods literature (Morse & Richards, 2002), the qualitative interview data were continuously, systematically and recursively analysed throughout the data generation process. This aided me in building an understanding from the data and, if required, enabled me to adapt my research method as this understanding developed. I used a mixture of related analytical techniques to analyse the qualitative interviews in this study. The qualitative perks and irks data were analysed by combining qualitative template analysis, thematic analysis and constant comparison analysis. The discretionary work effort data were analysed using content analysis in combination with a deductively pre-determined coding template (King, 2004b; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

Template analysis involves a varied set of related analytical techniques for thematically organising and analysing qualitative data (King, 2004b). To analyse the qualitative perks and irks data, I created an initial template (i.e. list of descriptive titles or codes) representing potential themes and sub-themes. This template was then applied to the data. Sections of text were coded to identify underlying themes in the data (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). This involved a systematic, iterative process of reading, coding, and comparing sections of coded data (i.e. constant comparison), and reviewing, synthesising and reducing the entire data set to identify and confirm core themes and sub-themes (i.e. thematic analysis). The final template was developed in conjunction with the analysis of the data. Throughout the analytical process the codes were revised and modified as new ideas and themes emerged.

This analytical procedure represented a deductive-inductive approach. It commenced with a loose deductively created template as described below, and finished with an inductively modified template. The constant comparison technique combines similarly coded data and related codes to form themes and sub-themes but, unlike content analysis, it does not quantify the frequency with which codes are used (King, 2004b; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). This approach suited the analysis of the perks and irks data since the domains of these constructs were not clearly defined and delineated in the literature. Thus, using an entirely deductive approach to analyse the data was precluded. A more flexible approach to identifying perks and irks themes was required. The qualitative template analytical technique that commences with an initial coding scheme and builds flexibility into the coding procedure provided a practical solution. This enabled major themes and sub-themes to emerge from the data to inform the design of measures for Study 2.
The main steps involved in the analytical procedure were to:

1. Identify and code sections of text that related to non-monetary work environment characteristics.

2. Identify the full range of positive and negative non-monetary work environment characteristics reported to influence discretionary work effort (i.e. perks and irks) by taking participant comments out of their original context and coding them by key words and phrases. These coded words and phrases formed categories of statements.

3. Align these categories of statements to their source in the work environment, namely, the job, leader, co-workers or organisation as a whole.

4. Inductively identify major themes and sub-themes of perks and irks by grouping and collapsing the categories of statements for each source.

5. Identify typical phrases and statements to capture the content of each major sub-theme.

For the discretionary work effort data, classic content analysis was used. This analytical technique is similar to constant comparison analysis. The main distinction is that the frequencies with which codes are used is identified (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). Frequency data makes it possible to determine which concepts are identified most often and thus potentially represent important concepts for the research.

Content analysis is a more structured approach to analysing qualitative data. The codes are commonly derived deductively from the literature. The coding scheme created is applied to the qualitative data and descriptive analysis of the data can be undertaken. This approach suited the analysis of the discretionary work effort qualitative data for two main reasons. Firstly, a solid body of literature existed from which to theoretically conceptualise this construct and to develop a detailed coding scheme to guide the analysis. Secondly, the main purpose of the questions on discretionary work effort was to assess if local government employees conceived this construct in a manner that was consistent with its theoretical conceptualisation in the literature. Thus, a content analysis enabled statements about discretionary work time, discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort, and what directed effort employees perceived as discretionary to be quantified. This enabled me to assess their relevance and importance as elements of discretionary work effort, and to identify what behaviours and activities were broadly conceived by the participants as forms of discretionary directed effort.

Figure 4.2 summarises the process of data analysis followed for this study. A discussion of the procedure for creating the coding templates, the computer software used and how the data were analysed then follows. While the flow chart suggests a set of
sequenced steps, it was an iterative process with many of the steps repeated as the data was continuously analysed.

Figure 4.2: Flow Chart of the Data Analysis Process

1. Interviews audiotaped, transcribed & imported into NVivo
2. Initial read for content and Level 1 descriptor codes applied to text
3. Re-read & break text into units – full statements in response to an interview question or comment – and assign a level 2 code
4. Re-read and assign units of text to one or more level 3 & 4 codes
5. Group sections of text by level 3/4 codes – identify any deletions, additions, modifications to codes
6. Relate back to research questions & review level 3/4 codes as too broad or too narrow & modify as required
7. Repeated re-reading of level 3/4 coded sections to identify themes/sub-themes
8. Prepare summary descriptions of each theme/sub-theme & initial write-up of findings
9. Follow-up focus group to test themes/sub-themes and their descriptors
10. Refine, compare with literature & confirm/refute propositions

Level 1 Codes:
- Non-monetary work environment characteristics
- Work effort concepts

Level 2 Codes:
- Perks
- Irks
- Discretionary work effort

Level 3 Codes:
- Perks and Irks
  - Job characteristics
  - Leader characteristics
  - Co-worker characteristics
  - Organisational characteristics
  - Discretionary work effort
    - Discretionary work time
    - Discretionary work intensity
    - Discretionary directed effort

Level 4 Codes:
- Perks and Irks
  - Inductively determined from the data
  - Discretionary directed effort:
    - Helping
    - Individual initiative
    - Civic virtue
    - Organisational compliance
    - Organisational loyalty
    - Sportsmanship
    - Self-development
Creating the Coding Templates

Prior to conducting the interviews and undertaking the data analysis, templates were developed as a framework for coding the qualitative data. King (2004b) suggested modelling the templates on the interview guides with the broad topics used as higher order codes and the probes as lower order codes. He maintained that this technique is most effective when the researcher has defined many topics in advance and is working with a reasonably substantial and structured interview guide.

I defined the highest order codes (i.e. Level 1) in terms of the main topics under investigation, viz: (i) non-monetary work environment characteristics perceived to affect discretionary work effort; and (ii) work effort concepts. The level 2 codes were defined in terms of the core concepts for each main topic, viz: perks and irks for the first topic, and minimum effort and discretionary work effort for the second topic. The level 3 codes for perks and irks were initially defined in terms of the source of the work environment characteristics, viz: job, leader, co-worker and organisational characteristics. The level 3 codes for discretionary work effort were defined in terms of the facet of discretionary work effort, viz: (i) discretionary work time; (ii) discretionary work intensity; and (iii) discretionary directed effort. In addition, I created a level 4 code for discretionary directed effort as the literature indicated that this facet of discretionary work effort is multidimensional. Thus, I anticipated that the interview participants would talk about different forms of discretionary directed effort. By coding these different forms of discretionary directed effort, I would be able to assess if the interview participants conceptualised this facet of discretionary work effort in a manner that is consistent with its conceptualisation in the literature. I used a classification system suggested by Organ et al. (2006) to develop the level 4 codes for discretionary directed effort. These codes represented seven forms of ERB, viz: helping, individual initiative, organisational compliance, organisational loyalty, civic virtue, sportsmanship and self-development. No initial level 4 codes were developed for the non-monetary work environment characteristics template as no established classification system was found in the literature to guide me in preparing this next level of coding. Thus, I anticipated that these would emerge from the analysis. An example of an initial coding template created is presented in Figure 4.3.
Figure 4.3: Coding Template Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Code:</th>
<th>Non-monetary work environment characteristics perceived to affect discretionary work effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Code:</td>
<td>Perks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 Codes:</td>
<td>Level 4 Codes: Types of Perks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coding and Analysis**

The templates provided the structure for coding and analysing the qualitative data. This analysis was done using NVivo, a computerised toolkit used for handling and working with qualitative data. This involved progressively coding, browsing, searching, sorting and linking sections of the qualitative data to develop themes.

The hierarchical templates guided the creation of nodes (i.e. places for storing references to qualitative text relating to each concept in the template) in NVivo. Two main nodes were created representing the level 1 template codes. Successive branches were then added to represent the lower order codes. The audio-taped interviews were progressively transcribed and imported into NVivo and prepared with topic headings and probes to signal topic changes. Then, through progressively reading and re-reading the documents, the text was broken into sections by coding them to the relevant nodes. For example, in response to the question on what positive things in your job or work environment do you find motivating and rewarding, a participant talked about having autonomy in the way the job can be done. On the first reading, this section of text was coded to the level 1 topic of non-monetary work environment characteristics perceived to affect discretionary work effort. Then, on subsequent readings it was coded as a perk at level 2 and then as a job characteristic at level 3. Similarly, in response to the question of do you do any extra things that relate to your specific job that are voluntary and beyond what would be required of you, a participant talked about trying to develop and introduce a new quicker and easier accounting procedure. Through successive readings, this section of text was coded as a work effort concept at level 1, then as discretionary work effort at level 2, then as discretionary directed effort at level 3, and finally as individual initiative at level 4.

This coding process automatically sorted the data by code so that it could then be easily browsed by main topic and by sub-topics. With each subsequent reading of the perks
and irks data, the coding scheme was modified as new ideas emerged and codes were confirmed, created, reviewed and revised. Finally, codes were grouped to form categories of statements and reduced into major themes and sub-themes.

4.2.5 Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are important concerns for all research. In the context of qualitative research, this requires demonstrating the ‘trustworthiness’, ‘applicability’ and ‘consistency’ of the results (Morse & Richards, 2002). Much of this relates to the rigour with which the research is undertaken. The approach that I used to ensure the reliability and validity for this study was to:

1. Undertake an extensive review of the literature to ensure that I had a sound understanding of the body of knowledge relating to my research topic. Where possible, this knowledge and understanding was used to delineate the content domain and to provide explanations of the constructs under investigation.

2. Ensure the congruency of the purpose, research paradigm, research method and strategies that I employed to generate and analyse my data.

3. Sample for diversity, develop the trust of participants, and collect data to a point of relative saturation.

4. Carefully plan the coding of the data and be receptive and open to modifying my coding, definitions, theory and research framework in the light of the study findings.

4.3 RESULTS

The results are presented in two main sections. Firstly, the findings regarding what non-monetary work environment characteristics the sample participants perceived as perks and irks are presented and discussed. Here, the propositions formulated in Chapter 2 are examined in the light of the Study 1 findings. Secondly, the findings regarding how discretionary work effort was perceived by the sample of research participants are presented and discussed. Here, the research participants’ conception of discretionary work effort and the types of directed effort behaviours they considered discretionary are identified. These results are then discussed in light of how discretionary work effort is conceptualised in the literature and in my own research.

In the presentation of these findings, the data from the individual interviews are integrated with those from the first focus group interview. It was decided not to separate the findings from these two sources because the themes that emerged did not differ substantively.
4.3.1 Perceptions of Perks

One issue that needed to be considered was that for many people the term perks has a specific vernacular meaning. Direct questioning on perks, therefore, seemed inappropriate. Thus, an indirect questioning approach was adopted. A critical incidence approach was combined with direct questioning about positive non-monetary work environment characteristics in the participant’s current workplace. The individual interview participants were asked two main questions: (1) What work experiences have you had in which you believe you performed at or close to your maximum possible level of work effort?; and (2) What positive things about your current job and work environment do you find motivating and rewarding? The first question included probes that asked the participants to describe the circumstances surrounding their high work effort experiences and why they thought they were so prepared to work at this high level. The second question included probes that asked the participants to discuss positive aspects of their job, leader, co-workers, and the organisation overall (including their use of the organisation’s resources for personal benefit), and how they thought these factors affected their approach to their work. The first focus group only covered the second of these two questions.

Participant responses were analysed in light of the definition of perks developed for the purpose of this research (see Section 4.1.2). Factors identified as underpinning experiences of working at or near a maximum level were combined with the positive non-monetary work environment characteristics that participants viewed as motivating and rewarding in their current job to identify potential perks. Overall, participant statements about perks were numerous and varied. To gain a thorough understanding of the extent of the perks domain, a full list of perks were identified. Initially 35 perks emerged in the data. Most of these perks were common to the majority of employees regardless of their type of job (i.e. outside staff in blue collar roles versus inside staff in white collar or professional roles) or whether or not they were in a supervisory or non-supervisor role. Some perks, however, received limited mention by participants. Thus, any perk mentioned by less than 5 participants was removed as it was deemed not to be recognised broadly enough to warrant inclusion. This resulted in six of the 35 perks being removed from any further analysis. Four overarching themes with nine sub-themes were identified for the remaining 29 perks. The overarching themes were labelled: (1) intrinsically motivating job characteristics; (2) co-worker support; (3) leader support; and (4) organisational perks.

Intrinsically Motivating Job Characteristics

The perks associated with “intrinsically motivating job characteristics” related to the degree to which the job provides scope for challenging and responsible work, opportunities for personal achievement and growth, and gives rise to feelings of meaningfulness,
responsibility and ownership. The theme “co-worker support” incorporated perks that reflected the degree to which the employee’s co-workers value his/her contributions and care about his/her well-being through acts of support and constructive feedback. The perks within the theme “leader support” represented behaviours by the employee’s manager that indicated that he/she values the employee’s contributions and shows concern for the employee’s well-being through acts of psychological and instrumental support. The theme “organisational perks” incorporated perks that represented positive features of the organisation that provide the employee with the psychological and functional support needed to effectively perform his/her job and that give him/her a sense of making a meaningful contribution. I will now discuss each of these themes and their associated sub-themes and perks.

The importance of “intrinsically motivating job characteristics” for discretionary work effort was evident from the reliability with which this theme was mentioned by interview participants. Eleven of the 29 perks that emerged were aligned with this theme. These perks were subsequently broken into three sub-themes: (a) enriched job design; (b) challenging work; and (c) job imperatives. “Enriched job design” and “challenging work” attracted similar amounts of comment across an equally broad range of participants. Comments on “job imperatives”, however, were much less frequent and fewer participants mentioned it as a perk.

Under the sub-theme labelled “enriched job design” study participants talked about being motivated by things like “having an interest in the job”, “interesting work”, “a lot of variety”, “making a difference”, “letting me get on with it”, “being able to take something to completion from start to finish”, “see[ing] people use the end product” and “know[ing] that I’ve done that”. Overall, their comments emphasised doing work that is interesting, varied and meaningful, having freedom, being responsible for a whole project or task, and getting to see the finished job. In association with these job characteristics, they made comments about having responsibility for the job, feeling proud and getting a lot of self-satisfaction from the work and seeing the outcomes of their efforts (see examples in Table 4.2a). From these comments, six perks were identified and aligned with this sub-theme. The range of job characteristics that emerged closely resembled those found in Hackman and Oldham’s (1975, 1976) job characteristics model. Thus, this perk was defined as the degree to which the job provides variety, autonomy, task significance, task identity and feedback to create a sense of meaningfulness, responsibility and ownership.

Under the “challenging work” sub-theme, participants talked about liking challenges, tackling new tasks and learning new things. They used phrases like “it gives me a challenge”, “doing new things”, “you can do things creatively”, “you overcome problems”,
“you have to try to think of better ways to do things”, “breaking the boundaries” and “use all my skills and expertise”. Several participants stated that they preferred challenges that were in their area of skill, expertise and capabilities. They also commented on the sense of achievement and self-satisfaction that undertaking challenging tasks provided (see comments below in Table 4.2b). From these comments, four perks were identified and aligned with this sub-theme. This perks sub-theme refers to the degree to which the work provides personal challenge, and opportunities to tackle new tasks, to use and extend one’s skills and to learn new things.

“Job imperatives” took the form of needing to respond to crises or emergencies or being confronted with tight deadlines for completing tasks. These imperatives created a sense of importance and urgency to the tasks required. In this sense, participants felt they added to the meaningfulness of the tasks (see the comments in Table 4.2c). Thus, job imperatives can be described as features of the job that are by nature unavoidable and command a high level of work effort. There was one perk under this sub-theme.

Table 4.2 provides a sample of statements that capture the content of each of the sub-themes under the overarching theme of intrinsically motivating job characteristics.

### Table 4.2: Sample Statements on Intrinsically Motivating Job Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Enriched Job Design</th>
<th>(b) Challenging Work</th>
<th>(c) Job Imperatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interesting work is certainly a prime motivator. (16)</td>
<td>• I like a challenge. (41)</td>
<td>• … in break down situations … it’s one link that’s missing out of it and they can’t operate it. It could be holding up 10 people. … it’s a sense of urgency … and you know that it is important. (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … I felt great, I’m actually achieving something that I know the Aboriginal communities want. It’s not … meaningless … (31)</td>
<td>• … it’s new for me and that’s rewarding. This newness and challenges. (1)</td>
<td>• It had to be done in a certain time … It was pressure, very high pressure. (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … a degree of autonomy. That’s important to me. (16)</td>
<td>• When I’m allowed to explore options is when I feel really charged. (25)</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being responsible and being involved in the project compelled you to keep going. (18)</td>
<td>• I used all my skills, effort and expertise. (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeing the job finished. On time or before time, under budget. (12)</td>
<td>• My learning curve has just gone through the roof since I’ve taken this job. (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We do a big variety of work … I love that every day is different. (19)</td>
<td>• I like breaking the boundaries … I don’t want to use the word can’t or impossible. … I feel proud when I achieve something. (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We do our own little gardens. They all look pretty specky … we know that we’re doing a good job. (4)</td>
<td>• I got a lot of achievement out of that. Self-satisfaction. It’s driven my motive [sic]. (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.
Co-worker Support

“Co-worker support” formed the second overarching theme. Four of the 29 perks were aligned with this theme. These were collapsed into two sub-themes labelled: (a) teamwork; and (b) co-worker feedback. Teamwork was the dominant sub-theme.

In talking about their co-workers, the study participants emphasised positive interpersonal relationships (e.g. “caring”, “respectful”, “approachable”, “camaraderie”, “positive attitudes”), team support (e.g. “working as a whole group”, ”sticking together”, “feeling of cooperation”, “very supportive”, “like a family”, “committed”, “help each other out”) and team synergy (e.g. “the inspiration from the team”, “new ideas”, “we work off each other”, “working with a talented and motivated group of people”) (see table 4.3a). These formed three perks under the “teamwork” sub-theme. Thus, teamwork refers to the degree to which organisational members with whom an employee interacts and works most closely on a daily basis work cooperatively and support each other in the conduct of their work. For the “co-worker feedback” sub-theme, comments related to “being needed and appreciated”, “feedback” and “recognition” (see table 4.3b). These comments were grouped into a single perk of recognition and appreciation under the co-worker feedback sub-theme. Thus, co-worker feedback represents the degree to which an employee receives recognition and appreciation as feedback from other members of his/her group of co-workers.

The following account illustrates one employee’s view on the meaning of co-worker support for him and how he sees it affecting his discretionary work effort:

… the only reward or satisfaction is the other two blokes I work with … they’ve tried to split us up a few times and put other blokes with us but production goes down and the quality. It’s quality and quantity out the door … because the people that you’re working with know what to expect of you and vice versa. A hard job is a simple job … you only need one dead head in the system and it falls back on the other two blokes … One’s always trying to look after the bloke in the back and the bloke in the front will look after you so the circle goes around … it’s a pleasure to work with ‘em. If it’s a pleasure to work with a group of blokes everything is going to improve 100%. (30)

Table 4.3 provides sample comments reflecting the content of the two co-worker support sub-themes.
Table 4.3: Sample Statements on Co-worker Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teamwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We had a very close knit team to make it happen … it was very social … you got support from everyone and everyone had a positive attitude toward it … It was a bloody hard project but we had a GREAT [participant’s emphasis] team … (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … it’s very rewarding working with caring people, people who treat you as an equal or at least a member of the team … I like working with good people . (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … the camaraderie with my colleagues … highly, highly motivated, dedicated. (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They are approachable. They treat you with respect … that’s a very important component to me. (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The creative side of this department is amazing. We beg, borrow, steal resources to make things happen … (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … we all work off each other. We bounce things off … the interaction that’s what keeps, drives us all. (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-worker Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• … the people factor is huge … to be needed and appreciated … (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being part of that team … the feedback from my fellow staff members … the way we all interact … (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … being appreciated for the work that you put in. Being appreciated by your colleagues. (26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.

**Leader Support**

“Leader support” formed the third overarching theme and received a similar amount of comment to co-worker support. Nine of the 29 perks were aligned with this theme. These were collapsed into two sub-themes labelled: (a) psychological support; and (b) instrumental support. While both forms of support appeared important, psychological support attracted the greater level of comment.

Five perks fell within the “psychological support” sub-theme for leader support. These were: (i) respect; (ii) trust and confidence in staff; (iii) supportive, (iv) fair treatment; and (v) recognise and value contributions (see Table 4.4a). Thus, psychological support involves the degree to which an employee’s manager or supervisor provides psychological and emotional support that leads the employee to believe that the manager or supervisor cares about his/her contributions and well-being. Four perks came under the “instrumental support” sub-theme for leader support. These perks were: (i) open communication (e.g. consulting with employee, sharing knowledge and information, listening and being open to ideas); (ii) empowerment; (iii) vision; and (iv) encourages good performance (see Table 4.4b). Thus, instrumental support refers to the degree to which an employee’s manager or supervisor provides assistance in the form of resources, information, opportunity, guidance or advice to help the employee undertake his or her job. The following excerpt from one participant captures the way in which leader support was viewed by many participants.
It’s a real caring, sharing type of attitude. She is aware of what happens in my life. She is very aware of being in touch with everyone of her … team. She has a real open door policy in that we are always able to ask her questions even if it is minimal … never a problem and never told not to interrupt … that’s very supportive. The particular characteristics of her nature make her very easy to communicate with. That’s good. The support in terms of career movement or challenge, like a challenge you face - you would always be consulted about a coming project or new projects rather than just given and told to do. There is delegation but it is always communicated first. … if there’s an idea that I particularly think is good and might work in the community I am able to go and communicate those ideas and really brainstorm and talk and thrash out those ideas. … my supervisor … she’d take the time to sit in initially and see how everything is going to work out and once she’s happy with where it’s going and the requirement she will pull back and let you run with it. So that initial support is there. (24)

These comments encapsulate the nature of the psychological (e.g. caring, supportive) and instrumental (e.g. can ask questions, communicates) support that this participant receives from the leader and perceives as perks. Table 4.4 provides a sample of statements on these two leader support sub-themes to provide further insight to their content.

**Table 4.4: Sample Statements on Leader Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… [my boss] says I’m invaluable to him. (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t have done it without his support. (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was respected enough, my opinion was respected enough and the evidence that I provided for the redrafting of the terms of reference. So that was highly motivating … (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[my boss] is very staff conscious as to their emotional state or their health state … there’s a lot of understanding … he will offer advice to anyone that wants it to try and assist … There’s a lot of trust … it’s a great feeling of trust. (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the fact that I can talk to [my manager] about things and he does bounce ideas off me and vice versa. I can go to him and talk about various things. … we do have that mutual respect is probably a motivating factor for me actually. I feel a more valuable member of the team. And I suppose when you feel that way you tend to put more effort in. (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He’s very inclusive. He’s very team-orientated. (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… when the outcome is achieved … my manager always puts my name on it as well, so it’s not something that she’ll take the accolades … (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I do see something that I think is better I’ll certainly bring it up. Most times it’s taken on board … (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… without my immediate supervisor’s support I probably wouldn’t be here now … I knew how to do the job but I had very few people skills, and managing 7 or 8 staff … A bit extra training and a lot of support from my immediate supervisor…I am fairly comfortable where I am now. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was offered the resources and whatever I needed to make it happen … HUGE [participant’s emphasis] support from Council for the initiatives that were put up, support from the other Directors and from the CEO. (31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.

**Organisational Perks**

The final overarching theme was “organisational perks”, which received a little less commentary than the other three themes. Five of the 29 perks were aligned with this theme. Two sub-themes were identified within this overarching theme, namely: (a) organisational
support; and (b) public service. In terms of the extent of commentary and spread across the participants, organisational support was the dominant sub-theme.

Four of the five organisational perks came under the “organisational support” sub-theme. Furthermore, one perk within this sub-theme was mentioned more frequently than any of the others, and this was recognition and reward for effort and performance. The other perks identified within this sub-theme were: (i) organisational support for flexible work arrangements (e.g. flexitime, access to part-time work, and flexibility to work at home); (ii) supportive atmosphere (e.g. friendly, relaxed, encouraging); and (iii) organisational benefits for personal use (i.e. employer sanctioned use of company resources such as telephone, photocopying, internet, equipment, work time for personal purposes) (see Table 4.5a).

“Support for flexible work arrangements” was a perk associated with organisational support. It was more typically identified by employees with young children and employees in white collar or professional roles. One mother with a young child said:

I know that if my child was sick … I could stay at home for that day and actually work from home for that day and not actually have to take a sick day although I’d certainly be entitled to a sick day. So instead of using a sick day to look after that child I could work at home for that day and not lose out there. That’s a big influencing factor to the reason I came back to work as well as the little things like being able to leave at five minutes to five if I need to. And in return I would say that I like to start my day 15 minutes earlier than I need to … (24)

Comments on “support for flexible work arrangements” were less typical amongst participants in blue collar roles. This may be related to the nature of their work requirements. Some of these participants, however, commented on access to rostered days off (RDO) and flexitime as motivating features of their work environment.

“Organisational benefits for personal use” emerged as a perk from a question prompting participants about the use of company resources for personal benefit. Responses revealed that employer-sanctioned use of the organisation’s resources for personal benefit was perceived as a perk by many participants and was generally viewed as an indicator of organisational support. One participant who was in a work environment that had introduced a new company policy that forbade the use of company resources for personal benefit commented:

They’re changing from that whole ‘be reasonable’ to a heavy handed approach and it kills morale … … [To go] to that other extreme it’s ‘OK, do I really want to be here?’ (15)

A small number of participants considered the “use of company resources for personal benefit” to be inappropriate due to potential damage to equipment, limited organisational resources and the cost to rate payers. The more common view, however, was that it was a small but positive thing the organisation gave to employees. They indicated that it created a
feeling of goodwill and encouraged them to reciprocate with greater effort and commitment. An important caveat made by several participants, however, was that its usage should not be excessive and that staff should respect this.

Taken together, these “organisational support” perks represented a perception by employees that the organisation was willing to support them and were concerned about its employees. Thus, organisational support was defined as the degree to which the organisation provides its employees with the support needed to effectively perform their tasks, recognises and rewards employee efforts and provides socio-emotional support when needed.

Under the “public service” sub-theme, the study participants talked about “helping people”, “doing the best for the community”, “brightening up people’s day”, “providing a safer road, a nice park or a garden”, and “helping the planet”. Participant comments revolved around being able to provide a valuable civic service or contributing to public interest forming a single perk in this sub-theme (see Table 4.5b). Thus, “public service” refers to the opportunity to serve the community, perform a civic duty and contribute to the public interest. Table 4.5 provides a sample of statements reflecting the content of these two organisational perks sub-themes.

Table 4.5: Sample Statements on Organisational Perks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>Organisational Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>… I was putting in all that extra effort. … it is being told you are doing a good job. Like that positive input. That’s the most motivating. (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>It’s the recognition organisation wide that people know what they are doing. (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>We all work very hard … our department won that award this year for being the best department in the Shire. Sort of those little things … (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>That’s just like a perk … it’s nice when you’ve done a good job for the CEO to come up and say thanks for doing that, that’s great. (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>I’m very lucky that I work flexitime. (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>My perks are my flexibility here … there’s no monetary gain to me being able to work extra hours … I actually consider that a trade-off for being able to have that perk. (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Flexibility with time is probably the most important perk. Not having to be there necessarily from 9 to 5 … To be able to work to 2 in the morning at home if I want to … as long as I get the job done within the agreed time frames … I’ve got commitments … It’s important to me that I have flexibility. (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Because I’m only part-time … having those two days break doing my private things it probably rejuvenates my enthusiasm or my attitude towards the work. (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>I love the way that we work the extra hour and a half and have the extra RDO. (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>It’s a really encouraging sort of environment. (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>It’s a friendly, relaxed environment and it’s not like you’re going to work most times. (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>… the way we all interact. Things like cake day Friday and little things like that, that seem to make everyone here really happy and pleased to be here at work most of them. … As much as it’s a serious office it’s relaxed as well … we can have the odd joke and if customers aren’t around you don’t have a manager grimly staring at you … So long as you know you do your work. (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>… we have use of small machinery for a short time after work, access to hire gear for longer term. I think this is absolutely fantastic. That is one of the biggest motivators to me in this job. Assisted me to build a new house. That’s why I put in 110% every day. (41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 continued

(b) **Public Service**
- When you save people’s lives. Just helping people. …There’s saving the bloody whales on the beach. (19)
- … it’s just a pleasure to be able to … brighten up people’s day. You can see it when everything is in flower and the way it brightens their day or whether we’ve done something well for the environment. (5)
- Everything I do there on the roads is providing a safer road for residents, a nice park or garden for people to sit in. You take satisfaction from that. (41)
- It was really hard physical work. People stayed in wet beds if you didn’t do it. … because of the compassion angle that’s just what you did. (2)

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.

In summary, the qualitative interview questions on perks revealed that there are many important perks associated with the job, co-workers, leader and organisation. The perks that emerged in the data were aligned with four overarching themes that were labelled intrinsically motivating job characteristics, co-worker support, leader support and organisational perks. Within these four overarching themes, nine sub-themes representing different types of perks were identified. In total, 29 perks were identified from the interviews and focus groups. Table 4.6 summarises the overarching themes, their associated sub-themes and a description of each of these. It also lists the perks within each theme and sub-theme, and indicates from which of the interview questions (i.e. Q1 and Q2) these perks emerged.
Table 4.6: Classification of Perks Themes and Sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Perks identified within the sub-theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Intrinsically Motivating Job Characteristics** | **Enriched Job Design**                        | - Work that is interesting and meaningful  
- Doing a complete job  
- Autonomy  
- Seeing the end result  
- Sense of pride  
- Variety                                                                 |
|                               | Degree to which the job provides variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback that creates a sense of meaningfulness, responsibility and ownership. |                                                                                                       |
| **Challenging Work**          |                                                | - Challenging tasks/projects  
- Sense of achievement and self-satisfaction  
- Learn new things  
- Use skills and expertise                                                                 |
|                               | Degree to which the work provides personal challenge and opportunities to tackle new tasks, to use and extend one’s skills and to learn new things. |                                                                                                       |
| **Job Imperatives**           |                                                | - Responding to crises, emergencies and tight deadlines                                                                 |
|                               | Features of the job that are by nature unavoidable and command a high level of work effort. |                                                                                                       |
| **Co-worker Support**         | **Teamwork**                                   | - Team support  
- Team skill and synergy  
- Positive interpersonal relationships                                                                 |
<p>|                               | Degree to which organisational members with whom an employee interacts and works most closely on a daily basis work cooperatively and support each other in the conduct of their work. |                                                                                                       |
|                               | <strong>Co-worker Feedback</strong>                         | - Co-worker recognition and appreciation                                                                 |
|                               | Degree to which an employee receives recognition and appreciation as feedback from other members of his/her group of co-workers. |                                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Perks identified within the sub-theme</th>
<th>Perks Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Psychological Support</strong></td>
<td>- Respect</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree to which an employee’s</td>
<td>- Trust and confidence in staff</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manager or supervisor values</td>
<td>- Supportive (e.g. caring, approachable, consideration, flexible)</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>his/her contributions and</td>
<td>- Fair treatment</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shows concern for his/her</td>
<td>- Recognise and value contributions</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well-being through acts of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psychological and instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Instrumental Support</strong></td>
<td>- Open communication (e.g. listens, open to ideas, consultative, shares knowledge and information)</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree to which an employee’s</td>
<td>- Empowering</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manager or supervisor provides</td>
<td>- Vision</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assistance in the form of</td>
<td>- Encourage good performance</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources, information,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunity, guidance or advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that facilitates the employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to effectively undertake his or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>her job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organisational Perks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organisational Support</strong></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive features of the</td>
<td>Degree to which the organisation provides employees with the support needed to effectively perform</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organisation that provide the</td>
<td>their tasks, recognises and rewards employee effort and provides socio-emotional support when</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employee with the psychological</td>
<td>needed.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and functional support needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to effectively perform his/her</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>job and give him/her a sense of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>making a meaningful contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Public Service</strong></td>
<td>The opportunity to serve the community, perform a civic duty and contribute to the public interest.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Findings reported are from the 35 individual interviews in response to the first perks question.

*b* Findings reported are from the 35 individual interviews and one focus group interview with 6 participants in response to the second perks question.
4.3.2 Perceptions of Irks

Potential irks were identified using a similar approach to that employed for perks. A combined critical incidence and direct questioning approach were used. Participants were asked two main questions: (1) What experiences have you had in which you performed near or even below the minimum required level of work effort and what circumstances surrounded these?; and (2) What negative things about your current job and work environment do you find irksome and unrewarding and how do these affect how you approach your work? The first question included probes that asked the participants to describe the circumstances surrounding their experiences and why they thought they were only prepared to work at a low level. The second question included probes that asked the participants to discuss negative aspects of their job, leader, co-workers (including co-worker shirking) and the organisation overall, and how they believed the factors reported affected their approach to their work.

Participants’ responses were analysed in the light of the definition of irks developed for my research (see Section 4.1.2). Factors identified as underpinning past experiences of working near or below the minimum level were combined with the non-monetary work environment factors viewed by participants as irksome and unrewarding in their current job to identify important irks in the work environment.

Classification of Potential Irks

The analysis of potential irks followed the same procedure as that used for perks. Overall, the research participants identified numerous and varied work environment characteristics that they believed motivated low work effort. The full range of negative non-monetary work environment characteristics that emerged in the data from the two irks questions were reviewed. A total of 33 irks were initially identified from this analysis. While most of these irks were common to the majority of employees, nine had fewer than five participants identifying them as an irk, and so these were removed from any further analysis. Four overarching themes with seven sub-themes were identified for the remaining 24 irks. The overarching themes were labelled: (1) autocratic leader behaviour; (2) job stressors; (3) excessive bureaucracy; and (4) irksome co-worker behaviours.

Autocratic Leader Behaviour

The irks within the theme “autocratic leader behaviour” related to acts by the manager/supervisor that negatively affect the employee’s psychological and/or emotional state, or make it difficult for the employee to perform his/her job. The irks associated with the theme “job stressors” either represented demanding work conditions (e.g. unreasonable time frames, inadequate materials or equipment) or limited job scope (e.g. routine work).
The theme “organisational impediments” incorporated irks relating to organisational procedures and culture. The theme “irksome co-worker behaviours” was concerned with the attitudes and behaviours displayed by co-workers. While autocratic leader behaviour was clearly the dominant theme, there was sufficient comment and coverage by participants on the other three themes to warrant their inclusion as potential irks. I will now discuss each of these themes and their associated sub-themes and irks.

“Autocratic leader behaviour” formed the major irks theme in that the largest amount of comment by the largest number of study participants was associated with irks within this theme. Eight of the 24 irks identified were aligned with this theme. These irks were subsequently broken into two sub-themes: (a) psychological impediments; and (b) functional impediments. While there was a large amount of comment on both sub-themes, the psychological impediments sub-theme attracted more comment overall across a slightly larger number of participants. Half of the irks aligned with the autocratic leader behaviour theme were allocated to each of these sub-themes.

Within the “psychological impediments” sub-theme, participant comments covered: (i) being treated unfairly; (ii) abusive supervision (i.e. bullying, ridicule, a lack of respect, conflict); (iii) the manager being unsupportive and showing no consideration or concern for their well-being (i.e. negative or no feedback, no recognition, uncaring, inflexible); and (iv) the manager showing no confidence or trust in their abilities. Participants reported that they perceived these behaviours as unfair and unjustified, that they felt that their efforts and contributions were being devalued, and that this affected their sense of self-worth. Table 4.7a provides a sample of statements that are representative of irks falling within this sub-theme. Psychological impediments, therefore, relate to leader behaviours that impede the development of a positive interpersonal relationship with the employee by adversely affecting the employee’s psychological and/or emotional state.

The irks associated with the “functional impediments” sub-theme included: (i) poor communication from the leader (i.e. inaccessible, unapproachable, non-consultative, closed to other views, gate keeping information); (ii) controlling the employee’s work (i.e. controls everything, interferes, obstructs, undermines, doesn’t delegate); (iii) having unclear and sometimes unreasonable expectations; and (iv) acts that display passive leadership (i.e. inaction, indecision, poor decisions, shirking responsibilities). While participant comments were less extensive than those on psychological impediments sub-theme, these irks were still mentioned frequently. Table 4.7b provides a sample of statements that are representative of the irks within the functional impediments sub-theme. Thus, functional impediments represent leader behaviours that impede the ability of the employee to perform his/her job.
Table 4.7: Sample Statements on Autocratic Leader Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Psychological impediments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfair treatment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … some people are rewarded. Other people … it’ll be overlooked, belittled, dismissed. (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … he’s always off doing courses … But when we want to do a course he just throws it in the bin and just says we don’t have a budget for it. (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You feel you’ve gone above and beyond … and then you get something negative back to you … you feel I didn’t deserve that. … you just say OK if that’s the way you are going to treat me I really don’t care about this place anymore. I’ll just do my work and go home. (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abusive supervision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … people feel that by voicing their opinion they would be ostracised or picked on, they would be painted as a trouble maker. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … it’s the way he talks to staff. He can get very, very angry and he can just blow up. Verbally blow up. Doesn’t matter where he is. (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I felt belittled and treated like a child in many cases. (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsupportive leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … I wasn’t prepared to put in for someone who questioned my integrity … (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … you only hear about the bad things you do not the good things you do. (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … you have done something and you have put a lot of time and effort into something but it’s not valued. (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When he started he couldn’t even make the time to even meet us. We have to do his projects. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … it’s almost like a self worth. … it’s really an appreciation thing. (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distrust and no confidence in staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … it’s been publicly said, unequivocally publicly said, that staff here do not have the knowledge or the ability to do anything so we will get an outsider to do everything for them … we’ve got people here with higher qualifications and work experience than anything and anywhere else in this organisation. (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• He’d go behind my back and ask other people what I was doing. (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Functional Impediments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What demotivates me … Lack of communication. (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … it was just slap bang it’s gone … The whole project’s gone without one word to the people that were doing it. … I was peeved putting it simply. I mean, I was just flabbergasted. (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … he won’t take any criticism at all … I’ve stopped bringing things up at a meeting because it’s either not listened to or you are made to feel like an idiot for bringing it up. (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I was told I had to respond within a week which I did and then I had to wait a whole month to get my response. (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Something I have changed has reverted back to the way it was. That’s demotivating. (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controlling and interfering</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … your authority is undermined or there’s a very harsh reaction to something without actually knowing the full story. (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … my direct supervisor … he’s inflexible, almost totally inflexible. (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The CEO was a tyrant. He tried to pin me down all the time and interfere in my work … he didn’t handle me properly to get the best out of me. He just tried to control me as much as he could. (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I’m now under enormous pressure. … I’m now working under instruction. I’m required to document my delegation of authority or policy on every single decision I make. (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclear expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … a clear demotivator in life … when your performance measure goal posts keep changing. (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … the lack of clarity in what is expected of you … unreasonable time frames … Having to achieve that by having to work over the 100% is not an enjoyable or happy experience. (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All talk and no action. … Visions and no action. (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … a real lack of leadership … it is demotivating when you can see that for want of good management the process should have been resolved much earlier. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It’s about time the managers came out to the coal face and copped the flack that we get. That might make them sit up and take a bit of notice. (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.
The following account by one study participant encapsulates the full nature of the psychological and functional impediments associated with the autocratic leader behaviour theme.

As a new staff person when I first came on board, I was just left to sink or swim. Not knowing if you’re sinking. When you think you’re swimming, you’re obviously sinking I’ve found out. But no hand of help to provide you with the tools you need to actually be able to meet the expectations that aren’t articulated anyway. So you don’t really know what they are.

I presented to the CEO the first business improvement plan the organisation ever had and asked for comment … What I got back was a high school Geography essay … It was outrageous … I was absolutely horrified and I think the words I used when I went and saw the CEO about it was that I was professionally devastated to receive something like that and expected to make the changes with no discussion, that there had been no intellectual debate or discussion on the content.

… to have a boss not understand, not care all that much … not even read reports and documents that I give him properly and not bother to have the intellectual discussion on the content. Just by the stroke of a pen change a paragraph that changes the ENTIRE [participant’s emphasis] intent of the document.

… a whole period of unpleasant working relationships … asking me to explain what I meant by professionally devastated and how I dare use those words … questioning my delegation of authority … every response that I’ve made in a very quiet, measured way in writing to his diatribe has been ignored … the pressure has been relentless because I’m getting emails daily … I’m pressurised now daily so even if I manage to sort of bounce back one day, I get to work and there’s four more please explain, do this, do that, why did you do all of this, why did this happen here? So that pressure is ongoing. (31)

These comments highlight the types of psychological and functional impact that a strongly negative interpersonal relationship between a leader and an employee can have. The “unpleasant working relationship” that had developed was having an extremely negative psychological and emotional effect on this participant (evident in the intensity with which the comments were made during the interview) in that she felt “professionally devastated” and that the “pressure was relentless”. She also believed that her leader’s actions impeded her ability to effectively perform her job since she was not provided with a clear understanding of her role, a clear indication of what her leader expected from her or “the tools you need” to perform the role and meet expectations. Also, she was spending much of her time “writing to his diatribe” rather than focussing on tasks that might provide greater organisational benefit. While this account was from a senior employee in a professional role, similar experiences were reported by other participants, although generally with a lower intensity of emotion.

Job Stressors

“Job stressors” were the second overarching irks theme. Three of the 24 irks identified were aligned with this theme. These were collapsed into two sub-themes: (a) workload pressures and resource constraints; and (b) job routine. Workload pressures and
resource constraints attracted the most comment by more study participants than did the job routine sub-theme.

Two of the three irks within the “job stressors” theme fell within the sub-theme labelled “workload pressures and resource constraints”. In relation to the workload pressures irk, the study participants talked about “being overworked”, “getting busier”, “the workload is extreme”, “don’t get time to scratch yourself”, “overwork negativity” and “not able to focus on projects”. When talking about resource constraints as an irk they commented on “a lack of staff”, “a lack of resources”, “not enough money to finish [the job]”, “machinery always broken” and “not enough trucks [equipment]” (see Table 4.8a). Workload pressures were identified as an irk by a broad range of employees, but most commonly by participants in white collar, professional and managerial roles. In contrast, resource constraints were more commonly identified as an irk by outside staff in blue collar and trades roles. For many participants this job stressor was viewed as a lack of support to facilitate the effective performance of their job. Thus, “workload pressures and resource constraints” represent the degree to which the employee has to carry out his/her job under conditions of heavy workload, time pressures or inadequate resources.

The irk labelled “routine work” reflected the degree to which the job involved having to follow standard methods, is repetitive or involves many mundane tasks. Comments within this category were about excessive routine, lack of challenge and the boring nature of the work. Table 4.8b provides a sample of statements reflecting the content of this job stressor sub-theme.

**Table 4.8: Sample Statements on Job Stressors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Workload Pressures and Resource Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• … the lack of resources is a big deal for us in our area. (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sometimes I can’t do what I can do because I’m not getting the backup … they’ll say here’s the bricks, here’s the mixer, do what you have to do but there’s no labourer. … Usually some of the machinery – it’s always broken down some of it. (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … you’re told to go and do a particular street and get three-quarters of the way through that street and they pull you off … oh no we haven’t got enough money to finish it off … and that demotivates any person … The morale goes down and why? We look stupid. (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our workload is extreme and unfortunately there’s things that suffer … we’re all understaffed … We are pretty much left to wing it. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We tend to get bogged down with day to day. There’s still this expectation that we have a strategic focus and a management focus, yet we are the doers as well as managers. (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Routine Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I don’t feel that I am putting much effort in … at work there is not much there to motivate me. I find it repetitive, boring, unchallenging, almost robotic, very routine. (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I always feel a bit flat after you’ve had a fair bit of responsibility … you’ve had yourself fired up and motivated and the pressure has been really on, and all of a sudden that’s taken away and you’re back to normal. … it’s a bit run of the mill (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.
Excessive Bureaucracy

“Excessive bureaucracy” was the third overarching irks theme and incorporated nine of the 24 irks that were identified from the research. Two sub-themes were identified within this overarching theme: (a) bureaucracy; and (b) power-orientation. The “bureaucracy” sub-theme included six irks and the “power orientation” sub-theme incorporated three irks. Overall, the irks within the bureaucracy sub-theme attracted a slightly larger amount of comment by more participants than did the power orientation sub-theme.

Within the “bureaucracy” sub-theme, the study participants talked about the organisation being “departmentalised” and having “segregation”, there being a “lack of consideration and cooperation”, a “lack of responsibility” and “buck-passing”, people “all doing their own thing” and “won’t work it out”. These characteristics were perceived to impede their opportunity or willingness to engage in discretionary work behaviours. They also commented about “very minimal communication”. Poor communication and cross-communication presented problems in knowing and understanding the goals and direction of the organisation and how one’s own efforts linked into these. Some participants also reported that the organisation was too “business oriented” and had “lost its human side” and that they “don’t feel appreciated” and had a “feeling of neglect”. A lack of recognition and appreciation of employee contributions and extra efforts was especially irksome for a wide range of participants. These comments included no recognition of skills or opportunities for advancement. In most cases participants were not seeking substantive rewards for their efforts or contributions (i.e. promotion, pay rise), rather a genuine acknowledgement of the effort, contribution, or job well done when they really deserved it. Overall, the work environment was also seen as irksome when it was sterile, impersonal, non-consultative, reactive, resistant to change, and lacking accountability and cooperation (see Table 4.9a). Thus, “bureaucracy” refers to the degree to which the organisation has formal and inflexible procedures, functional silos, centralised control and decision-making, cumbersome approval processes, and thinking that maintains the status quo and uniformity of work effort and performance.

The second type of irk associated with the “excessive bureaucracy” theme was “power-orientation”. This involved internal political problems, a fear of challenging organisational members in positions of authority or influence, negativity and destructive internal competition (see Table 4.9b). These organisational characteristics were seen to increase the risk and cost of challenging how things are done within the organisation, and thus made employees less willing to engage in acts that were out of the ordinary (e.g. high work effort). This is evident in the following comments by one participant.
… if you want to be critical, you have to make yourself a target … I will protect myself as best I can through some camouflage and by keeping very arm’s length and very formal in my dealings with management … quietly going about the job that I would like to do… at perhaps a less entrepreneurial level than I would like to. (29)

The sample of statements in Table 4.9 reflect the content of these two sub-themes.

**Table 4.9: Sample Statements on Excessive Bureaucracy**

(a) Bureaucracy

- … too much of a bureaucratic organisation. It was sterile. The people weren’t that nice. That totally demotivated me. … I worked in a fairly structured, stifling environment and you don’t perform well. You perform steadily all day but you won’t do any more or any less. (8)
- The organisation has become too business oriented and has lost its human side. (25)
- … the decision is made behind closed doors and then it’s open door and here’s our decision with no discussion. (24)
- It has become a work practice. Resistance to change and getting things done. (38)
- It’s either going to get lost in bureaucracy … by the time it goes through that process it’s going to be a waste of time … there’s going to be people trying to derail it … there are certain times when you just say it’s not worth doing this because by the time we get through the process we’re going to be out of time to do what we need to … (32)
- … oh the handball is well and truly alive! (23)
- … it is just knee jerk after knee jerk after knee jerk. (17)
- … the lack of consideration and cooperation throughout the organisation. (17)
- … a lack of recognition … you’ve given yourself to the organisation or to the boss for a period of time but you just get slapped in the face. … I used to work very long hours and after a while it was just a case of this isn’t achieving anything. There was just no recognition. … I’ve had enough … when I’ve done my 7.6 hours I’m out of here. (17)
- I personally need to know that the bigger game plan has been mapped out and what I’m doing fits. That’s important to me and when that’s not present I find that a demotivator. And it’s very much that leadership level. (18)
- … there’s a lot of ambiguity at the top. They haven’t got a definite path … There seems to be cross-communications which is frustrating in itself. We don’t seem to be moving in the same direction. … you need to have some sort of goal and to know that that goal is going to feed into a bigger goal that will eventually achieve what the organisation is as a whole, and it would also foster a partnership between the different directorates and all the other business units and everything underneath. (35)

(b) Power-orientation

- There is a developing culture of people who are clawing the way to the top … there is a clique of senior staff that I think are acting outside the interests of the Shire, generally acting out of personal interest, personal power, job positions, position descriptions … (19)
- … they wanted a new time sheet project … we spent months on that and in the end I got slapped in the face from one side and a well done from the other side … organisation wide a lot of people come to work to do their job and go home. That sense of unity, teamwork across the organisation I feel has gone. … it is the lack of consideration and cooperation throughout … (17)
- Underhanded, number crunching, conniving sort of aspect of what happens in local government. (6)
- … I think probably the most irksome thing with working with the city is probably some of the bureaucracy and political aspects … (32)

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.

**Irksome Co-worker Behaviours**

The final irks theme was “irksome co-worker behaviours”. Four of the 24 irks identified were aligned with this theme. Only one sub-theme was identified, namely, “co-worker shirking”. Most comments on co-worker shirking were to a prompted question.
In describing the types of co-worker behaviours that they found irksome, the study participants identified a wide range of behaviours that reflected co-workers not pulling their weight. The participants referred to things like “missing deadlines”, “leaving jobs unfinished”, “always have excuses why things didn’t get done”, “diverting their workload” “not putting in the effort they should be”, “not getting on with the job”, “social chit chat”, “time wasters”, “look at the clock all the time”, “aren’t really interested”, “show no commitment” and “very negative about the staff and the job”. These comments formed four irks, namely: (i) shirking on the job; (ii) social loafing; (iii) lack of commitment and interest; and (iv) negative attitudes.

While co-worker shirking was reported as irksome and unrewarding by most participants, the attitudinal and behavioural responses to these experiences varied. The participants expressed a range of negative feelings including feeling burdened, feeling demotivated, frustration, annoyance, anger, depression, lost respect, embarrassment for work not done, uneasiness with the individuals concerned, helplessness, disappointment, resentment, stress, and disillusionment. When asked how this co-worker behaviour affected their own level of work effort, the responses were again varied. Five broad behavioural responses were revealed: (i) maintain my work effort; (ii) compensate by increasing my work effort; (iii) lower my work effort; (iv) decrease the amount of discretionary activities I engage in; and (v) leave the job. The latter three responses are related to decreasing discretionary work effort, with voluntarily leaving the job perhaps being the ultimate form of effort withdrawal. Many participants also indicated that they turned to management to resolve the problem but did not always get a satisfactory outcome. The range of attitudinal and behavioural responses are evident in the sample statements that appear in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10: Sample Statements on Reactions to Co-worker Shirking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… resentment and anger comes in. (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoys the crap out of me … I just keep going. (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d still be motivated to do my best and to prove that I wasn’t the one slacking off. (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always jumped in and helped ya mate, if he’s a worker not a bludger. (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You only need one dead head in the system and it all falls back on the [other] two blokes. … you’d work hard to cover for what he’s not doing so I don’t think your work effort would drop. It would pick up because you got to cover for the one that’s not pulling his weight. … Your satisfaction goes out the window because you’re really peevved off with the job. … you can expect a bit of friction … you get a bit grumpy. (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That is something that I find really hard to deal with if people don’t pull their weight in completing their projects. It influences everyone else and their workload. … while your level of effort might increase you’re not getting the rewards for it. … I found it really hard and talk about … [it’s] disheartening. … This was the type of situation I was in and it was part of the reason I left. … That level of frustration just increases. (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It impacts the whole team … you get a bit frustrated. … ultimately it gets to a point where it keeps deteriorating that they look to management to get a resolution. (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the participant making the comment.
While the dominant response was to maintain one’s own effort, several participants said they either lowered or even increased their level of work effort. Amongst those who said they maintained or increased their effort, however, several reported engaging in fewer discretionary activities such as helping a shirking co-worker, not volunteering for extra tasks or refusing to work with shirking co-workers. Examples of these discretionary work effort lowering responses are reflected in the sample statements provided in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Sample Statements on Irksome Co-worker Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-worker Shirking as an irk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It’s awful here … you feel why should I put in any effort when the others aren’t? Why should I put my head on the chopping block when nobody else is? … I am also not pulling my weight and I am not saying that I am better than anybody else. … But I did have standards before I come here and they have fallen substantially which I’m not too happy about … but who gives a rats. (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It affects my drive if it’s out of my control to affect it. (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … if somebody is trying to put something on me but it isn’t really my role … I just throw it back at them. … the first thing I tend to do is lose respect for them. I tend to be less likely to assist them if they need assistance. (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … I don’t have a lot of respect for those sorts of guys and I can’t work as a team with those sort of guys. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I do some extras that are usually not required but … it depends on who’s working with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You stop and say oh I think we should stop and fix that up … Nah don’t worry about it. It’s what’s his name’s job. But if I’ve got someone else that’s interested in the job with me I’d say oh what do you reckon fix it up eh” Yeah. It’s all over in half an hour. (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I find it very frustrating being in a very negative situation. … I was avoiding, strategically avoiding some processes … because I knew I would find it very frustrating to sit in … (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.

Overall, while most irks identified were common to all types of employees, there were some small differences. These were mainly for irks reported by a low frequency of participants. For example, “skills not used” and “no autonomy” were reported by only outside staff, and “difficult people” was reported by only employees in supervisory roles. Similarly, a “lack of leadership and vision” was reported by only staff in white collar or professional roles but was common to both supervisory and non-supervisory employees.

In summary, the irks that emerged were aligned with four overarching themes that I labelled autocratic leader behaviour, job stressors, excessive bureaucracy and irksome co-worker behaviours. Within these four themes there were seven sub-themes and 24 irks. Based on the proportion of comments, the primary irks identified were associated with the leader. Two types of irksome leader behaviours were revealed - psychological impediments and functional impediments. However, irks associated with the job itself also appeared to be potentially important, with workload pressures and resource constraints being the main type of irks related to the job itself. Table 4.12 provides a summary of these overarching themes, their associated sub-themes and a description of each. It also lists the irks within each theme and sub-theme, and indicates from which interview questions these irks emerged.
Table 4.12: Classification of Irks Themes and Sub-themes

Irks: The negative non-monetary work environment characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Irks identified within the sub-theme</th>
<th>Irks Questions Q1 X Q2 X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autocratic Leader Behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Psychological Impediments</td>
<td>• Unfair treatment</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviours by the manager or supervisor that negatively affect the employee’s psychological and/or emotional state or make it difficult for the employee to perform his/her job.</td>
<td>Leader behaviours that adversely affect the employee’s psychological and/or emotional state.</td>
<td>• Abusive supervision (e.g. bullying, ridicule, disrespect)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsupportive (e.g. devalues contributions, uncaring, inflexible)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Distrust and no confidence in staff</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Impediments</td>
<td>• Poor communication (e.g. non-consultative, inaccessible, closed to other views)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader behaviours that impede the ability of the employee to perform his or her job.</td>
<td>• Controlling (e.g. controls, interferes, obstructs, undermines, non-delegation)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Passive leadership (e.g. shirks responsibilities, indecision, inaction, poor decisions)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unclear expectations</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Stressors</strong></td>
<td>Workload Pressures and Resource Constraints</td>
<td>• Time and workload pressures</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requirement to carry out one’s job under demanding conditions (e.g. time pressures, inadequate materials or equipment) or with insufficient job scope.</td>
<td>Having to carry out one’s job under conditions of heavy workload, time pressures, or inadequate resources.</td>
<td>• Inadequate materials and equipment</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine Work</td>
<td>• Routine and repetitive work</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which the job requires following standard methods, is repetitive or involves many mundane tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
<td>Irks identified within the sub-theme</td>
<td>Irks Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>• No recognition and reward (including no career path)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Functional silos (e.g. departmentalism, lack of cooperation, buck passing)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of leadership and vision</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor communication</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservatism</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Imperson</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power-orientation</td>
<td>• Internal politics</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rule by fear</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Negativity</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irksome Co-worker Behaviours</td>
<td>Co-worker Shirking</td>
<td>• Shirking on the job (e.g. missing deadlines, leaving tasks unfinished, frequently being absent or late, taking frequent breaks, wasting time, working slowly, engaging in social chat, doing personal business, doing the minimum, having poor work standards)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social loafing (e.g. withholding effort in groups)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of commitment or interest</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Negative attitudes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplementary notes:

*a* Findings reported are from the 35 individual interviews in response to the first irks question.

*b* Findings reported are from the 35 individual interviews and one focus group interview with 6 participants in response to the second irks question.
4.3.3 Follow-up Focus Group Results

The themes and the types of perks and irks identified from the interviews were subsequently tested in follow-up focus group discussions with 11 participants from a different organisation. These discussions provided strong support for the perks and irks identified in the interviews. However, the perks and irks were also validated quantitatively. The participants were provided with definitions of perks and irks, and a list of the work environment characteristics that had emerged as perks and irks from the individual interviews and the first focus group. A brief description of each of these characteristics was provided. The follow-up focus group participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale (1 = very negative/strong irk to 7 = very positive/strong perk) the extent to which they viewed each work environment characteristic as a perk or an irk. This process revealed that 100% of participants agreed on intrinsically motivating job characteristics and co-worker support as perks (i.e. rated 5-7), 91% agreed that organisational support was a perk and there was 82% agreement on leader support being a perk. Similarly, 91% of the participants agreed that autocratic leader behaviour and organisational impediments were irks, 82% agreed that irksome co-worker behaviours was an irk and 73% agreed that workload pressures and resource constraints was an irk.

In the discussion, however, these participants suggested that opportunities for training and development should be identified as a perk and a lack of teamwork represented an additional irk differentiable from co-worker shirking. It was suggested that training and development indicates appreciation and support from the organisation. This view is evident in the following account by one focus group participant:

We have the opportunity to travel to Perth for training, take the company car and stay at a nice hotel. Little things like that show a little bit of appreciation. (42)

Thus, I concluded that this perk could be included as a perk within the “organisational support” sub-theme.

From the focus group discussions, the participants also suggested that a lack of teamwork as represented by co-workers being unhelpful, uncooperative or negative towards other members of the organisation as an additional irk. This irk, however, overlapped with a number of other sub-themes identified in the qualitative interviews. Being unhelpful and uncooperative reflects a low level of co-worker support and thereby represented the opposite end of the co-worker support construct. Negative attitude was an irk within the co-worker shirking sub-theme. Negative co-worker behaviours like bullying and ridicule, and friction and conflict were types of irks that were eliminated due to low frequency of comment. Therefore, I concluded there was no need to add this to the list of irks as it could not be
adequately differentiated from other perks and irks already identified. Overall, the perks and irks themes that had emerged from the individual interviews and the first focus group were confirmed by the follow-up focus group discussions.

4.3.4 Local Government Employee Conception of Discretionary Work Effort

On the topic of discretionary work effort, the participants in the individual interviews and the first focus group were asked two key questions. Firstly, participants were asked: “How do you gauge if you and other members of the organisation are working above the minimum level of work effort required or expected and at your maximum level of work effort?”. This question aimed to assess whether or not local government employees conceive discretionary work effort in a way that is consistent with how it is conceptualised in the literature and for this research. That is, it aimed to evaluate whether the study participants viewed discretionary work effort as comprising the three facets of time, intensity and direction. Secondly, participants were asked: “What types of extra things do you do for your job, for other people in the organisation and for the organisation as a whole that are not required of you?”. This question aimed to evaluate the types of work activities or behaviours towards which they direct their effort that are perceived as discretionary by local government employees. This would inform us on how they view discretionary directed effort and indicate if they perceive this facet of discretionary work effort in a way that is consistent with the forms of ERB depicted in the literature (Organ et al., 2006). The qualitative data obtained from the 41 participants who took part in the individual and first focus group interviews were analysed collectively and the findings are presented below.

Employee Conceptualisation of Discretionary Work Effort

To identify how the study participants perceive discretionary work effort, a total of 574 statements were coded and content analysed. This initially resulted in 31 types of discretionary work effort behaviours being identified. As a classic content analysis was used, the frequency of comments for each type of work behaviour was calculated. Work behaviours with low frequencies (i.e. reported by fewer than five participants), were deemed not to be sufficiently common across participants to warrant inclusion and so were subsequently removed. The discretionary work behaviours that emerged were also examined in relation to the supervisory status (management versus non-management) and job type (inside white collar and professional roles versus outside blue collar and trades roles) of the interview participants so that it was possible to determine whether differences in perceptions existed between these sub-groups.

While most participants identified the same types of discretionary work behaviours, some differences were evident. For instance, inside employees identified “encouraging
others”, “preventing conflict and maintaining harmony” and “regard for authority” as types of discretionary work behaviours but the outside employees did not. Employees in non-supervisory roles identified “courtesy and consideration toward others”, “working at full capacity giving 100%”, “self-development”, and “tackling difficult tasks and problem solving” as types of discretionary work effort behaviours but employees in managerial roles did not. Also, only employees in managerial roles identified “mentor others” as a type of discretionary work behaviour. Most of these differences, however, had low frequencies of participants identifying them as discretionary work behaviours. The most notable exceptions were perceptions by managerial and non-supervisory employees on “working at full capacity giving 100%”, “courtesy and consideration toward others”, and “mentor others”.

Additional analysis of the 31 types of work behaviours suggested they could be classified under three overarching themes. These themes related to contributing extra time to work activities, working hard or with extra intensity, and voluntarily directing effort into non-required work activities. These were respectively labelled: (1) discretionary work time; (2) discretionary work intensity; and (3) discretionary directed effort. In response to the first interview question about discretionary work effort, 59% of participants referred to contributing discretionary work time, 83% reported behaviours relating to discretionary work intensity and 88% talked about directing effort into at least one form of work behaviour/activity that was perceived as discretionary. When the coded statements about what work behaviours indicate that they are working above the minimum level of effort required were combined with statements from the second question about the types of extra things they direct their effort into that are not required of them, 16% of the coded statements referred to discretionary work time, 21% referred to discretionary work intensity and 63% related to various forms of discretionary directed effort. The higher frequency of comments on work behaviours relating to discretionary directed effort is likely to have reflected the greater number of interview prompts on this topic rather than the greater importance of this facet of discretionary work effort. The prompts on this topic were intended to draw out comments on the types of work behaviours the study participants conceived to be related to discretionary directed effort.

Further analysis of the types of work behaviours within each overarching theme suggested that discretionary work time and discretionary work intensity each comprised single themes. However, six sub-themes for discretionary directed effort were evident, reflecting different types of discretionary work behaviours. These were: (a) individual initiative; (b) helping; (c) civic virtue; (d) organisational compliance; (e) organisational loyalty; and (f) self-development. Each theme and sub-theme was given a label and a description to provide insight to its meaning and content. The descriptions developed were
consistent with the conceptual definition of discretionary work effort used for this research. Where the content of the themes and sub-themes reflected concepts used in the literature, the labels from the literature were used to provide consistency with previous research. Similarly, the descriptions developed for the sub-themes drew on existing definitions in the literature. The following sections consider in greater detail the overarching themes and the two dominant discretionary directed effort sub-themes.

Discretionary Work Time

“Discretionary work time” refers to the extra voluntary time committed to work-related tasks or activities that are at a level that is above what is minimally required. Participants’ comments under this theme related to contributing more hours than required according to their employment contract, or more hours than they were paid for. They also considered discretionary work time to represent working longer hours than the norm within their section of the organisation.

Six types of work behaviours were initially aligned with this theme: (i) extra time to complete tasks at work; (ii) long hours at work; (iii) after hours work not at work (nights and weekends); (iv) more time worked relative to others; (v) start early and leave late; and (vi) think about work when not at work. “Think about work when not at work” was subsequently removed from the list because relatively few participants mentioned this form of discretionary work time. Table 4.13 provides a sample of typical statements underpinning this discretionary work effort theme, along with the frequency of comments for each type of work behaviour. The most commonly reported types of discretionary work time behaviours related to putting in extra time to complete tasks at work (39% of all participants) and working long hours at work (27% of all participants). This theme appeared to be uni-dimensional as no sub-themes could be identified within the comments.
Table 4.13: Discretionary Work Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Work Behaviours</th>
<th>Sample Comments</th>
<th>Number of Interview Participants (n = 41)</th>
<th>Number of Statements Coded (n = 574)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra time to complete tasks at work</td>
<td>• I stay until I finish the task. (41)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The work doesn’t stop at the end of the working day so I am prepared to put in the extra time. (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put in long hours at work</td>
<td>• It’s a huge amount of extra hours, unpaid hours. (23)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I don’t have an 8 to 5 or 9 to 5 job. Mine’s 24/7. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After hours work not at work (nights, weekends)</td>
<td>• It’s all out of hours work. (29)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It’s after hours work … there’s hours that you undertake and functions that you attend that are far beyond what anyone would deem to be necessary … A lot of weekend work. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do my time sheets at home, sometimes I’d sit and do something up on the computer … you don’t put in for the time. (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I take a lot of work home with me to do at home. (34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked relative to others</td>
<td>• Some people come in and just put in their day’s effort, do their job, nothing beyond and head home … we put in until the job’s done. (15)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of them can’t wait to go once the bell goes. They’re off home and quite content to leave a paper half finished … I don’t like doing that. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start work early and leave late</td>
<td>• There are those of us who do get there early and work late and work weekends. (33)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I usually get in pretty early. (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most weeks I’m here til 6 o’clock at night … (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.

Discretionary Work Intensity

“Discretionary work intensity” refers to the voluntary contribution of intensity towards work-related tasks or activities to a level that is above what is minimally required. Participants’ statements related to how hard or intensively they worked in the time that they were at work. This was reported in terms of their own capacity to work intensively and how hard they worked relative to others.

Five types of work behaviours reflected discretionary work intensity: (i) work intensively; (ii) strive to do my best; (iii) work at full capacity giving 100%; (iv) relative intensity; and (v) do an honest day’s work. None of the types of work intensity behaviours needed to be eliminated due to low frequency. Table 4.14 provides a sample of typical
statements underpinning this theme along with the number of participants making comments within each type of work behaviour.

### Table 4.14 Discretionary Work Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Work Behaviours</th>
<th>Sample Comments</th>
<th>Number of Participants Commenting (n = 41)</th>
<th>Number of Statements Coded (n = 574)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work intensively</strong></td>
<td>• It makes you work harder and faster ... (3)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• … you’ve had a pretty full day … you’ve been at it all day. (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We’re just flat out the whole time. (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Just no time for breaks … (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We had to push to come in under budget … a 3 week job had to be done in a week and a half. (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• … it’s physically demanding. (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strive to do my best</strong></td>
<td>• Putting in your best effort ... I do everything to the best of my ability... (19)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Striving to do your best in the time that you have allocated. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relative intensity</strong></td>
<td>• … who’s in there doing the hard yards and who’s there holding the shovel. (41)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I always compare them to myself … I know I can shovel a trailer load out in 10 minutes … they should be able to ... (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work at full capacity giving 100%</strong></td>
<td>• When you’re on that hour’s work you actually give it 100%. (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Putting in a maximum effort. (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How much heart and soul you put into your work. (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do an honest day’s work</strong></td>
<td>• Do an hour’s work for an hour’s pay. (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• … an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay. (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.

The most commonly reported types of discretionary work intensity behaviours were working intensively (71% of participants), followed by striving to do my best (32% of participants). Working intensively involved working hard, at a fast pace, being very busy, needing to push oneself and not having time for breaks. Striving to do my best involved doing the best you could based on your ability and the time available. As all of these types of work behaviours had the common underlying idea of voluntarily working intensively relative to one’s own capacity and/or relative to others this theme was deemed to be unidimensional.

**Discretionary Directed Effort**

“Discretionary directed effort” involves voluntarily directing work effort towards behaviours or activities that lie outside one’s formal job role and responsibilities, but that are
consistent with the organisation’s goals. In response to the question: “What extra things do you do for your job, other members of the organisation or the organisation as a whole that are not generally required or expected?”, participant responses were wide and varied. A content analysis of the statements initially revealed 21 types of work behaviours. Five of these were subsequently removed due to low frequency of reporting. These were “extra customer service”, “voice opinions”, “encourage and support others”, “prevent conflict and maintain harmony”, and “regard for authority”.

A subsequent analysis of the remaining 16 types of work behaviours revealed six sub-themes. The sub-themes reflected the forms of ERB reported in the literature (Organ et al., 2006) and so were given the labels used in the literature to provide consistency with previous research. All of the types of work behaviours identified from the interviews and first focus group were consistent with an established form of ERB, suggesting that there was nothing idiosyncratic about the coding of the data. The sub-themes that emerged (and the proportion of participants who commented on them) were: (1) individual initiative (85%); (2) helping (80%); (3) civic virtue (32%); (4) organisational compliance (27%); (5) organisational loyalty (22%); and (6) self-development (17%).

Individual initiative and helping were the dominant forms of discretionary directed effort identified. More than three-quarters (82%) of the coded statements on discretionary directed effort came under these two sub-themes. Civic virtue, organisational compliance, organisational loyalty and self-development each accounted for between 3-5% of the coded comments on discretionary directed effort. Less than one-third of participants reported each of the latter four forms of directed effort as discretionary. Given that a sizeable proportion of study participants recognised these four forms of work behaviour as discretionary and that these are consistent with the established forms in the ERB literature, they are important enough to be identified as facets of discretionary directed effort.

As there are several different forms of ERB, however, in my research I chose to limit the operationalisation of the direction facet of discretionary work effort construct to exemplars of this construct. As a large number of variables needed to be measured for my research, I was a concerned about the length of the measurement instrument and the impact this may have on the response rate if all forms of ERB were included as dimensions of discretionary directed effort. My research findings on discretionary directed effort suggested that the two most appropriate exemplars might be individual initiative and helping as these were the most widely recognised forms of discretionary directed effort amongst the study participants. The use of these two forms of discretionary directed effort also seems appropriate in that they are representative of the two broad classes of ERB, namely,
challenging ERB (i.e. proactive behaviour dimension of individual initiative) and affiliative ERB (i.e. helping). Thus, I limit the following discussion to these two dominant sub-themes that emerged in my research.

**Individual Initiative Sub-theme**

“Individual initiative” involves engaging in task-related behaviours that are not required, but which benefit the work unit or organisation. Six types of work behaviours were allocated to this sub-theme. These appeared to represent two types of initiative and so were collapsed into what were called “job dedication” and “proactive behaviour”.

“Job dedication” refers to effort directed at doing the job to a high standard. It involves a self-disciplined use of time. This includes displaying commitment, making an effort to achieve outcomes and giving attention to quality. This form of discretionary directed effort is related to the intensity facet of discretionary work effort in that it involves striving to do one’s best to ensure the job is undertaken to a high standard. It is distinctive from discretionary work intensity, however, in that it represents acts of self-discipline that demonstrate conscientiousness and a commitment to the job such as taking an interest in the job, giving attention to detail and focussing on the quality of outcomes. In contrast, discretionary work effort refers to the pace and intensity with which one works.

“Proactive behaviour” involves taking a self-initiated active approach to one’s work. This includes taking initiative, spontaneous creative and innovative acts, actively finding ways to improve individual, group or organisational functioning, taking on extra responsibilities, and taking on difficult tasks and solving problems. Proactive behaviour is more effortful, more change oriented and more broadly targeted than job dedication. The coded statements were split almost equally between these two types of initiative. Table 4.15 provides a sample of statements reflecting these categories.
### Table 4.15 Discretionary Directed Effort – Individual Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Work Behaviours</th>
<th>Sample Comments</th>
<th>Number of Participants Commenting (n = 41)</th>
<th>Number of Statements Coded (n = 574)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job dedication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … people that go the extra mile and do that little bit extra in terms of following things through. (24)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make sure everything is finished. (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I don’t like to cut corners. I like to get it right. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making sure everything is right and accurate with minimal error … (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aim for a bit of quality … to achieve a certain standard in your work. (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … have a pride in the job. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … do they turn up every day … taking off sick days … at the office, at their desks most of the time of the day … not excessive breaks. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … show that commitment. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … simple presence, demeanour, question asking, interest level. (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … attitude … focussed on the job … doing what they can. (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proactive behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … I’ve experimented with different techniques of operating a grader to get some benefit for the Shire … I wrote a book on it … I gave it to the learner operators … They use it. (6)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … try and improve the way we are doing things. Perhaps not in quantum leaps but progressively. (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If you see something that needs doing for the next crew … No-one asked us or anything we just thought let’s do it. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … try and find stuff I can do, useful stuff. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I try and handle things. (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … we’re trying to save the Council a lot of money on every job we do. (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Every year I like to get … a few extra tasks added. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … you can take on the challenge and you can develop it and try and get an outcome. (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … give physically and mentally … (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in brackets represent the identification code for the participant who made the comment.

**Helping Sub-theme**

“Helping” involves voluntary effort directed at supporting and cooperating with specific individuals on work related tasks and problems. This includes a wide range of voluntary acts. Four types of work behaviours were allocated to the “helping” sub-theme. These were: (i) support and cooperate with others; (ii) share knowledge and expertise; (iii) show courtesy and consideration towards others; and (iv) mentor (i.e. counsel others and instil wisdom). Table 4.16 provides a sample of representative statements for this sub-theme.
“Support and cooperate with others” was the dominant work behaviour. This refers to acts like assisting others with the accomplishment of tasks, helping others with heavy workloads, helping people who have been absent, helping to orient new members of the organisation when not required to, training others when not required to, displaying concern and consideration towards others and avoiding work practices that make others work harder.

Table 4.17 summarises the overarching themes, sub-themes and the types of work behaviours associated with these that resulted from a content analysis of the comments on discretionary work effort. The order in which the types of work behaviours are listed reflects the frequency of participants commenting on them, with the more frequently mentioned behaviours appearing at the top of each list.
Table 4.17 Discretionary Work Effort Themes and Sub-Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary Work Effort Themes and Descriptions</th>
<th>Sub-themes and Descriptions</th>
<th>Types of Work Behaviour</th>
<th>Number of Participants Commenting (n = 41)</th>
<th>Number of Initial Statements Coded (n = 574)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Discretionary Work Time**                      | No sub-themes identified    | • Extra time to complete tasks  
| Voluntary contribution of time towards work-related tasks or activities to a level that is above what is minimally required. |                            | • Long hours  
|                                                 |                             | • After hours work not at work (nights, weekends)  
|                                                 |                             | • Hours worked relative to others (e.g. put in more than others, clock watchers)  
|                                                 |                             | • Start early and leave late  | 24 (59%)  | 89 (16%) |
| **Discretionary Work Intensity**                 | No sub-themes identified    | • Work intensively (e.g. work hard, fast pace, flat out, no time for breaks, do an honest day’s work)  
| Voluntary contribution of intensity of effort towards work-related tasks or activities to a level of intensity that is above what is minimally required. |                            | • Strive to do your best  
|                                                 |                             | • Work at full capacity giving 100%  
<p>|                                                 |                             | • Relative intensity (e.g. work more harder than others)  | 34 (83%)  | 121 (21%) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary Work Effort Themes and Descriptions</th>
<th>Sub-themes and Descriptions</th>
<th>Types of work behaviour</th>
<th>Number of Participants Commenting (n = 41)</th>
<th>Number of Initial Statements Coded (n = 574)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discretionary Directed Effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary contribution of effort towards work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related activities that lie outside one’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal job roles and responsibilities but are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with the organization’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Initiative</strong></td>
<td>Engage in acts of personal</td>
<td>• Job dedication (e.g. display commitment to the job, make an effort to achieve outcomes, give</td>
<td>35 (85%)</td>
<td>194 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiative in an effort</td>
<td>attention to quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improve the effectiveness</td>
<td>• Proactive behaviour (e.g. take on extra tasks and responsibilities, take on difficult tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the organisation.</td>
<td>and solve problems, take initiative, take charge to initiate change/make improvements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helping</strong></td>
<td>Voluntarily help, support</td>
<td>• Support and cooperate with others</td>
<td>33 (80%)</td>
<td>105 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and cooperate with others</td>
<td>• Share knowledge and expertise with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on work related tasks or</td>
<td>• Show courtesy and consideration to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problems.</td>
<td>• Mentor others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Virtue</strong></td>
<td>Display interest in, or</td>
<td>• Participate in organisational governance activities</td>
<td>13 (32%)</td>
<td>20 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commitment to, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organisation as a whole by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participating in its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>governance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Compliance</strong></td>
<td>Acceptance and support of</td>
<td>• Punctuality and attendance (includes meeting deadlines)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>17 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the organisation’s formal</td>
<td>• Protect organisational resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and informal rules,</td>
<td>• Regard for authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regulations and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Loyalty</strong></td>
<td>Protect, defend and remain</td>
<td>• Promote a positive organisational image externally</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>18 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>committed to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organisation, and promote a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive image to outsiders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-development</strong></td>
<td>Voluntary engagement in</td>
<td>• Self-development (e.g. undertake training or self-education in a work related area)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>10 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acts to improve one’s own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge, skills and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 DISCUSSION

4.4.1 Perks and Irks

Study 1 was designed to ascertain what non-monetary work environment characteristics employees perceive as perks and irks. In the literature review in Chapter 2, four propositions were formulated based on extant theoretical and empirical evidence. I postulated that: (1A) positive job characteristics of challenge, autonomy, meaning and variety; (2A) leader support; (3A) co-worker support; and (4A) organisational support will be perceived as perks. In addition, I postulated that: (1B) workload pressures and resource constraints; (2B) autocratic leader behaviour; (3B) co-worker shirking; and (4B) excessive bureaucracy (coercive and political) will be perceived as irks. While the findings from this study generally supported these propositions, several of the sub-themes that emerged suggested a greater degree of differentiation in the constructs than was postulated. Also, two additional perks and one additional irk were identified, although these were amongst the more minor sub-themes. Amongst the most notable findings in Study 1 were:

1. Perks were more important as motivators of discretionary work effort than irks were as de-motivators of discretionary work effort.

2. Even though many of the perks and irks had the same focus (i.e. job, leader, co-worker, organisation), there were differences in how important they were perceived to be in affecting discretionary work effort.

3. One perk (“intrinsically motivating job characteristics”) and one irk (“autocratic leader behaviour”) emerged as the most dominant themes (with different foci).

4. Psychological and instrumental (functional) behaviours were differentiated in the perks and irks constructs relating to leader behaviours.

5. The psychological dimensions of the perks and irks constructs were generally more important than the instrumental dimensions in influencing discretionary work effort.

6. “Public service” was identified as an idiosyncratic perk.

Below, I examine the extent to which the Study 1 findings fit the propositions formulated. I also talk about these key findings and the insights that this study provides on how local government employees view perks and irks in the context of the literature.

Dominance of Perks

In terms of the number of sub-themes that emerged and the amount of comment provided by the study participants, there were more perks than irks identified. There were
also more dominant perks themes and sub-themes than there were for irks. Five of the top seven non-monetary work environment characteristics identified as affecting the level of discretionary work effort were perks. This dominance of perks over irks seems consistent with the literature in that most theories and empirical research on the effect of work environment characteristics on work motivation and discretionary work effort have emphasised positive rather than negative factors (see Chapter 2). For example, Amabile et al. (2004) noted that almost all leader behaviour theory focuses on positive leader behaviours and that empirical research in this area has emphasised the effects of positive leader behaviours or the absence or low frequency of positive leader behaviour on employee perceptions and work behaviours. My findings in this study are consistent with findings in the literature in that they suggest that the study participants believe that a wider range of perks than irks influence their level of discretionary work effort. This may reflect that employees react in ways other than changing their level of discretionary work effort in response to negative work environment characteristics. It may also reflect that they are more sensitive to positive than to negative work environment characteristics. Nonetheless, the Study 1 findings also highlight that negative work environment characteristics should not be ignored in that “intrinsically motivating job characteristics” (a positive factor) and “autocratic leader behaviour” (a negative factor) emerged as the two dominant themes, attracting similar amounts of comment from a similarly wide group of study participants.

**Propositions 1A and 1B**

The “intrinsically motivating job characteristics” perks theme fits Proposition 1A, in that the content of the sub-themes supported the proposition that work that provides challenge, autonomy, meaning and variety motivates employees to increase their discretionary work effort. This perks theme, however, was more differentiated than what I postulated and was re-labelled (previously positive job characteristics) to better capture the content of the sub-themes that emerged. The comments about positive job characteristics distinguished between “enriched job design”, “challenging work” and “job imperatives” as perks. “Job imperatives”, however, was substantially less important. It attracted about one-tenth the amount of comment from about one-third the number of participants as the other two perks. Finding intrinsically motivating job characteristics as the most important motivator of discretionary work effort confirmed what we already know about these positive job characteristics as important motivators of discretionary work effort from the extensive body of prior research (see Chapter 2). The enriched job design sub-theme is consistent with research on Herzberg’s (2003 [1968]) “motivators” and Hackman and Oldham’s (1975) job content model. The distinction that emerged between enriched job design and challenging work is also consistent with research in the entrepreneurship literature (Amabile et al., 1996)
where challenging work is differentiated from autonomy as a stimulant of creative and innovative acts (forms of discretionary directed effort). While job imperatives in terms of responding to crises, emergencies and tight deadlines, might be perceived as involving urgent and important tasks that may be perceived as having greater meaning and challenge (Amabile et al., 1996), this perk is situationally different from the other two.

While positive job characteristics attracted extensive comment as a perk, the negative job characteristic of “workload pressures and resource constraints” was a much less dominant theme. While this irk theme generally fit Proposition 1B in that “workload pressures and resource constraints” attracted the greatest amount of comment, “routine work” also emerged as a second although more minor sub-theme. The comments by the study participants on workload pressures and resource constraints suggested ongoing issues with a lack of time due to heavy workloads or inadequate materials and equipment to undertake tasks. While the comments on workload pressure and time constraints were largely made by employees in white collar and professional roles, comments on resource constraints were mainly made by employees in blue collar and trades roles. This distinction seemed to be more attributable to the type of jobs held by these two groups of employees rather than a clear differentiation of the type of irk. This idea is consistent with the “resource availability” concept in the literature which encompasses all types of resources including time, money, materials and equipment (Amabile, 1996; Hornsby et al., 2002). The comments analysed suggested that the problems faced by employees were neither at manageable levels nor temporary. In addition, while the sub-theme of routine work suggests a lack of variety, the comments also indicated that the job was “unchallenging” and that when “the pressure has been really on and all of a sudden that’s taken away” it becomes “run of the mill”. This implies that the job was also seen as having too little workload pressure. Thus together, these findings confirm the view that when workload pressures and resource constraints that are too high or too low, they can demotivate discretionary work effort (Amabile et al., 1996; Gardner, 1986). This contrasts with the approach often taken in research on workload and time pressures in which it is assumed to have a linear relationship with discretionary work effort and inconsistent results have been reported (Andrews & Farris, 1972; Hui et al., 1994; Jex et al., 2003; Organ & Hui, 1995; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000).

Propositions 2A and 2B

A surprising outcome in the Study 1 findings was the identification of “autocratic leader behaviour” as an equally dominant work environment characteristic to “intrinsically motivating job characteristics”. The autocratic leader behaviour irk that emerged generally fit Proposition 2B but was more differentiated than what I postulated. The analysis of participant comments differentiated between “psychological impediments” and “functional
impediments”. Psychological impediments represent leader behaviours that adversely affect the psychological and emotional state of the employee. These leader behaviours are the same as what have been categorised in the literature as “consideration” or “relationship-oriented” leader behaviours and are the common focus of most “leader support” research in the leadership literature (Amabile et al., 2004; Fleishman, 1953). Functional impediments represent leader behaviours that impede the ability of the employee to perform his/her job. These leader behaviours are the same as what have been classified as “task-oriented” or “initiating structure” leader behaviours (Fleishman, 1953) but are usually combined with the relationship-oriented behaviours in measures of “leader support” in entrepreneurship research (Amabile et al., 1996; Amabile et al., 2004; Fleishman, 1953; Hornsby et al., 2002).

My findings indicated that both psychological and functional impediments are important. Amabile et al. (2004) maintained that investigating the absence or low frequency of positive leader behaviours is a one-sided approach as negative leader behaviours may affect employee work behaviours differently from an absence of positive leader behaviours. In a qualitative study on the effect of negative leader behaviours on creative acts (a form of discretionary directed effort), they concluded that negative leader behaviours are important and may be more important than positive leader behaviours in affecting employee work behaviour. Similarly, specific forms of negative leader behaviour (non-contingent punishment and abusive supervision) which are conceptually similar to the “psychological impediments” irk, are reported to negatively affect the direction facet of discretionary work effort in the form of affiliative ERB (Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Tepper, 2000). This prior research, however, only addresses the direction facet of discretionary work effort. The findings in my research suggest that this irk may also influence other facets of discretionary work effort. Even though there was considerably more comment on psychological impediments than on functional impediments, the numbers of study participants commenting on these two types of negative leader behaviour was similar and both of these irks were in the top five perks and irks sub-themes identified.

Interestingly, even though “leader support” (a positive leader behaviour) was also a dominant theme that emerged in my research, it attracted much less comment than autocratic leader behaviour. The leader support perk generally fit Proposition 2A but it was also more differentiated in that both a “psychological support” and an “instrumental support” sub-theme emerged. Unlike the finding for negative leader behaviours, however, the psychological support perk was the more important of the two leader support sub-themes. This perk was amongst the top six sub-themes identified by the study participants as a determinant of discretionary work effort. It was of a similar level of importance as the functional impediments irk. The dominance of the “psychological support” factor is
consistent with how leader support is conceptualised in the leadership literature (Amabile et al., 2004). Together, the findings on leader behaviours suggest positive and negative behaviours may be perceived differently and affect employee work behaviours in different ways as contended by Amabile et al. (2004). It also suggests that while psychological support may counteract the need for as much instrumental support from the leader, psychological impediments may reinforce the importance of functional impediments as a perceived irk.

**Propositions 3A and 3B**

“Co-worker support” was found to be an important perk and was amongst the top six perks and irks sub-themes that emerged from the analysis of the Study 1 data. This finding confirmed Proposition 3A with one minor variation. It had a minor sub-theme that I labelled “co-worker feedback” that was distinguished from the acts of support and cooperation that came under the “teamwork” sub-theme. This finding differs from how this construct has been commonly conceptualised in research on discretionary work effort in that most prior measures of co-worker support have been uni-dimensional and principally included only acts of helping work group members (Bommer et al., 2003; Deckop et al., 2003). Given the inconsistent empirical evidence on co-worker support as a determinant of discretionary work effort reported in Chapter 2, I suggested that this construct may need to be broadened to include acts beyond helping, such as more challenging behaviours. This might include constructive, positive feedback and acknowledgement of the contributions of other work group members even if these contributions may challenge the status quo. The emergence of the “co-worker feedback” sub-theme suggests that this may be a useful direction for extending the conceptualisation of this perk.

The findings on “co-worker shirking” as an irk supported Proposition 3B in that this irksome co-worker behaviour was the single sub-theme that emerged after eliminating low frequency behaviours that represented abusive co-worker behaviours like bullying. Much of the comment on this irks theme, however, was prompted in order to gain a better understanding of the effect of co-worker shirking on employee discretionary work effort. This was in response to the literature on shirking presenting two opposing views. One view proposed a “sucker effect” (Kerr, 1983) in which employees will lower their work effort, and the other view proposed a “social compensation effect” (Williams & Karau, 1991) in which employees increase their level of discretionary work effort. My research findings suggest several other possible responses beyond these two reactions. These included maintaining one’s level of discretionary work effort and modifying the direction of one’s work effort to avoid helping or working with those members in the work group who are shirking. Thus, this research points to a more fine-tuned reaction. This extends our understanding of employee
perceptions of co-worker shirking as an irk in that it suggests that this irk may have an affect through a specific facet of discretionary work effort, namely the direction facet.

**Propositions 4A and 4B**

The final proposition relates to organisational characteristics posited to be perks and irks. While “organisational support” emerged as the dominant perks sub-theme, “public service” was identified as a second substantive perks sub-theme. Thus, this perks theme was relabelled “organisational perks”. The content of the “organisational support” sub-theme was largely as expected, in that it included perks like recognition and reward for good performance, support for flexible working arrangements and a supportive atmosphere. These factors have been identified in the literature as elements of the organisational support construct from which employees form a global view of how much the organisation cares about their well-being and values their contributions (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, this part of the research findings supports Proposition 4A.

The “public service” sub-theme, however, related to something quite distinctive. I defined “public service” as the opportunity to serve the community, perform a civic duty and to contribute to the public interest. In the public administration literature, the ‘public service motivation’ involves serving the community, performing a civic duty and contributing to the public interest (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000; Perry, 1997; Perry & Wise, 1990). It is considered a dispositional factor grounded in motives that are distinctively associated with working in public institutions (Perry & Wise, 1990). Prior research has shown that this motivator is unique to public sector employees (Crewson, 1997; Perry, 1997; Perry & Wise, 1990; Wittmer, 1991; Wright, 2001). Thus, this organisational perk is idiosyncratic to the context of my research. Except for one study on the direction facet of discretionary work effort (Kim, 2006), it seems that prior research has not specifically addressed the effect of public service motivation on discretionary work effort (Perry, 1997). My research findings suggest that public service is positively related to discretionary work effort.

The “excessive bureaucracy” irks theme was found to be of a similar level of importance to the “organisational perks” theme. The form that it took generally matched what was proposed in Proposition 4B although there was a clear differentiation made between “bureaucracy” and “power orientation”. These two sub-themes reflected features of a bureaucracy that can be alienating and potentially perceived as coercive as well as political. Thus, this conceptualisation of excessive bureaucracy as an irk by the study participants combines the features of a coercive type of bureaucracy (Adler & Borys, 1996) with organisational politics (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Gandz & Murray, 1980). While Amabile et al. (1996) have previously conceptualised organisational
impediments as an obstacle to creative and innovative acts (a form of discretionary directed
effort), these authors found this to be a uni-dimensional construct. In my analysis of the
Study 1 findings, however, these organisational impediments were not commonly discussed
together and so were identified as separate irks sub-themes.

To recap the preceding discussion, Table 4.18 summarises the propositions and the
extent to which these were supported by the Study 1 findings.

Table 4.18: Summary of the Study 1 Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Study 1 Themes and Sub-themes</th>
<th>Key Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1A Positive job characteristics of challenge, autonomy, meaning and variety will be perceived as a category of perks by employees. | **Intrinsically Motivating Job Characteristics:**  
- Enriched job design  
- Challenging work  
- Job imperatives | Supported with the additional job characteristic of “job imperatives” revealed although this was a minor sub-theme. |
| 1B Negative job characteristic of excessive workload pressures and resource constraints will be perceived by employees as a category of irks. | **Job Stressors:**  
- Workload pressures and resource constraints  
- Job routine | Supported with the additional irksome job characteristic of “routine work” revealed as a minor sub-theme. |
| 2A Leader support will be perceived by employees as a category of perks. | **Leader Support:**  
- Psychological support  
- Instrumental support | Supported with the strongest evidence for psychological leader support |
| 2B Autocratic leader behaviour will be perceived by employees as a category of irks. | **Autocratic Leader Behaviour:**  
- Psychological impediments  
- Functional impediments | Supported with two dimensions identified – “psychological” and “functional”. |
| 3A Co-worker support will be perceived by employees as a category of perks. | **Co-worker Support:**  
- Teamwork  
- Co-worker feedback | Supported with co-worker feedback identified as a second minor dimension of co-worker support |
| 3B Co-worker shirking will be perceived by employees as a category of irks. | **Irksome Co-worker Behaviours:**  
- Co-worker shirking | Supported with the main impact in terms of its negative effect on the direction facet of discretionary work effort. |
| 4A A supportive organisation that cares about the welfare and needs of its employees will be perceived by employees as a category of perks. | **Organisational Perks:**  
- Organisational support  
- Public service | Supported with the additional idiosyncratic organisational perk of “public service” revealed. |
| 4B Excessive bureaucracy (i.e. coercive and political) will be perceived by employees as a category of irks. | **Excessive Bureaucracy:**  
- Bureaucracy  
- Power orientation | Supported. |
While “job imperatives” and “public service” were identified as perks, and “job routine” was identified as an irk in Study 1, these sub-themes will not be included in Study 2. Apart from being amongst the more minor perks and irks sub-themes that emerged from this research, there were other reasons for not including them in the next study. It was felt that “public service” is idiosyncratic to public institutions. Thus, this dimension of perks is context specific and so has less universal relevance outside the public sector. The main aim of my research, however, was to identify common perks and irks that may be generalised across different industries and occupations. In addition, “job imperatives” may be empirically difficult to differentiate from other more important perks and irks constructs that emerged in Study 1. For example, it may no be possible to distinguish job imperatives from the “enriched job design” perk and the “workload pressures and resource constraints” irk. Responding to crises, emergencies, tight deadlines or similar is likely to increase the perceived importance of a job or project and so may be perceived as more meaningful (Amabile et al., 1996), a feature of enriched job design. Similarly, it is likely to increase workload pressures. Likewise, “job routine” is closely correlated with the job variety perk within the “enriched job design” sub-theme. In prior discretionary work effort research it has been measured as the converse of job variety (Organ et al., 2006) indicating that it is the opposite end of a single construct. Also, aspects of this sub-theme suggest that it may be perceived as a situation of low workload pressure and so may overlap with the “workload pressures and resource constraints” irk. Furthermore, excluding these three more minor perks and irks, makes the scope my research more manageable.

4.4.2 Discretionary Work Effort

Overall, participants’ discussions about discretionary work effort confirmed the facets of this construct identified from the literature review in Chapter 2. As expected, the different behaviours identified by the participants fell within three overarching themes: (1) discretionary work time; (2) discretionary work intensity; and (3) discretionary directed effort. Under the discretionary directed effort theme, six sub-themes were revealed. These were: (a) individual initiative; (b) helping; (c) civic virtue; (d) organisational compliance; (e) organisational loyalty; and (f) self-development. Individual initiative and helping were the two dominant sub-themes.

A high degree of commonality is apparent in the way that the interview participants conceived discretionary work time and intensity and how these dimensions of discretionary work effort were operationalised by Brown and Leigh (1996). The work time scale developed by these authors included putting in long hours, starting work early and leaving late, and putting in more hours than co-workers. Similarly, the qualitative interview participants emphasised putting in long hours and extra hours to complete tasks as well as working extra time at home and after hours, starting work early and leaving late, and putting
in more hours than their co-workers. Brown and Leigh’s work intensity scale included working with intensity and to one’s full capacity, devoting all one’s energy to doing the job, fully exerting oneself and striving hard to be as successful as possible. This content was again mirrored in the comments by the qualitative interview participants. They referred to working intensively, striving to do their best and working at full capacity. One type of behaviour that was mentioned by participants in this study, but is not represented in Brown and Leigh’s work, is relative intensity (i.e. working harder than co-workers). This type of discretionary work behaviour associated with intensity was mentioned by nearly one-third of the study participants in the individual interviews and first focus group. Thus, this aspect of discretionary work intensity may be something that should be added to Brown and Leigh’s intensity scale.

In evaluating how local government employees conceived discretionary directed effort, the results revealed six sub-themes that resembled six of the seven common types of discretionary directed effort reported in the ERB literature (Organ et al., 2006). Only sportsmanship, a willingness to tolerate less than ideal working conditions without complaint, did not emerge as a sub-theme for the current sample. Helping others and individual initiative were the two forms of directed effort most commonly and broadly identified by the sample of participants as discretionary. In the literature, sportsmanship has received much less research attention than other forms of ERB (Organ et al., 2006). This supports the possibility that this form of discretionary directed effort is not as broadly recognised as others even in the private sector. In contrast, helping has been identified as perhaps the most important and most widely researched form of discretionary directed effort in the ERB literature (Organ et al., 2006). Similarly, individual initiative have been investigated quite extensively but it has been suggested this construct can be difficult to distinguish empirically from required job performance or what is called “in-role” performance (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). This difficulty, however, seems more likely to be a problem for the “job dedication” sub-theme of individual initiative than for the “proactive behaviour” sub-theme as the latter involves behaviours that are more effortful and change-oriented (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Job dedication, on the other hand, has been conceptualised in the ERB literature as engaging in task-related activities with more enthusiasm and persistence than is minimally required. Some researchers have included behaviours like not wasting time, being conscientious and putting in an honest day’s work as indicators of job dedication (Podsakoff et al., 1990). As this conceptualisation overlaps with the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort, it seems that individual initiative may be better conceptualised as including only proactive behaviours and that the job dedication aspect of individual initiative be captured in the time and intensity facets of
discretionary work effort. This conceptualisation should alleviate concerns expressed in the ERB literature with empirically differentiating this form of ERB. Also, since the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort are defined in generalised terms, they are not affected by whether the behaviour is directed into required or non-required tasks.

Overall, the Study 1 findings informed my research firstly by confirming that local government employees perceive discretionary work effort in a manner that is consistent with its conceptualisation in the economics and OB literatures on discretionary work effort. More specifically, the local government employees discussed discretionary work effort from a multidimensional perspective, recognising the time, intensity and direction facets. This outcome validated the relevance and appropriateness of using a discretionary work effort measure that incorporates these three dimensions in this research context. Secondly, the findings clarified that there is broad recognition amongst local government employees of the main forms of discretionary directed effort identified in the ERB literature. Individual initiative and helping were the two forms of directed effort most broadly recognised as discretionary by the target population. While future research should include all these facets of discretionary directed effort, I have chosen to include these two more widely recognised forms as exemplars of the direction facet of discretionary work effort in my research. This decision helped to keep the scope of my study manageable. Also, this approach was consistent with prior ERB studies where only some forms of affiliative and/or challenging ERB were investigated (Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2003). Furthermore, helping and individual initiative provide exemplars of the two broad forms of discretionary directed effort, namely, affiliative ERB (helping) and challenging ERB (individual initiative).

Based on the findings from Study 1, the research model presented in Chapter 1 was expanded to incorporate the key perks and irks themes/sub-themes and the facets of discretionary work effort. The expanded research model is presented in Figure 4.4.
4.5 STUDY LIMITATIONS

One common practice in qualitative research is to assess inter-rater reliability for the emerging themes, sub-themes and categories of comments. While this would have added to the overall robustness of the methodology employed, this step was not taken in this study. Rather, practical constraints led me to opt for using a follow-up focus group interview in which the themes were discussed and tested with an independent group of local government employees. In addition, the perks and irks themes, sub-themes, and sample comments were reviewed by a panel of experts in the area. Also, as the findings from this study were largely consistent with the literature, this suggested that there was nothing idiosyncratic about how the data was coded.

Another potential limitation of Study 1 was that the interview participants were recruited from a convenience sample of organisations. It should be noted, however, that they were from multiple organisations that differed on many characteristics, and that there was good diversity in the types of occupations represented, participant demographics and reported levels of work motivation, level of work effort and job satisfaction. Nevertheless, all of the study participants worked in rural and regional public sector organisations, and thus the findings may not generalise to other types of employee groups.

A further possible limitation relates to the use of in-depth individual interviews to gather the data. This method raises the potential concern of whether the interview questions
were understood in the same way by all participants. This issue is usually of greatest concern for participants who have a lower level of education. I tried to minimise this potential limitation by remaining alert to hesitations by the participants in answering questions. Where appropriate or necessary, the questions and discussion prompts were rephrased. I also tried to use simple language throughout the interviews.

4.6 THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings of Study 1 have several theoretical and practical implications. This research clarified the perks and irks constructs and improved our understanding of them. Unlike other broader work environment constructs like work climate and psychological climate, the conceptualisation of perks and irks constructs is restricted to those non-monetary work environment characteristics that affect the level of discretionary work effort. This study was the first step towards delineating the domains for these two constructs.

The findings identified that some perks and irks that have previously received little research attention like negative leader behaviour and co-worker shirking, may be important in affecting discretionary work effort. Of particular note was the importance of negative leader behaviour as an irk. Employees perceive intrinsically motivating job characteristics, leader behaviours (both positive and negative) and positive co-worker behaviours as the most important determinants of their level of discretionary work effort. Relationship-oriented behaviours that form the “psychological” dimension of relationships between employees and their managers and co-workers seemed to be particularly important. The practical implication of this enhanced understanding of perks and irks is that it suggests some new ways in which managers might motivate employees to supply discretionary work effort in the workplace.

Another important theoretical contribution relates to the conceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct. In my approach to this research, I combined the facets of discretionary work effort from the economics and OB literatures and demonstrated that these facets can be differentiated. To the best of my knowledge, by including all three facets of discretionary work effort to provide a more complete conceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct this study is unique. My conceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct also provides a means for addressing concerns raised in the ERB literature about differentiating “job dedication” from required task-related effort (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996).

In addition, by having gathered my data from public sector organisations my research has balanced the tendency for research on discretionary work effort to focus on
private sector organisations. This study provided several useful insights to how public sector employees perceive perks and irks as well as discretionary work effort.

One interesting finding was that with one exception, public sector employees seem to view similar types of work environment characteristics as perks and irks as those reported in the literature using private sector organisations. The one exception was “public service”. In using a public sector sample I was able to identify public sector work as inherently motivating. This finding extends prior research in the literature on public service motivation (Crewson, 1997; Perry, 1997; Perry & Wise, 1990; Wright, 2001) that features the desire to serve society and public interest as a dispositional factor. This research, however, has focussed on the meaning and antecedents of public service motivation rather than its effects on employee behaviour (Perry, 1997). My research confirms that a broad range of public sector employees perceive public service as a perk and that it is perceived to affect their level of discretionary work effort. This has important practical implications. If public sector jobs are perceived as intrinsically more meaningful because they provide an opportunity to serve the community and public interest, then this perk may help public sector managers to counteract their inability to offer salaries that are competitive with the private sector. Also, if “serving the public” is more than a dispositional factor, then it may be a work environment characteristic that can be fostered to motivate greater discretionary work effort.

A further theoretical contribution from using a public sector sample was that it confirmed that public sector employees perceive discretionary work effort to include the three facets of time, intensity and direction. It also confirmed that these employees view discretionary directed effort in a manner that is largely consistent with how this construct has been conceptualised in the ERB literature and researched in private sector settings. To the best of my knowledge, this has not been previously tested to ensure that the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort and discretionary directed effort can be generalised across both sectors. The practical importance of this conceptualisation of discretionary work effort is that managers need to give attention to all three facets of discretionary work effort. Also, it suggests that they may be able to influence different facets of discretionary work effort by manipulating different work environment characteristics. This possibility will be investigated as part of my program of research.
4.7 CONCLUSION

Study 1 served to inform the conceptualisation of the perks and irks constructs and to confirm that local government employees perceive discretionary work effort in a manner that is consistent with its conceptualisation in the economics and OB literatures. The findings suggested four key non-monetary work environment characteristics that are perceived as types of perks amongst a broad sample of local government employees that will be tested in Study 2. These were: (1) intrinsically motivating job characteristics (enriched job design and challenging work); (2) co-worker support (teamwork and co-worker feedback); (3) leader support (psychological and instrumental support); and (4) organisational support. In addition, four types of irks were revealed that will also be tested in Study 2. These were: (1) autocratic leader behaviour (psychological and functional impediments); (2) workload pressures and resource constraints; (3) co-worker shirking; and (4) excessive bureaucracy (bureaucracy and power orientation).

The outcomes of Study 1 provided the necessary background research to inform the development of suitable measurement scales for these perks and irks, which in turn moves my program of research one step closer to being able to test the model depicted in Figure 4.4. The development of these measurement scales forms the focus of Study 2 which is presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

Study 2 - Perks and Irks Scale Development

This chapter presents the second of the three studies comprising my program of research. This second study, like the first one, addressed the core question of what non-monetary work environment characteristics do employees commonly perceive as perks and irks. Study 2 extends Study 1 by developing reliable measures of the perks and irks constructs.

This chapter commences by outlining how Study 2 extends the key findings of my Study 1 research. Next, Section 5.2 provides a description of the method used to conduct Study 2. This section describes the research participants, the procedures used, the development of the measurement items and the survey instrument, how the questionnaire was implemented, and the analyses undertaken. Section 5.3 then outlines the Study 2 results. This is followed by a discussion of the results in Section 5.4. Finally, Section 5.5 considers the research limitations of Study 2 and directions for further research. There, I outline how Study 2 informed Study 3 and which directions for further research are addressed by Study 3 in Chapter 6.

5.1 EXTENDING STUDY 1

The literature review in Chapter 2 identified an initial array of non-monetary work environment characteristics that should affect discretionary work effort. I called these non-monetary work environment characteristics “perks” and “irks”. These characteristics were broadly classified as job, social and interpersonal, and organisational perks and irks. However, with no prior research directly addressing the perks and irks constructs, these could only be theorised indirectly. Study 1, therefore, tested these potential perks and irks via qualitative research. An analysis of the qualitative interviews revealed a set of key non-monetary work environment characteristics that the sample of participants perceived as perks and irks, in that they believed that they motivated or demotivated them to supply discretionary work effort. The most salient perks and irks were identified based on the amount of comment dedicated to them, and the reliability with which they were mentioned by interview participants. My research does not produce an exhaustive list of perks and irks – such a list might be endless in view of the diversity of human preferences. Rather, Study 1 identified the most important perks and irks and provided insight into their nature.
Based on the literature and the analysis of the Study 1 findings, four salient perks themes were identified and were subsequently labelled: (i) intrinsically motivating job characteristics (i.e. enriched job design, challenging work, job imperatives); (ii) leader support (i.e. psychological and instrumental support); (iii) co-worker support (i.e. teamwork and co-worker feedback); and (iv) organisational perks (i.e. organisational support and public service). Likewise, four salient irks themes were identified and these were labelled (i) workload pressures and resource constraints; (ii) autocratic leader behaviour (i.e. psychological and functional impediments); (iii) excessive bureaucracy (i.e. bureaucracy and power-orientation); and (iv) co-worker shirking. To maintain a manageable scope for Study 2, I restricted my investigation to the most dominant perks and irks that emerged in Study 1. Thus, job imperatives, public service and routine work did not form part of this next study (see Chapter 4).

In Study 2, I aimed to extend Study 1 in several ways. Most importantly, the literature review and the findings of Study 1 were the basis for formulating a set of hypotheses that were tested via quantitative research in Study 2. By using an alternative research method and a larger sample, this second study enabled me to validate my Study 1 qualitative research findings.

**Study 2 Research Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1:** Employees will perceive i) intrinsically motivating job characteristics; ii) leader support; iii) co-worker support; and iv) organisational support as perks.

**Hypothesis 2:** Employees will perceive i) workload pressures and resource constraints; ii) autocratic leader behaviour; iii) co-worker shirking; and iv) excessive bureaucracy as irks.

These hypotheses were tested by developing a questionnaire and then conducting a Q-sort-type procedure and factor analysis on the data collected. This procedure was used to develop a methodologically sound measure of the salient perks and irks constructs that emerged from Study 1. My aim was to establish if these constructs were consistently identified as perks and irks by a large sample of the target population. I also sought to see if the perks and irks items consistently loaded on their intended perks and irks factors.

A further aim of this study was to validate the perks and irks measures by testing their predictive validity. This required testing if the perks and irks correlated with one or more criterion variables. Three criterion variables were selected, namely, discretionary work effort, employee well-being and the quality of the work environment.
**Perks, Irks and Discretionary Work Effort**

Perks are the positive non-monetary work environment characteristics that in my research model of discretionary work effort are postulated to increase discretionary work effort. Thus, perks should correlate positively with discretionary work effort. Similarly, irks are the negative non-monetary work environment characteristics that in my research model of discretionary work effort are postulated to decrease discretionary work effort. Thus, irks should correlate negatively with discretionary work effort.

**Perks, Irks and Employee Well-being**

Also, according to the subjective utility theory and expectancy theory frameworks, employees will invest more or less discretionary work effort if they expect the satisfaction derived from the rewards associated with the extra effort to outweigh the dissatisfaction associated with the costs. That is, they will supply more discretionary work effort if they expect this to increase their overall level of well-being. Job satisfaction is an indicator of the employee’s evaluation of the well-being expected from this work behaviour. As perks are a source of satisfaction, they should positively correlate with job satisfaction. Likewise, as irks are a source of dissatisfaction they should negatively correlate with job satisfaction.

**Perks, Irks and the Quality of the Work Environment**

In my research, the notion of perks and irks was drawn from the economists’ concept of “net perquisites” which are defined as the net non-monetary rewards and costs an employee associates with his/her job (Douglas, 1989; Douglas & Shepherd, 2000; Morris & Douglas, 2004). Thus, net perquisites reflect the quality of the non-monetary work environment. As positive non-monetary work environment characteristics, perks should increase the employee’s evaluation of the quality of the work environment other things being equal. Thus, perks should correlate positively with net perquisites. In contrast, irks are negative non-monetary work environment characteristics and so should decrease the employee’s evaluation of the overall quality of the work environment other things remaining equal. Thus, irks should correlate negatively with net perquisites.

Thus, to provide preliminary evidence to validate the perks and irks scales, the following hypotheses were tested.

*Hypothesis 3a:* There will be a positive correlation between each of the perks constructs and extra-role behaviour (ERB) as an indicator of discretionary work effort.

*Hypothesis 3b:* There will be a positive correlation between each of the perks constructs and job satisfaction as an indicator of employee well-being.
Hypothesis 3c: There will be a positive correlation between each of the perks constructs and net perquisites as an indicator of the quality of the non-monetary work environment.

Hypothesis 4a: There will be a negative correlation between each of the irks constructs and ERB as an indicator of discretionary work effort.

Hypothesis 4b: There will be a negative correlation between each of the irks constructs and job satisfaction as an indicator of employee well-being.

Hypothesis 4c: There will be a negative correlation between each of the irks constructs and net perquisites as an indicator of the quality of the non-monetary work environment.

As part of Study 2, I also undertook post-hoc analyses to see if employee perceptions of perks and irks varied with some key demographic and work status characteristics. Values, attitudes and preferences for different types of work rewards may vary for different sub-groups of employees (Filer, 1985; Ross, 1996). Therefore, it has been common practice in research on discretionary work effort to control for some of these individual differences (Bielby & Bielby, 1988; Choi, 2007; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Maume, 2006; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). I aimed to identify differences in perceptions related to employee demographic and work status characteristics that might need to be controlled for in Study 3 or might provide contextual explanations for findings that emerge from the Study 3 analysis.

Finally, in Study 2 I also tested the conceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct as having three facets – time, intensity and direction. No known prior research has conceptualised and tested discretionary work effort to include a time, intensity and direction facet. Therefore, it was necessary to investigate whether these facets of discretionary work effort form separate factors in a factor analysis. In addition, three of the scales chosen to measure these facets of discretionary work effort had only been used in a small number of prior studies and none of these studies had been conducted in a public sector context. These scales were selected because they best suited how I conceptualised the discretionary work effort construct for my research and no other more appropriate measures could be located in the literature. Thus, I needed to test the psychometric properties of these three scales and their suitability for my research context.
5.2 METHOD

To develop Likert scale measures for the perks, irks and discretionary work effort constructs, I was guided by the scale development literature (Churchill, 1979; Hinkin, 1995, 1998; Nunnally, 1967; Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991) and Hinkin’s (1995, 1998) recommended procedure for scale development. I also considered the approaches used in similar studies that had developed measurement scales (Brown, Davidsson, & Wiklund, 2001; Giles & Mossholder, 1990; Hornsby et al., 2002; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 1994).

Hinkin (1995, 1998) argued that constructing good measurement devices is perhaps the most difficult yet the most important part of any study. The main steps that he proposed for scale development were: (1) domain specification; (2) item generation; (3) questionnaire administration; (4) item reduction, factor analysis and scale refinement; (5) assessment of reliability and validity; and (6) replication with an independent sample. The first two steps in this process are discussed in Section 5.2.3 where the perks and irks measures are described. Step 3 is considered in Section 5.2.4 which outlines the questionnaire and data collection procedure. Steps 4 and 5 are discussed in Section 5.2.5 which outlines the data analysis procedures employed. Step 6 will be addressed in Study 3 (see Chapter 6).

5.2.1 Participants

The questionnaire was distributed to all non-CEO employees from 12 local governments located in metropolitan and rural and regional locations in the state of Western Australia. A total of 2288 questionnaires were distributed and 586 were returned (a response rate of 25.6%). Of these, 585 cases (25.6%) were retained for analysis (see Section 7.2.4.1 on the handling of missing data). Response rates across the 12 participating organisations ranged from 15% to 66% with a median response rate of 25.5%. Hinkin (1995) recommended a minimum sample size of 150 for studies using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and a minimum of 200 for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). He indicated that the recommended item-to-response ratios range from 1:4 to 1:10 although at least 1:10 is desirable. I had a ratio of at least 1:15 for most analyses. The item-to-response ratio fell below this level (a ratio of 1:9) only for the Harman’s one-factor test for common method variance. On the basis these guidelines, my sample size seemed large enough to ensure adequate power for the statistical analyses planned.

Table 5.1 presents the characteristics of the 585 participants retained for analysis in Study 2. There were equal numbers of males and females in the sample. About one-third of the participants were aged 40-49 years. This age category represented the median age for local government employees in the state. Most participants (82%) were full-time employees.
and nearly two-thirds (62%) had been with the organisation for five years or less. More than half the participants (58%) were in non-supervisory roles. Slightly more than three-quarters of the participants (78%) were classified as inside staff (i.e. in white collar and professional work roles) and the remainder were classified as outside staff (i.e. largely in trades and blue-collar work roles). Nearly two-thirds of participants (64%) worked in rural/regional locations. As Table 5.1 shows, all categories of employee characteristics were represented in the data set. As noted in Study 1 (see Section 4.2.2), however, I was unable to determine if this sample was representative of the population due to the lack of industry statistics available to make this assessment.

**TABLE 5.1: Study 2 Participant Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants (n = 585)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30 years</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60+ years</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure with the Organisation</td>
<td>Up to 5 years</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Level</td>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside/Outside Staff</td>
<td>Inside staff</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside staff (75+% work outside)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Capital city/metropolitan</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural/Regional</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 Procedure

Study 2 used a survey design to collect data for developing the scale measures for the perks and irks constructs. A whole of organisation survey was conducted with local government employees from 12 organisations. The data were collected through a self-report questionnaire that asked participants to respond to items that aimed to measure the key variables. The questionnaire was designed to operationalise the perks and irks constructs, three facets of discretionary work effort, and two criterion variables to assess the predictive
validity of the perks and irks scales. The questionnaire also contained a variety of demographic and work situation questions. Existing measures taken from the literature were used wherever appropriate. The measures used are described in Section 5.2.3 below.

The questionnaire was administered over a six week period in early 2006. Several techniques were used to enhance the response rate to the survey. Support for the study was obtained from two peak industry bodies, namely, the Western Australian Local Government Association and the Local Government Managers Association. Endorsement of the research by these professional industry bodies was expected to enhance the interest in and credibility of the research amongst participants. To further build awareness of and interest in the research, participants were provided with a preliminary letter outlining the purpose of the study and the potential benefits from participating. Then, after the questionnaire had been distributed, participants were provided with reminders at two weekly intervals.

Once collected, multiple techniques were employed to analyse the data. These included missing data analysis, factor analysis, correlation analysis, reliability analysis and validity analysis (see Section 5.2.5).

5.2.3 Measures

5.2.3.1 Perks and Irks

The perks and irks were key constructs in my model of discretionary work effort that required measurement. These constructs, however, are not explicitly defined and measured in the formal academic literature. Nonetheless, in the literature there are many existing measures of individual and multi-dimensional constructs that represent the types of perks and irks identified in Study 1. These include measures for constructs like leader support (Hornsby et al., 2002), organisational support (Eisenberger et al., 1986), workload pressures (e.g. Amabile et al., 1996) and enriched job design (Hackman & Oldham, 1975), as well as multi-dimensional constructs like psychological climate (Brown & Leigh, 1996; James & James, 1989) from which I could draw suitable scale items. Thus, the perks and irks measures were developed by drawing on several existing scales that reflected the types of perks and irks as defined in Study 1.

To develop the perks and irks measures, I used a combined deductive-inductive approach (Hinkin, 1995). Deductive scale development uses a theoretical definition of the construct of interest and an established typology prior to data collection to guide item development. However, if there is little or no theory to guide the development of the measure, then an inductive approach is warranted. This relies on a sample of participants to provide descriptions of the construct of interest. These are then content analysed, key areas
are identified and items generated. In the following sections, I outline how I applied these procedures.

**Domain Specification**

To facilitate the domain specification for perks and irks, I used the definitions presented in Section 1.2.4 in Chapter 1 of my thesis. Domain specification involves reviewing the research literature to identify any existing constructs that meet these definitions. This step constituted a deductive approach. This was supplemented with qualitative interviews that comprised Study 1. Randall (1990) and Benkhoff (1997) supported working with study participants to develop a better understanding of how a construct is conceived, the language they use and the meanings that different members or groups attach to them. This step involved an inductive approach.

Study 1 revealed overarching themes and sub-themes representing the most salient perks and irks, for which descriptions were developed. Where appropriate, these descriptions were based on equivalent constructs identified in the literature. Sometimes they were modified slightly to better reflect the content of the themes that emerged (see Chapter 4). The scope of each of the perks and irks themes and sub-themes was delineated by these descriptions. A further search of the literature was then conducted to try to find appropriate scales to measure these constructs. Where existing measures could not be identified I developed and tested items to measure the constructs identified from the literature review and Study 1 interviews.

**Item Generation**

Hinkin (1995, 1998) emphasised the importance of parsimony and high reliability in scale development. He asserted that scales consisting of five or six items using a 5-point or 7-point scale would be adequate for most measures. Using Hinkin’s guidelines of losing at least half the items generated and retaining four to six items for most scales, my aim was to generate a large initial pool of items to ensure enough could be retained for each perk and irk construct for reliable and valid measures to be developed.

An initial pool of 141 items was generated from established measures and new items drawn from the Study 1 interviews to measure the perks and irks constructs. By combining items from both of these sources, I could capitalise on my Study 1 findings that had informed the definitions of the perks and irks constructs developed for my research. In selecting established scales, I considered their suitability for the target population, their reliability and demonstrated validity, and the length of the survey instrument (Robinson et al., 1991). Minor modifications were made to some items drawn from established scales to better suit the target population. New items were added where it was felt that either the item content of a
given construct did not suit the research setting or the interviews suggested some important content was missing. For constructs where no appropriate measures could be located, new items were generated to capture that construct. Table 5.2 provides a description of each of the perks and irks constructs for which items were generated, the numbers of items generated and the sources of these items. The full questionnaire is replicated in Appendix 3.

Table 5.2: Perks and Irks Descriptions and Source of Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs Measured</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Source of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PERKS                                                    | **Intrinsically motivating job characteristics**  
  - The degree to which the job provides scope for challenging and responsible work, opportunities for personal achievement and growth, and gives rise to feelings of meaningfulness, responsibility and ownership.                                                                         | 15               | Items from Hornsby, Kuratko & Zahra (2002) work discretion scale plus items modified from various other sources - (Amabile et al., 1996; Amabile et al., 1994; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Sagie & Elizur, 1999).                                                                 |
|                                                          | **Co-worker support**  
  - The degree to which organisational members with whom an employee interacts or works closely on a daily basis value his/her contributions and care about his/her well-being through acts of constructive support and feedback.                                                                                                                   | 14               | New items generated guided by measures of helping behaviour and team support (Bishop et al., 2000; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1997)                                                                 |
|                                                          | **Leader support**  
  - The degree to which an employee’s manager or supervisor values his/her contributions and shows concern for his/her well-being through acts of psychological and instrumental support.                                                                                                                                                    | 20               | Items developed from content of various measures - (Gupta et al., 2004; Hornsby et al., 2002; Podsakoff et al., 1996b; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004; Smither, Reilly, Millsap, & Salvemini, 1995)                                                                 |
|                                                          | **Organisational support**  
  - The degree to which the organisation provides employees with the support needed to effectively perform their tasks, recognises and rewards employee effort and provides socio-emotional support when needed.                                                                                                                                  | 38               | Items generated from various literature sources (e.g. (Amabile et al., 1996; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Hornsby et al., 2002) and the Study 1 interviews.                                                                 |
| IRKS                                                     | **Workload pressures & resource constraints**  
  - Having to carry out one’s work under conditions of heavy workload, time pressures, or inadequate resources, or external distractions.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 12               | Items from Hornsby, Kuratko & Zahra’s (2002) time availability scale and Amabile & colleagues (1996) workload pressures and sufficient resources scales.                                                                 |
|                                                          | **Co-worker shirking**  
  - Co-workers fail to give 100% effort to their job, or not carrying their weight when working on a group task, or neglecting their own work through frequent absence, lateness, breaks or poor quality work, and displaying little or no commitment or interest in their job.                                                                                                                               | 15               | Items from Kidwell and Robie (2003) withholding effort scale with some minor modifications and some new items based on content from the Study 1 interviews.                                                                 |
|                                                          | **Autocratic leader behaviour**  
  - The degree to which the manager or supervisor is directive, controlling, rigid and non-communicative in the way he/she interacts with subordinates, engages in abusive supervision, administers non-contingent punishment, focuses on employee weaknesses, and engages in behaviours that are perceived as unsupportive and unfair.                                                                       | 13               | New items generated from various literature sources (e.g. (Amabile et al., 2004; Ligos, 2000) and the Study 1 interviews.                                                                 |
|                                                          | **Excessive bureaucracy**  
  - The degree to which the organisation is characterised by bureaucratic systems, procedures, thinking and behaviours are perceived as coercive.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 14               | Items generated from various literature sources (e.g. (Amabile et al., 1996; Hornsby et al., 2002; Katz & Kahn, 1978) and from Study 1 interviews.                                                                 |
The style of statement used in established measures guided the wording of new items. Particular attention was given to keeping statements short and simple, using language familiar to the participants and employing good questionnaire design principles (Hinkin, 1998). Wording (reverse-coding) items negatively is a common practice to reduce response set bias. Hinkin, however, questioned the benefit of this practice. The use of negatively worded items may reduce the validity of questionnaire responses, introduce systematic error to a measurement scale and may produce an artefactual response factor comprised of the negatively worded items (Hinkin, 1995). Also, my questionnaire scale included both positive and negative factors which negated the need for negatively worded items. Thus, I opted not to negatively word any of the items generated.

Although the items came from several sources, and thus had different Likert scales, for the purpose of this study all items were converted so that they could be rated using a single 7-point rating scale where 1 = very negative (strong irk); 2 = moderately negative; 3 = slightly negative; 4 = neutral; 5 = slightly positive; 6 = moderately positive; and 7 = very positive (strong perk). This was considered to be a relatively efficient number of rating points to use for the attainment of reasonable reliabilities for the scales developed (Hinkin, 1998; Nunnally, 1967).

5.2.3.2 Criterion Variable Measures

As a preliminary test of the predictive validity of the perks and irks scales, three variables with which perks and irks were expected to correlate were also measured. One was an existing general measure of ERB (an indicator of discretionary work effort) and the other two related to indicators of employee satisfaction.

Extra-role behaviour - A short 7-item measure of ERB developed by Lynch, Eisenberger and Armeli (1999) was used as an indicator of discretionary work effort. These researchers conceptualised ERB as “discretionary acts by employees that serve to increase organisational effectiveness” (Lynch et al., 1999, p.472). They adapted items from several established measures of ERB (Smith et al., 1983; Van Dyne et al., 1994; Williams & Anderson, 1991). These items captured discretionary acts of initiative, helping and civic virtue (Organ et al., 2006). Examples included “this employee makes constructive suggestions to improve the overall functioning of my work group” and “this employee volunteers for things that are not required of him/her”. Lynch et al. (1999) reported internal reliabilities of .90 and .91 for two independent studies. This scale was selected because of its parsimony, good psychometric properties and because it was expected to correlate with the measure of discretionary work effort that I planned to use in testing my model of discretionary work effort in Study 3. For my research, however, the items were modified slightly to enable self-reporting by
participants. Also, while Lynch et al. used a 5-point response format (1 = disagree and 5 = very strongly agree), I used a 7-point response format with the descriptors strongly disagree (1), moderately disagree (2), slightly disagree (3), neutral (4), slightly agree (5), moderately agree (6) and strongly agree (7). Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the scale was .81, and thus, indicated a relatively high reliability.

Job satisfaction - A short measure of job satisfaction developed by Chalykoff and Cochan (1989) was used. This scale consisted of 5 items that asked employees to rate how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with five facets of their work - the job, pay/benefits, promotion opportunities, recognition received for a job well done, and the amount of say in how the work is to be done. The internal reliabilities for this scale in prior research were reported as .78 (Chalykoff & Kochan, 1989) and .84 (Kidwell & Robie, 2003). While Chalykoff and Cochan used a 7-point scale anchored by very dissatisfied (1) and very satisfied (7), I changed the response format to provide some variation in question style. I used a 7-point scale anchored by a sad face at the lower end, a happy face at the top end and a neutral face at the mid-point of the scale. I used this as a strategy to help reduce the potential effects of response bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the scale was .85, and thus, was comparable to those reported in prior research.

Net Perquisites - As no measure of net perquisites was found in the literature, I drew on the economists’ net perquisites concept to develop a scale for this study. It consisted of 5 items that asked employees to rate the extent to which the positives associated with a specific non-monetary aspect of their job outweigh the negatives. The items rated were: (i) the tasks done; (ii) how their manager/ supervisor leads their work area; (iii) the things their co-workers do; (iv) being part of their organisation; (v) and the community they work in. The community was included based on comments that emerged in Study 1. I used a 7-point response format with the descriptors very inaccurate (1), moderately accurate (2), slightly accurate (3), neutral (4), slightly accurate (5), moderately accurate (6), and very accurate (7). A single factor solution resulted from an EFA of the items. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability of .81, indicating a high internal reliability.

Discretionary work effort - To answer the planned research questions for Study 3, a measure of discretionary work effort was required. As outlined in the literature review (see Chapter 2), the construct of discretionary work effort has three facets - time, intensity and direction. To understand the complex relationships between discretionary work effort and the factors that drive it, a multi-dimensional operationalisation of this construct is required (Katerberg & Blau, 1983; Terborg & Miller, 1978). While there have been several efforts to develop multi-dimensional measures of work effort (see for example Blau, 1993; Brown & Leigh,
no good, single approach was found in the OB or labour economics literatures. Therefore, these three facets of discretionary work effort were operationalised using a combination of existing measures from the literature to encompass the definition of this construct developed for my research (see Section 2.2 in Chapter 2). The aim was to pre-test these measures in Study 2 so that I had a reliable measure to test the key research questions in Study 3.

The time and facets of discretionary work effort were measured using Brown and Leigh’s (1996) bi-dimensional scale of work effort. While this measure has only had limited testing, it was the only work effort scale identified in the literature that tapped both the time and intensity facets. The authors developed these scales, as a general measure of work effort rather than as a measure of discretionary work effort. Nonetheless, the items seemed to reflect discretionary work effort as they were worded in terms of doing more than the minimum required effort. That is, they referred to either working longer hours than others (suggesting a time commitment above the norm, hence beyond the minimum required) or to exerting maximum effort. Thus, it seemed appropriate to use these scales as measures of the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort.

Brown and Leigh’s (1996) bi-dimensional scale was parsimonious, its factor structure has been tested using CFA and it had good psychometric properties. The scale comprised 5 time items and 5 intensity items. The items included “Few of my peers put in more hours weekly than I do” and “When I work, I really exert myself to the fullest”. For two independent samples, Brown and Leigh (1996) reported an adequate fit for a two correlated factor model and internal reliabilities of .82 and .83 for the intensity scale and .86 and .82 for the time scale. As the items in this scale were written for sales personnel, I adapted them slightly to suit the context of my research. Yoon, Beatty and Suh (2001) reported testing the work intensity scale in a non-sales setting and found it to be unidimensional with a comparable internal reliability to the original scale.

There is a wide range of established measures for the direction facet of discretionary work effort. I selected two existing scales, one representing challenging ERB and the other affiliative ERB as exemplars of discretionary directed effort (see Chapter 2). I chose a 10 item taking charge scale developed by Morrison and Phelps (1999) to measure challenging ERBs, and a 5 item helping scale developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990) to measure affiliative ERBs. These two forms of discretionary directed effort were chosen because they were the most widely recognised amongst local government employees in Study 1.

The taking charge scale items (Morrison & Phelps, 1999) assessed change-oriented behaviours directed at making improvements in the context of the job, work unit or
organisation. The internal reliabilities reported in the literature ranged from 0.88 to 0.95 across four independent samples. The discriminant validity of this construct from other forms of discretionary directed effort has also been demonstrated (Chiaburu & Baker, 2006; McAllister et al., 2007; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Items included “This person often tries to bring about improved procedures for the work unit or department” and “This person often tries to change how his or her job is executed in order to be more effective”.

Helping is one of the most frequently researched forms of discretionary directed effort and represents discretionary acts of helping with work related problems that are directed towards specific individuals in the organisation (Organ et al., 2006). The helping scale developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990) has been widely tested in multiple different settings and is reported to have good content and discriminant validity and good psychometric properties (Organ et al., 2006). The internal reliability for this scale averaged across 12 independent studies was .88 and the empirical research suggests that this scale is relatively stable. The scale items included “Helps others who have work related problems” and “Helps others who have heavy workloads”.

As with the other measures in the questionnaire, all of the items used to assess discretionary work effort were measured on a 7-point Likert-type agree/disagree scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Participants were asked to think about their present job and to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements listed. The wording of all the items for the time, intensity and direction facets of the discretionary work effort scales were modified where necessary to enable self-reporting by the participants.

Unlike the other three scales chosen to measure discretionary work effort, the helping scale was very well established and had been broadly tested. Also, unlike taking charge, the generalised nature of helping others at work suggested that the content of this scale would be broadly relevant in all work contexts. Thus in Study 2, I opted to only pre-test the less well established scales of discretionary work time, discretionary work intensity and taking charge as one of my indicators of discretionary directed effort.

5.2.3.3 Demographic and Work Situation Characteristics

Employee demographic and work situation characteristics are often used as control variables in research to reduce systematic biases, and thereby lower the potential for spurious relationships between the hypothesised predictor variables and the criterion variable (Choi, 2007; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Gender, age, work status, organisational tenure and organisational level are amongst the most common control variables included in discretionary work effort studies (Choi, 2007; Morrison & Phelps,

While no specific hypotheses were developed on expected relationships between employee characteristics and perceived perks and irks, in Study 2 I chose to gather data on gender, age, work status, tenure, job type (inside versus outside staff) and management status. This information was used in post-hoc analyses to assess the presence of differences in perceptions of perks and irks amongst sub-groups of participants in order to provide insight to potential alternative explanations for relationships that may emerge.

Categorical scales were used for all of these variables except job type. Gender and work status were measured as dichotomous variables. Age and tenure were measured using ranges of values. Management status had four categories, non-management, and lower, middle and senior management. To assess job type, participants were asked to indicate the percentage of their work time spent working inside in an office environment or outside. In the local government industry, employees are commonly referred to as “inside” and “outside” staff. Being an inside staff member is indicative of being a white collar employee in an administrative, clerical or professional work role. Being an outside staff member is indicative of being in a principally blue-collar or trades work role. Because these do not represent formally recognised job types, the percentage of time spent working outside was used as a proxy measure of these categories of job types. For the purpose of my research, participants who spent 75% or more of their time working outside were classified as outside staff. My selection of this cut-off level was based on my knowledge of the industry and advice from local government managers. This allowed for outside staff with some administrative duties. I also cross-checked the participants in this sub-group against the department in which they worked to ensure that it was likely to have outside staff. Ninety-two percent of the participants classified as “outside staff” reported working outdoors for at least 90% of their time.

5.2.4 Questionnaire Administration

Prior to distributing the questionnaires, information about the survey was communicated to participants either through an internal newsletter or an email. This communication informed members of the organisation about the purpose of the research and the potential benefits of participating. It also aimed to build interest in the study. The questionnaire was then distributed using either internal distribution channels or through a personal contact with groups of staff where the organisation was agreeable to this.
Each questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix 3) and a reply paid envelope. The cover letter outlined the purpose of the study, indicated that participation was voluntary, provided an assurance of confidentiality, gave an overview of the potential benefits from participating, and provided instructions on how to complete and return the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into three main sections. Section one contained demographic and work status questions. Section two contained items measuring employee perceptions of perks and irks. Section three comprised items for measuring discretionary work effort, job satisfaction and ERB.

Section two of the questionnaire commenced by explaining that the items listed related to work environment characteristics and informed the participants that the aim of these questions was to gain an accurate picture of what they personally viewed as perks and irks. It emphasised that they were not rating their actual work environment but how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) they personally viewed each work environment characteristic. The rating scale for this section was then explained. Brief definitions of the key terms perks, irks, organisation, work area, manager/supervisor and co-workers were then provided to ensure participants had a common understanding of these.

The perks and irks items followed and were grouped into the four broad sources of work environment characteristics identified in Study 1 - job, leader, co-worker and organisational characteristics. The items in these four sub-sections represented the different perks and irks constructs being measured and were listed randomly. I chose not to randomly mix all 141 perks and irks items in a single set as practiced in some other studies (e.g. Amabile et al., 1996; Hornsby et al., 2002). The strategy of breaking the items into sub-groups aimed to focus participants on one aspect of the work environment at a time to help reduce confusion that may arise from constant shifts across different work environment characteristics. Such confusion was a potential concern for participants with lower levels of literacy. This structure also aimed to reduce participant fatigue by having shorter sets of items separated by statements that introduced each new section to help participants to refocus their thinking. This approach also aimed to reduce the potential effect of acquiescence by creating breaks in the flow of responses made.

For each sub-group of items, participants were asked to rate the extent to which they perceived each item to be a perk or an irk using the Likert-type scale described in the previous section. The lead-in statement for each sub-group of items asked the participants to think about that particular part of the work environment and to rate how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) they viewed each item listed. For example, the lead-in statement for job characteristics was: “Thinking about the content of a job and how you would prefer to work,
how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) would you personally find a job situation where ...

The survey was conducted over six weeks from late January until early March 2006. A reminder email or internal newsletter with a note of encouragement to participate was provided at two weekly intervals. Participants could request an electronic version of the questionnaire if preferred. Four organisations allowed their staff to complete their surveys during working time. The response rate was higher for this group (an average of 60%) compared with the remaining organisations (an average of 19%). Based on industry knowledge, there seemed to be no substantive differences between the two groups of organisations that should affect the representativeness of the sample. Subsequent comparisons of average ratings on items between the two groups of organisations confirmed this belief. The alternative approaches were dictated mostly by logistical considerations. The questionnaires were mostly collected through reply paid mail. Some participants, however, opted to return their questionnaire directly to me during the on-site visit or by email.

5.2.5 Data Analysis

Several steps were taken in the analysis of the Study 2 data. Firstly, the level of missing data was assessed to determine if any cases should be discarded (see Section 5.2.5.1). This was followed by a Q-sort type procedure. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was then conducted to examine the factor structure of the previously identified constructs postulated to represent facets of perks and irks (see Section 5.2.5.2). Next, internal consistency reliabilities were assessed for the resulting factors (see Section 5.2.5.3). The content, predictive and construct validities of the measures were then evaluated. Content validity was assessed using expert opinion and the Q-sort-type procedure while correlation analysis was used to assess the predictive validity of the measures. A Harman’s one-factor test was also conducted as a supplementary analysis to assess the presence of common method bias in the study. Evidence of construct validity was sought through a combination of the EFA and correlation analysis (see Section 5.2.5.4). Finally, ANOVA and t-test post-hoc analyses were conducted to determine differences in perceptions of perks and irks amongst participants. This analysis aimed to provide insight to alternative explanations for the perks and irks that emerged and to ascertain the potential need for controlling for these variables in Study 3 (see Section 5.2.5.5). The approaches used at each stage of analysis are detailed in the following sections.

5.2.5.1 Missing Data Analysis

Missing data is a common problem that needs to be addressed by researchers (Malhotra, 1987; Roth, 1994; Roth & Switzer III, 1995). In surveys, it is common for
individuals to not answer all items. This issue was pertinent for both Studies 2 and 3 of my research program, where all of the data were collected via questionnaires.

Missing data is problematic because it reduces statistical power, that is, the ability of a statistical technique to detect a significant relationship or effect in the data set. Thus, it affects the accuracy of estimating parameters for the population under study. It can also affect the generalisability and validity of the findings. Consequently, deciding how missing data will be handled is an important consideration prior to analysis.

The best method of dealing with incomplete data is to try to avoid its occurrence through careful planning and being vigilant during data collection. Missing data in surveys can be reduced by motivating respondents to create high interest in the study, using follow-up letters to increase response rates and pilot testing the survey instrument (Roth & Switzer III, 1995). These methods were used in both my quantitative studies. In addition, where personal contact with survey participants was possible, the importance of answering every question was emphasised. Nonetheless, even with careful planning and the use of these strategies to minimise its occurrence, some missing data occurred.

Consequently, I needed to decide how to deal with this issue. Roth (1994) argued that in deciding how to handle missing data, the amount and pattern of missing data needs to be evaluated to determine the most appropriate technique. The criteria for making this latter decision are the level of bias and accuracy, and the complexity and power considerations of the alternative missing data techniques (MDT). There are no commonly agreed amounts of missing data at which a case or item should be eliminated. Roth (1994) extensively reviewed the missing data literature and provided guidelines on handling this issue. He contended that the pattern of missing data is more important than the actual amount of missing data. He maintained that up to 30% missing data could be adequately handled by the more complex MDTs like maximum likelihood (ML) estimation.

Following Roth’s (1994) guidelines, I firstly assessed the amount and pattern of missing data. Each questionnaire item and each individual case were evaluated. The level of missing data for individual questionnaire items was low, with all items having less than two percent of the data missing. Also, the pattern of missing data appeared random. Of the 586 surveys returned, a very small proportion of cases had missing data. For the 141 perks and irks items, 77% of cases had no missing data and 99.7% of cases had less than 10% missing data. Only 2 cases (0.3%) had more than 10% missing data. Using the missing data literature and Roth’s framework (Malhotra, 1987; Roth, 1994) as guidelines, I discarded one case from further analysis due to its high level of missing data. The level of missing data for all other cases was within an acceptable level.
Secondly, I assessed the different MDTs to determine how I would handle the missing data. Each technique had its advantages and disadvantages (Roth, 1994; Roth & Switzer III, 1995). Gains in accuracy needed to be balanced against greater complexity. Listwise deletion, pairwise deletion, mean substitution, regression imputation and hot-deck imputation are amongst the simplest techniques but are also the least accurate and most biased techniques. ML estimation and the Expectation Maximisation (EM) algorithm are more complex but are more accurate and less biased, especially as the amount of missing data increases (Roth, 1994). The SPSS statistical package offered a user-friendly approach to ML estimation. As this MDT provides less bias, greater accuracy and maximum retention of cases in the analysis (hence greater overall power), I opted to use this technique to handle my missing data.

5.2.5.2 Item Reduction, Factor Analysis and Scale Refinement

To develop the perks and irks measures, the item reduction, factor analysis and scale refinement step of Hinkin’s (1995) process was undertaken in two stages. As described below, a Q-sort-type procedure and iterative EFA were used. Further item reduction occurred with the refinement of the measures in Study 3.

Q-sort-type Procedure

A Q-sort-type procedure was undertaken to classify items as a perk or an irk. All of the perks and irks items were assessed for the extent to which participants perceived them to be a positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) non-monetary work environment characteristic. In the absence of any extant criteria for this categorisation process, I was guided by the approach and cut-off criteria commonly used in Q-sort procedures. This seemed an appropriate approach as the aims and desired outcome of a Q-sort procedure seemed similar to what I needed to classify items as perks and irks.

In Q-sort procedures, expert panels are used to classify items as belonging to specified constructs based on definitions provided. Items are generally accepted as belonging to a construct domain if at least 75-80% of the experts agree (Chatman, 1989; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 1990). For my research, the experts (those with a good knowledge or understanding of what is viewed as a perk or an irk) were the survey participants. The participants were provided with a description of perks and irks. Also, each set of non-monetary work environment characteristics listed in the questionnaire was preceded by the statement “Thinking about the [source of work environment characteristics] that you would prefer to work with, how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) would you personally find the following?” Participants then needed to rate each item listed using the following scale: 1 = very negative (strong irk);
2 = moderately negative; 3 = slightly negative; 4 = neutral; 5 = slightly positive; 6 = moderately positive; 7 = very positive (strong perk). Because I wanted to build a high quality data set, I established a rigorous set of criteria for items to qualify as perks and irks. My first criterion was set according to the level of agreement commonly used in Q-sort procedures (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 1990). I then added three others. The criteria that I used were:

1. At least 80% agreement that an item is a perk (rated 5,6,7 by participants) or an irk (rated 1,2,3 by participants).
2. At least 60% agreement that an item is a moderate/strong perk (6,7 rating) or a moderate/strong irk (1,2 rating).
3. At least 30% agreement that an item is a very strong perk (i.e., a 7 “very positive” rating) or a very strong irk (i.e., a 1 “very negative” rating).
4. For borderline items, a 2% allowance was permitted if the percentage of agreement on at least one other rule was exceeded.

This step aimed to ensure content validity of the items retained for analysis of each of the constructs and to assist with the item reduction process.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

Items meeting the criteria from the Q-sort-type procedure were then subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA). EFA was used to reveal the factor structure of perks and irks. EFA affords a less stringent interpretation of the uni-dimensionality of a construct than CFA (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). However, EFA is a useful preliminary technique for scale construction (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Churchill, 1979). It enables a large number of indicators to be reduced to a more manageable set. Anderson and Gerbing (1988) argued that it is especially suited to situations where theory provides insufficient detail about the indicators of the underlying constructs they are intended to measure. Thus, for Study 2 it seemed reasonable to use this less strict factor analytic technique for the initial development of the perks and irks measures. This approach was consistent with the procedure used in other studies involving scale development (Blau & Ryan, 1997; Hornsby et al., 2002; Rioux & Penner, 2001). Anderson and Gerbing (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988), however, recommended subsequently using CFA to evaluate the uni-dimensionality of the scales constructed and to refine these measures. This technique was therefore used in Study 3 where scale refinement and validation were amongst the study aims.

Extant theory and empirical research, together with the outcomes of Study 1, assisted in identifying the number of factors expected as dimensions of perks and irks (Nunnally, 1967). The number of factors retained from the EFA was guided by a
combination of theory and quantitative results. I conducted the EFA using the SPSS statistical program. Following Hinkin’s (1995) recommendations, I used principal axis factoring with oblique rotation. He argued that methods like principal component analysis mix common, specific and random error whereas a common factoring method like principal axis factoring would develop reasonably independent scales. Also, as several of the perks and irks had a common source (i.e. associated with the leader, co-workers and so forth) I anticipated that at least some of the resulting factors could be significantly correlated. Thus, I used oblique rotation to provide a more interpretable result (Hinkin, 1995).

The criteria employed for evaluating the factor solutions were: 1) all factors had an eigenvalue of at least one; 2) each item loaded cleanly on only one factor with loadings on other factors being less than 0.3; 3) the highest loading was twice as strong as that on any other factors and/or the difference between the two highest loadings was more than 0.2; and 4) a factor contained at least three items (Blau & Ryan, 1997; Nunnally, 1967; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996; Van Dyne et al., 1994). In addition, scree plots were examined and communalities considered.

An iterative factor analysis procedure (Rioux & Penner, 2001) was used to derive the measures of perks and irks. Firstly, items were grouped according to the constructs they were intended to measure. Separate EFAs were then conducted for each hypothesised perk or irk construct. In these initial factor analyses, I set the factor loading criteria relatively high to ensure the development of good quality measures of the perks and irks constructs. Items were retained if they had a factor loading of at least 0.7. As noted by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996 p.677), factor loadings in excess of 0.71 are considered excellent as this reflects a 50% overlapping variance. While many studies use 0.3 or 0.4 as the criteria for item retention, by setting a relatively high factor loading for this first stage of my analysis the likelihood of these factors displaying convergent validity in the next step was increased. For cases where the number of items for a factor would fall below three, however, items were retained if their factor loadings were close to 0.7, the items did not cross-load on other factors, and the factor was deemed important to the content of the construct domain (based on the literature and Study 1 qualitative interviews).

Next, all the perks items retained from the previous step were pooled and an EFA was conducted on all the perk items. Then all of the irks items retained from the previous step were pooled and another EFA was conducted on all of the irks items. This second stage of EFA aimed to assess the convergent and discriminant validities of the perks factors and then the irks factors. In interpreting the results for the pooled items, only factors with an eigenvalue greater than one and a factor loading of 0.5 or above, thereby reflecting a good to
very good factor structure (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996 p.677), were retained. Items loading significantly on more than one factor were deleted. Scale scores were then calculated for each perk factor and each irk factor by averaging the item ratings for the relevant factors.

The final stage of EFA involved performing a factor analysis with the all the perks factors and the irks factors pooled together using the composite scale scores calculated in the previous step to test if a two factor solution resulted in which the perks factored together and the irks factored together.

5.2.5.3 Reliability Analysis

Means, standard deviations, internal reliabilities and correlations were calculated for the factors extracted. Two concerns relating to reliability are the consistency of items within a measure and stability of a measurement scale over time (Hinkin, 1995). Cronbach’s alpha, the most common measure of scale reliability (Field, 2005), was calculated for each factor extracted to evaluate its internal consistency reliability. A coefficient alpha of 0.7 was used as the minimum acceptable standard for demonstrating adequate reliability (Hinkin, 1995; Nunnally, 1967). This was a necessary pre-condition for demonstrating validity of the measures. The stability of the measures was not assessed as this requires either a longitudinal study whereby the instrument was administered a second time to the same sample or to a second sample (Hinkin, 1995). As the internal reliability assessment of a measure is integrally related to the factors derived from EFA, the results of this analysis are presented in the same section as the EFA results (see Section 5.3.1).

5.2.5.4 Validity Analysis

Nunnally (1967) argued that once a measurement scale has been constructed it is important to evaluate its usefulness by establishing the validity of the instrument. An instrument has validity if the measurement indicators accurately measure what they are intended to measure (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). Three types of validity to be considered are content, predictive and construct validity.

Content validity refers to the extent to which items measuring the construct of interest adequately sample the specified domain (Nunnally, 1967). One consideration in assessing content validity is face validity, that is, the extent to which the items look like they measure the variable of interest. Nunnally (1967), however, argued that face validity is an essential but not complete standard for determining content validity. Therefore, I examined content validity using two additional techniques. Firstly, I asked an expert panel of four people to examine the list of items generated and to assess the extent to which they appeared to measure the variable domains. The items were then modified based on this preliminary evaluation. Secondly, the Q-sort-type procedure outlined above was used to identify those
items commonly perceived by employees as belonging to the perks and irks domains. Only these items were then subjected to further analysis. These two techniques aimed to aid the domain definition process, providing a subjective measure of content validity.

Predictive validity is relevant when the purpose of the measure constructed is to predict a variable of interest. Perks and irks were expected to be related to the level of discretionary work effort. Thus, prediction was one purpose of the measures developed. Nunnally (1967) proposed that predictive validity can be determined by evaluating the correlation between the measure constructed and one or more criterion variables. I assessed the predictive validity of the perks and irks measures by correlating the perks and irks scale scores with three criterion variables. These were a general measure of ERB as an indicator of discretionary work effort, job satisfaction as an indicator of employee well-being and net perquisites as an indicator of the quality of the work environment.

Construct validity is the greatest concern (Nunnally, 1967) and the ultimate aim of scale development. Factors analysis, internal consistency and demonstrating relationships with other variables through predictive validity are some techniques by which construct validity can be demonstrated (Hinkin, 1995). Nunnally (1967) recommended evaluating the internal structures and cross structures of measures developed to provide evidence of construct validity. Ultimately, multiple methods of analyses and multiple samples are required to build this evidence over time. Nonetheless, for this study I examined the internal reliabilities, the size of factor loadings and the inter-item correlations to provide a preliminary assessment of the adequacy of the internal structures for my perks and irks measures. Correlations between these measures and other variables expected to be significantly related to them were also calculated to provide a preliminary appraisal of the cross structures. Further construct validation will be considered in Study 3. In this next study which will use the CFA technique to evaluate the perks and irks measurement model developed in Study 2, the discriminant validity of the perks and irks constructs will be assessed using the procedures recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

5.2.5.5 ANOVA and T-test Analyses

ANOVA and t-test analyses were conducted to determine whether gender, age, work status, tenure, job type and management status were related to employee perceptions of perks and irks. Due to unequal sample sizes, Scheffe’s post-hoc tests (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) were used to determine the nature of the differences between sample sub-groups.
5.3 RESULTS

This results section commences by describing the outcomes of the Q-sort-type procedure, the EFA, reliability and correlation analyses for the perks and irks constructs, the hypothesis tests and the assessment of the validity of the perks and irks measures. This is followed by a description of findings from the post-hoc analysis that examined the relationship between employee perceptions of perks and irks and selected demographic and work status characteristics. Finally, the findings for the analysis relating to the discretionary work effort construct are presented.

5.3.1 Perks and Irks Construct Measures

5.3.1.1 Q-sort-type Procedure Results

The Q-sort-type procedure reduced the initial set of 141 items to 93. Employing the established criteria, 61 items were classified as perks and 32 items were classified as irks. The extent of item reduction for the postulated perks and irks is presented in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3: Perks and Irks Items Retained from the Q-sort-type Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Descriptors</th>
<th>Number of Items Generated</th>
<th>Number of Items Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsically motivating work</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader support</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload pressures and resource constraints</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leader behaviour</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker shirking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive bureaucracy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from these results that items designed to tap all four of the postulated perks constructs and three of the four irks constructs were supported by the Q-sort-type procedure. No items measuring workload pressures and resource constraints met the prescribed criteria to qualify as an irk. This irk related to having inadequate time, equipment, materials, information and/or finances to do the job well. Items included “The time I have to complete a task is not enough to do good quality work”, “I often have trouble getting the right materials or equipment to do a job properly”, and “The budget allocated for projects is never enough to do the job properly”. As no items were retained, this factor was not included in the EFA for irks.
In addition, half of the items generated to measure organisational support did not meet the criteria for classification as a perk. Nine of these items related to employer sanctioned use of organisational resources (both time and physical resources) for personal benefit. These items included “Having access to the work phone for important or urgent personal calls” and “Having the opportunity to do little things for myself during work time (e.g. personal calls, photocopying, email) as long as I don’t go overboard”. Another four items related to an organisational focus on results and quality of output. Amongst the items deleted were: “An organisation that focuses on the quality of work more than the quantity of work” and “An organisation that uses ‘best practice’ procedures”.

Between 64% and 93% of the items designed to measure each of the other six perks and irks constructs met the Q-sort-type procedure criteria for retention. Notably, for the excessive bureaucracy irks theme, all five of the items that failed to meet the criteria for retention were designed to measure bureaucracy. These items reflected the conservatism, formalisation and risk avoidance features of bureaucracies. Amongst the items deleted were “An organisation that prefers to make ‘safe’ decisions rather than take some risks” and “An organisation that has a lot of formal rules and procedures that must always be followed”. Thus, most of the items retained for this irks theme represented power-orientation.

5.3.1.2 Perks Construct Measurement Results

Based on the Study 1 findings, I anticipated that the intrinsically motivating job characteristics, co-worker support and leader support constructs would each have two dimensions. In contrast, because organisational support is conceived to represent an employee’s formation of a global belief of the extent to which the organisation values his/her contributions and cares about his/her overall well-being (Eisenberger et al., 2002), I expected this construct to be uni-dimensional.

The first stage EFAs were used to test the factor structure of each of the hypothesised perks constructs. When the items for each construct were initially factor analysed, however, co-worker support and leader support were found to have a single factor structure, while intrinsically motivating job characteristics and organisational support each had a two-factor structure. However, 25 of the 61 items retained from the Q-sort procedure either cross-loaded or failed to load at a high enough level. Seven intrinsically motivating job characteristics items, two co-worker support items, four leader support items and 12 organisational support items were subsequently deleted. The final perks factors that emerged from the iterative analyses will now be discussed.
Intrinsically Motivating Job Characteristics

The items measuring intrinsically motivating job characteristics initially loaded on two factors as hypothesised. However, the items measuring enriched job design did not form a clean factor. Five of the seven items intended to measure enriched job design loaded on the second factor. The highest loading on this factor, however, was .51 and several items cross-loaded on the factor representing challenging work. Thus, these five items were deleted from further analysis. Two additional items, one representing enriched job design and the other challenging work, were also subsequently deleted due to their low factor loadings. The factor retained represented work that was challenging, and provided opportunities to experiment, be creative, do different things, and to stretch oneself. Thus, this perks construct was relabelled “challenging work”.

Co-worker Support

Co-worker support was found to be uni-dimensional even though 10 of the 12 items intended to measure this construct were retained. While six items were designed to tap the “co-worker feedback” dimension of co-worker support, two did not meet the Q-sort-type procedure criteria for classification as perks and another two failed to attain a high enough loading for retention in the EFA. These items related to providing constructive feedback and communication with co-workers. The items retained related to recognising and valuing the contributions of co-workers. These loaded with the items representing the “teamwork” dimension of co-worker support and had comparably high factor loadings. Together, the retained items still represented co-worker support but suggested that employees view feedback as part of the overall cooperation and support provided by co-workers.

Leader Support

Similarly, leader support was found to be uni-dimensional rather than having a “psychological support” and an “instrumental support” dimension. Ten of the 16 items designed to measure this construct had loadings of at least 0.7. In addition, I opted to retain two extra items with factor loadings close to 0.7 due to the importance of their content to adequately represent this construct based on the findings of the qualitative interviews in Study 1. These items related to mutual respect between the leader and employee. The items retained represented a mix of both psychological and instrumental leader support. The four items deleted mostly reflected aspects of instrumental leader support and included open communication, and encouragement and support for good performance. Leader behaviours that encouraged, built and supported a team approach formed the greatest number and highest loading items, thus, this factor was relabelled “team-oriented leadership”.
Organisational Support

Contrary to my expectation, organisational support was not found to be unidimensional. After subjecting the 19 organisational support items to an iterative factor analysis, only seven items were retained. Initially, a two-factor solution emerged. The first factor represented a mix of reward for good performance and providing a supportive environment. The second factor represented organisational support for flexible work arrangements and limited personal use of company resources. In this factor solution, however, one item cross-loaded and all but five items had a loading below 0.7. Thus, to develop acceptable scales to measure this important construct, I retained items with a loading of at least 0.6. Seven items from the first factor and three items from the second factor were retained. Nine items mostly related to providing a supportive atmosphere were deleted.

A subsequent factor analysis of the seven items contained in factor one resulted in five items with a loading of at least 0.7. I deleted one of these items (“making work a place its members like and enjoy”) as its content seemed inconsistent with the remaining four items. The items retained represented the organisation’s support for and recognition of good performance. Thus this construct was labelled “recognition for good performance”.

Further factor analysis of the three items from the second organisational support factor resulted in two of the three items exceeding 0.7. These items reflected the organisation’s support for flexible working arrangements, and so, this factor was labelled “support for flexible work arrangements”. Although the third item had a factor loading below 0.7, I opted to retain it for three reasons. Firstly, it provided a minimum of three items as recommended for reasonable measurement stability. Secondly, flexible work arrangements had emerged as a reasonably important perk in the qualitative interviews in Study 1, and so, retention of this factor seemed warranted. Thirdly, the factor loading on this item was very close to 0.6 when principal axis factoring was employed in the EFA and above 0.7 when a principal components EFA was conducted.

Pooled Perks EFA Results

Following this first stage EFA, all 36 retained perks items were pooled and factor analysed together to test if the constructs could be discriminated. The factor structure supported the discriminant validity of the five perks constructs in that, with the exception of one item, all items loaded on their intended factors. One co-worker support item, namely, “co-workers recognise and value the work I do”, cross-loaded. When this item was eliminated a five perks factor structure was supported. Table 5.4 presents the final EFA results for the 35 pooled perks items retained. These items represent 40% of the initial pool of perks items generated to measure the perks constructs. The final five factors consistently
identified as perks were labelled team-oriented leadership (12 items), challenging work (7 items), co-worker support (9 items), support for flexible work arrangements (3 items) and recognition for good performance (4 items). These factors accounted for 43%, 10%, 5%, 5% and 3% of the common variance respectively. Their respective Cronbach’s alpha internal reliabilities were .94, .91, .94, .74 and .87, all exceeding the minimum recommended acceptable level (Nunnally, 1967).
### TABLE 5.4: EFA Rotated Factor Structure for Perks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERKS MEASUREMENT SCALE ITEMS</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>FACTOR 1 Team-oriented Leadership</th>
<th>FACTOR 2 Challenging Work</th>
<th>FACTOR 3 Co-worker Support</th>
<th>FACTOR 4 Support for Flexible Work Arrangements</th>
<th>FACTOR 5 Recognition for Good Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who willingly shares his/her knowledge &amp; expertise with me.</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who makes me feel like a valued member of the team.</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who gives me a clear understanding of where we are going.</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who builds a team spirit and attitude amongst members in our work area.</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who inspires members of our work group with his/her plans for the future.</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who acknowledges improvements in the quality of my work.</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who always gives me positive feedback when I perform well.</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who is someone that I can respect.</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who encourages everyone in my work area to be a team player</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who leads by example providing me with a good role model.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who treats me with respect and integrity.</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/supervisor who encourages me to find new and better ways of doing things.</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.0166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the chance to be creative &amp; use my own initiative.</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job allows me to make full use of my skills and abilities.</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to tackle new problems or do different things.</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work gives me opportunities to learn new things.</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find the work personally interesting or I feel passionate about it.</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work stretches my abilities and brings out the best in me.</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am allowed to experiment and discover new things.</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 5.4: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERKS MEASUREMENT SCALE ITEMS</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACTOR 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who work well together as a team.</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who have a good blend of skills and talents.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who are committed to the work we are doing.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who go out of their way to help each other out when needed.</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who trust each other.</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who encourage me to look for new and different ways of doing things.</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who freely share information that helps me do my job better.</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who are energetic and inspiring.</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who value the contributions I make to our work area.</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the opportunity to trade-off some of my own time (e.g. lunch break) so I can do some personal things during work time (e.g. attend school functions, finish work early).</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having access to flexible work arrangements that accommodate my needs to take care of personal matters during work time as long as I get my work done.</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the opportunity to work from home for personal reasons (e.g. to care for a family member) if needed rather than having to take a sick day or personal day off.</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organisation that recognises outstanding performance.</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organisation where people with good ideas for improving things get time to develop them.</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organisation that provides opportunities for advancement for good performance.</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organisation that invests in the development of its people (e.g. provides opportunities to go to conferences, seminars, training courses).</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIGENVALUES (Unrotated)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% OF COMMON VARIANCE EXPLAINED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s Alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1.3 Irks Construct Measurement Results

Based on the Study 1 findings, I anticipated that the co-worker shirking irk would be uni-dimensional while autocratic leader behaviour and excessive bureaucracy would each have two dimensions. I expected that autocratic leader behaviour would include “psychological impediments” and “functional impediments” as dimensions, and that excessive bureaucracy would consist of the dimensions “bureaucracy” and “power-orientation”. When these irks constructs were subjected to factor analysis, however, a single factor structure emerged for all three constructs. Contrary to my predictions, the psychological impediments and functional impediments dimensions of autocratic leader behaviour did not emerge as separate factors. Furthermore, while the content of the autocratic leader behaviour and co-worker shirking constructs only varied slightly from what I anticipated, the content of the resulting excessive bureaucracy factor differed substantially from what I expected. This latter outcome was a product of “bureaucracy” failing to emerge as a dimension of excessive bureaucracy. The majority of the items designed to measure bureaucracy failed to meet the criteria set for classification as an irk in the Q-sort-type procedure discussed in Section 5.3.1.1.

In the factor analysis of the irks constructs, factor loadings on all items were relatively high and exceeded the commonly used cut-off of 0.4. However, using the more stringent 0.7 factor loading criterion, nearly one-third of the items retained from the Q-sort procedure were eliminated. Four autocratic leader behaviour items, three co-worker shirking items and four excessive bureaucracy items were deleted as outlined below.

Co-worker Shirking

Co-worker shirking most closely retained the form and content anticipated. Eleven of the 14 co-worker shirking items subjected to factor analysis were retained. Two job neglect items ("avoids personal responsibility" and "frequently absent or late") and one shirking item ("never volunteers for extra tasks") failed to meet the factor loading criterion for retention and so were deleted. The remaining items still represented a mix of withholding effort behaviours by co-workers. These included behaviours of job neglect, giving less than 100% effort to the job (i.e. shirking) and social loafing (Kidwell & Robie, 2003).

Autocratic Leader Behaviour

For the autocratic leader behaviour construct, five of the nine items were retained. Items reflecting functional impediments, namely, poor people skills and specific aspects of communication ("only gives negative feedback" and "a negative response to suggestions and having views challenged") did not load adequately and so were deleted. The items retained, however, still represented a mix of functional impediments (i.e. controlling behaviours and
poor communication) and psychological impediments (i.e. ridiculing suggestions for improvements and focussing on mistakes) associated with autocratic leader behaviour.

**Excessive Bureaucracy**

Following the loss of most of the items designed to tap the bureaucracy dimension of the excessive bureaucracy construct in the Q-sort-type procedure stage of the analysis, this irk was found to be uni-dimensional. Five of the nine items had a factor loading of at least 0.7. Two of the items eliminated represented features of bureaucracy (i.e. “all decisions are made by management without consulting staff” and “punishes people for mistakes rather than rewards people for good outcomes”). The other two items related to features of power-orientation (i.e. “different departments focus on protecting their territory” and “encourages people and different departments to compete rather than cooperate with each other”). Four of the five items retained represented power-orientation. Poor communication also loaded on this factor. This suggested that respondents may interpret poor communication to include withholding information as a source of power. This idea is consistent with Kanter’s (1985) identification of information and knowledge in organisations as “power tools”. Thus, I relabelled the excessive bureaucracy irk “power-orientation”.

**Pooled Irks EFA Results**

Following this first stage factor analysis, all 21 irks items retained were pooled and factor analysed to test their discriminant validity. Overall, the factor structure supported the discrimination of the three irks constructs in that, except for one item, all items loaded on their intended factors. One power-orientation item, namely, “other departments are uncooperative or even obstructive”, cross-loaded on autocratic leader behaviour and so was eliminated. Table 5.5 presents the final EFA results for the 20 pooled irks items retained. These items represented 37% of the original pool of items generated to measure the irks constructs. The three factors consistently identified as irks were labelled co-worker shirking (11 items), autocratic leader behaviour (5 items) and power-orientation (4 items). These factors explained 51%, 10%, 6% of the common variance respectively. Their associated Cronbach’s alpha internal reliabilities were .85, .95, and .83 respectively, all of which exceeded the minimum recommended level (Nunnally, 1967).
**TABLE 5.5: EFA Rotated Factor Structure for Irks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRKS MEASUREMENT SCALE ITEMS</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Rotated Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who just do the minimum work required of them.</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who put in less effort than other members of the work group.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who take more breaks than they should.</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who contribute less effort when others are around to do the work.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who try to look busy but waste time on non-work activities (e.g. social chat, personal calls)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who do poor quality work.</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who leave jobs unfinished for others to do.</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who fail to report work related problems when they see them.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who don’t meet deadlines or deliver on promises.</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who show no interest or commitment to their job.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers who stand around watching other team members do the work.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/ supervisor who frequently takes over or interferes in the work I am doing.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/ supervisor who focuses on my mistakes rather than recognising any of the good things I do.</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/ supervisor who controls everything I do and how I do it.</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/ supervisor who does not communicate information that affects me or my job.</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A manager/ supervisor who ridicules anyone who offers suggestions for improving things.</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organisation where there is poor communication.</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organisation where people try to shift their responsibilities or blame onto other (buck pass)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organisation where people play political or power games.</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organisation where people are critical of any new ideas.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>-0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIGENVALUES (Unrotated)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.119</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% OF COMMON VARIANCE EXPLAINED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.595</td>
<td>10.060</td>
<td>5.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s Alpha</strong></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1.4 Combined Perks and Irks EFA Results

Following the preceding analyses, a scale score was calculated for each of the perks and irks factors by averaging the ratings for the items comprising each factor. Then, in the final step of the EFA the five perks factors and the three irks factors that emerged from the preceding analyses were factor analysed together in the one analysis to see whether there was a two-factor structure or if these factors all loaded on a single factor. This analysis was conducted using the composite scale scores for each of the perks and irks constructs calculated in the preceding analyses. As can be seen in Table 5.6, the five perks factors loaded together and the three irks factors loaded together as expected. The first factor represents the positive non-monetary work environment characteristics (i.e. perks) and explained nearly 53% of common variance. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability for this factor was .80. The second factor represents the negative non-monetary work environment characteristics (i.e. irks) and explained 13% of common variance. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability for this factor was .81. A two factor solution is consistent the economists’ theoretical concept of “net perquisites” in that it differentiated the work environment into positive and negative aspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPOSITE SCALE SCORE MEASURES FOR PERKS &amp; IRKS</th>
<th>Scale Score Mean</th>
<th>Scale Score s.d.</th>
<th>Scale Score Reliabilities</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Co-worker support (9 items)</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.764  -0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team Oriented Leadership (12 items)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.757  -0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognition for good performance (4 items)</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.742  -0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Challenging Work (7 items)</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.559  0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support for Flexible Work Arrangements (3 items)</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.517  -0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Power orientation (4 items)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.001 0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Autocratic Leadership (5 items)</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.002 0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Co-worker Shirking (11 items)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.052 0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues (Unrotated)</td>
<td>4.211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Common Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.634 13.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this two-factor solution, a composite perks score was then calculated by summing the scores for the five perks that loaded on this first factor and a composite irks score was calculated by summing the scores for the three irks that loaded on this second factor. As the distributions of the scores for the two factors were non-normal, a Kendall’s Tau-b correlation was calculated. A moderate to strong negative correlation of -.43 was found. This correlation is not so strong as to suggest that the two factors are tapping the same construct. While these results suggest that the perks and irks constructs can be
empirically discriminated, this will be tested in Study 3 using more stringent CFA measurement model procedures (Hair et al., 2010; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

5.3.1.5 Perks and Irks Factor Correlations

The distributions of the scale scores for the five perks and three irks that emerged from the factor analysis procedure were skewed (i.e. non-normal). Given the criteria set for determining if items were commonly perceived as perks and irks in the Q-sort-type procedure, this result was anticipated. Thus, Kendall’s Tau-b correlations were calculated for the perks and irks constructs rather than Pearson’s correlations. The means, standard deviations, internal reliabilities and correlations are reported in Table 5.7.

Table 5.7: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities and Correlations for the Perks and Irks Constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team-oriented leadership</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Challenging work</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Co-worker support</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support for flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recognition for good performance</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Co-worker shirking</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Autocratic leader behaviour</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Power-orientation</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: n = 585. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients appear in parentheses along the diagonal. Kendall’s Tau-b correlations reported. * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01.

As anticipated, all of the perks constructs were significantly positively correlated with each other. Similarly, all of the irks constructs were significantly positively correlated with each other. Also, all the perks constructs were significantly negatively correlated with each of the irks constructs. Based on Cohen’s guidelines for judging the relative strength of correlations between variables (Cohen, 1988; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), most of the correlations between the constructs were moderate (0.3) to strong (0.5) although not so strong as to cause their discriminant validity to be questioned. The average correlation amongst the perks constructs was .42 and amongst the irks constructs was .39. The average correlation for pairs of perks-irks was .34.

Challenging work was least strongly correlated with the other factors. This result might be expected in that challenging work has been identified as an intrinsic motivator whereas all the other factors are extrinsic motivators (Herzberg, 2003 [1968]). There was a very strong correlation between team-oriented leadership and co-worker support. This
outcome is reasonable as both of these factors represent social and interpersonal relationship factors. Employees who perceive good relationships as a perk are likely to value these with both their co-workers and their manager or supervisor. Recognition for good performance was also quite strongly correlated with team-oriented leadership and support for flexible work arrangements. The lowest correlation was between support for flexible work arrangements and co-worker shirking.

5.3.1.6 Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 – Perceived Perks

The results of the Q-sort-type procedure analysis and the EFA provided a starting point from which to evaluate the study hypotheses. The first hypothesis was that employees would perceive intrinsically motivating job characteristics, leader support, co-worker support and organisational support as perks. This hypothesis was only partially supported in that, while there was evidence of each of these constructs being consistently identified as perks, the form that these constructs took differed from what was expected based on the Study 1 findings. First, five perks factors were identified instead of the four posited (the additional perk arising because organisational support was revealed to have two factors). Also, some constructs (namely intrinsically motivating job characteristics and leader support) were relabelled to better reflect the item content emerging from the factor analysis. Thus, the results of the Q-sort-type procedure and the EFA suggested that employees reliably identify challenging work, co-worker support, team-oriented leadership, support for flexible work arrangements and recognition for good performance as common perks.

Only one of the two dimensions of intrinsically motivating job characteristics (i.e. challenging work) was consistently identified as a perk following the Q-sort-type procedure and EFA. Most items generated to measure intrinsically motivating job characteristics survived the Q-sort-type procedure for classification as a perk, however, only challenging work emerged as a factor in the factor analysis. Enriched job design was an important sub-theme of the intrinsically motivating job characteristics theme in the qualitative interviews in Study 1. Enriched job design and challenging work were discussed equally by participants in these interviews. Also, enriched job design appeared to be a potential second dimension of the intrinsically motivating job characteristics perk in the factor analysis. Nonetheless, most of the items tapping this construct cross-loaded with the challenging work factor or had unacceptably low factor loadings. A clean factor that could be retained for the subsequent analyses did not emerge. Thus, while enriched job design is a potentially important perk, its measure requires further development.
While empirical support was found for co-worker support and leader support being consistently identified as perks, these constructs took a different form to how they were conceptualised in the Study 1 findings (see Section 5.3.1.2). Both of these perks were unidimensional rather than bi-dimensional. While the content of the co-worker support measure was generally consistent with how it was conceptualised, co-worker support that displayed teamwork emerged as the focus of this construct with some co-worker feedback items (i.e. recognising and valuing co-worker contributions) also loading on this factor. Similarly, the leader support construct was initially conceptualised as having two elements, psychological support and instrumental support. However, the leader support perk measure that emerged was uni-dimensional and seemed to more strongly reflect team building and personal consideration by the leader. Thus, this factor was relabelled “team-oriented leadership”.

Organisational support was the perk for which least empirical support was evident in Study 2, in that this construct took a substantially different form to that expected. This measure lost the largest number of items through the Q-sort-type procedure and factor analyses. Rather than finding evidence of a single general measure of organisational support, two separate factors emerged. One was labelled “support for flexible work arrangements” and the other “recognition for good performance”. The first factor represented the provision of various flexible work arrangements by the organisation. The latter factor represented the organisation’s support, recognition and reward for good performance. Overall, the perks measures developed in Study 2 appeared to have reasonable content validity.

_Hypothesis 2 – Perceived Irks_

The second study hypothesis was that employees will perceive workload pressures and resource constraints, autocratic leader behaviour, co-worker shirking and excessive bureaucracy as irks. Again, the Q-sort-type procedure and EFA provided partial support for this hypothesis. Workload pressures and resource constraints were not consistently identified as an irk in that none of these items met the Q-sort-type procedure criteria for classification as a common irk.

Autocratic leader behaviour and excessive bureaucracy took different forms to what was anticipated based on the Study 1 findings (see Section 5.3.1.3). While there was evidence supporting autocratic leader behaviour being an irk, this construct was expected to have a psychological and a functional impediments dimension. Instead it was found to be uni-dimensional. The resulting autocratic leader behaviour measure tapped a combination of the psychological and functional impediments revealed in Study 1. The item content was consistent with descriptions of autocratic leadership and abusive supervision reported in the literature (Aranson, 2001; Tepper et al., 2004).
The excessive bureaucracy construct was expected to contain elements of bureaucracy that would impede motivation to supply discretionary work effort, as well as the power-oriented characteristic of many bureaucratic organisations. With most of the items representing bureaucracy failing to meet the Q-sort-type procedure criteria for classification as an irk, only power-orientation was consistently identified as an irk. Only one of the three items representing bureaucracy that were identified as irks in the Q-sort-type procedure loaded adequately on the factor that resulted in the EFA. Thus, based on its item content, this factor was relabelled “power orientation”. Power-orientation is described in the literature as the use of power to control the behaviours of subordinates, rule by fear, abuse of power and an inequity of access to resources (Harrison & Stokes, 1992).

Co-worker shirking was consistently identified as an irk in the Q-sort-type procedure analysis, and as anticipated, was supported as a uni-dimensional factor by the EFA. The resulting co-worker shirking measure captured a mix of withholding effort behaviours (i.e. job neglect, social loafing/free-riding and shirking) (Kidwell & Robie, 2003) by co-workers. Overall, the irks measures developed in Study 2 appeared to have reasonable content validity.

_Hypotheses 3 and 4 - Predictive Validity of Perks and Irks_

Whilst the Q-sort-type procedure analysis and the factor analysis were designed to ensure the content validity and construct validity of the perks and irks constructs, these analyses did not examine predictive validity. To test the predictive validity of the perks and irks measures developed in Study 2, six supplementary hypotheses were formulated (see Section 5.1). It was anticipated that each of the perks constructs, will be positively correlated with ERB as an indicator of discretionary work effort (Hypotheses 3a) as well as with job satisfaction and net perquisites (Hypotheses 3b and 3c). It was also postulated that each of the irks constructs will be negatively correlated with ERB (Hypotheses 4a) as well as with job satisfaction and net perquisites (Hypotheses 4b and 4c).

Prior to testing these hypotheses, the items measuring ERB, job satisfaction and net perquisites were subjected to a factor analysis to check their uni-dimensionality and their internal reliabilities. The items measuring each of these constructs loaded on a single factor with acceptable factor loadings. The scale measures for each construct also had acceptable Cronbach’s alpha internal reliabilities (see Table 5.8). A scale score was then calculated for each construct by averaging scores on the relevant items comprising each measure.

Bi-variate correlations for the five perks constructs, the three irks constructs, ERB, job satisfaction and net perquisites were then calculated. While the scale scores for ERB, job satisfaction and net perquisites were relatively normally distributed, the distributions of the
scale scores for each of the perks and irks constructs measures were non-normal and so Kendall’s Tau-b correlations were calculated. These results are also reported in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8: Correlations between Perks and Irks and the Criterion Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perks and Irks Constructs</th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Net Perquisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team-oriented leadership</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.261**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.091**</td>
<td>.157**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for good performance</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>.139**</td>
<td>.227**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker shirking</td>
<td>-.252**</td>
<td>-.139**</td>
<td>-.145**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leader behaviour</td>
<td>-.152**</td>
<td>-.060*</td>
<td>-.117**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-orientation</td>
<td>-.244**</td>
<td>-.077*</td>
<td>-.125**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities 0.81 0.85 0.81

NOTE: N = 585. Kendall’s Tau-b correlations reported. * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01.

While the correlations between the five perks and the three irks constructs and the three criterion variables were mostly weak to moderate, all of the correlations were significant and in the predicted direction. All five perks constructs were significantly positively correlated with ERB supporting Hypothesis 3a. Similarly, all three irks constructs were significantly negatively correlated with ERB supporting Hypothesis 4a. The correlations between the five perks, three irks and job satisfaction were weaker than those for ERB, but again, all the correlations were statistically significant and in the predicted directions. This provided evidence supporting Hypotheses 3b and 4b. Also, the correlations between the five perks, the three irks and net perquisites were all statistically significant, mostly moderate to weak in strength and in the predicted directions. Therefore, these results provided evidence supporting Hypotheses 3c and 4c.

Overall, these results provided some evidence supporting the predictive validity of the perks and irks measures. However, given that this was a cross-sectional study in which all of the data were collected through self-reports from the same employees, common method variance might be responsible for the correlations among the variables. In an effort to minimise this issue, several procedural techniques were employed (see Section 3.3.3 in Chapter 3). In addition, to statistically determine the extent to which common method variance might present a problem in the current sample, Harman’s single-factor test was undertaken (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). This test uses factor analysis to test for the existence of a one factor solution. This technique assumes that if there is a substantial amount of common method variance present, then a single factor model will fit.
the data well and that this will provide a superior fit to the full measurement model. If a one-factor model does not fit the data well, then common method variance is unlikely to be an influential force in the study. Thus, all 72 items measuring the 8 perks and irks constructs and the three criterion variables with which the perks and irks were expected to correlate, were subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis. The results from this test indicated that a single factor model did not have good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(2484df)} = 16555.6, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .494; \text{RMSEA} = .098$). In comparison, the full 11 factor measurement model produced an acceptable fit ($\chi^2_{(2429df)} = 5437.6, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .892; \text{RMSEA} = .046$). Furthermore, a Chi-square difference test between these two models was significant ($\Delta\chi^2_{(55df)} = 11118, p < .001$), indicating that the full 11 factor measurement model was significantly superior in representing the data than the single-factor model. Hence, there was no evidence to suggest that common method variance was responsible for the observed relationships.

5.3.1.6 ANOVA and T-test Results

To evaluate the relationship between perceptions of perks and irks and selected demographic and work status characteristics, supplementary data analyses were performed. This involved a series of one-way ANOVAs and independent t-test analyses. Scheffe’s post-hoc test was used to determine where significant differences exist for demographic and work status variables with three or more groups.

For the five perks and three irks constructs under investigation, effects for gender and job type were found. Although outside workers are more typically male, there was only a moderate correlation between gender and outside staff suggesting that these variables are measuring different things. The differences found, however, related to the relative strength of perceptions of perks and irks and not whether these non-monetary work environment characteristics were consistently identified as perks and irks. Caution should be taken in interpreting these results as the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated. However, these analyses showed that, on average, females had higher scores for perks and lower scores for irks than males. Similarly, respondents classified as outside staff (i.e. employees in blue-collar and trades job roles) had scores that were lower for perks and higher for irks than respondents classified as inside staff (i.e. employees in principally white collar and professional job roles).

For the other four demographic and work situation characteristics measured, however, few consistent significant differences were evident. There was no evidence of full-time employees perceiving perks and irks differently from part-time/casual employees. Middle managers, however, were found to more strongly identify challenging work as a perk than non-management employees. Long-term employees (i.e. more than 15 years tenure)
consistently identified support for flexible work arrangements and recognition for good performance as less of a perk than employees with relatively low tenure (i.e. 5 years or less). In relation to age, older employees (i.e. 50+ years) generally perceived support for flexible work arrangements as less of a perk than younger employees (i.e. under 30 years). Again, these differences need to be interpreted with some caution as in a number of instances the assumption of homogeneity of variance was contravened. Overall, it appeared that the most consistent differences in perceptions of perks and irks were related to gender and job type.

5.3.1.7 Discretionary Work Effort Results

A final aim of Study 2 was to validate the measures of discretionary work effort. Towards this end, three scales taken from the literature to measure the different facets of discretionary work effort were pre-tested and subjected to factor analyses. When the items for each individual facet were factor analysed, all three constructs were found to be unidimensional. All factor loadings were acceptable. Most factor loadings exceeded 0.7 and the lowest loading was .497. The items measuring the time facet accounted for 61.4% of the variance in this construct and had a Cronbach’s alpha internal reliability of .84. The items measuring the intensity facet accounted for 63.8% of the variance in this construct and had an internal reliability of .86. The items measuring taking charge as an indicator of the direction facet accounted for 56.4% of the variance in this construct and had an internal reliability of .91. These internal reliabilities are comparable to those reported in the literature (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Morrison & Phelps, 1999).

The items for these three scales were then pooled together and factor analysed using principal axis factoring with oblique rotation to examine their discriminant validity. A three factor solution resulted with all items loading on their expected factors. These results provided evidence that these are discrete facets of discretionary work effort. Collectively, these three factors accounted for up to 61% of the variance. The measures tested in this study thus provided a strong foundation for examining the research hypotheses in Study 3. The results of this combined factor analysis are presented in Table 5.9.
Table 5.9: Discretionary Work Effort EFA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Factor 1 Direction Facet of Discretionary Work Effort</th>
<th>Factor 2 Time Facet of Discretionary Work Effort</th>
<th>Factor 3 Intensity Facet of Discretionary Work Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often make constructive suggestions for improving how things could operate within the organisation.</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to introduce new work methods that are more effective for the organisation.</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to adopt improved procedures for doing my job.</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to correct a faulty procedure or practice at work.</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to change organisational rules or policies that are non-productive or counterproductive.</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>-.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to introduce new structures, technologies or approaches to improve efficiencies.</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to implement solutions to pressing organisational problems.</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to bring about improved procedures in my work area.</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to change how my job is done in order to be more effective.</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to eliminate redundant or unnecessary procedures.</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put in more hours throughout the year than most the people in my work area.</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spend long hours at work.</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among my co-workers, I’m usually the first to arrive and the last to leave work.</td>
<td>- .059</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually start work early and leave late.</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few of my co-workers put in more hours each week than I do.</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>-.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work at my full capacity in all my job duties.</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I work, I really exert myself to the fullest.</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When there’s a job to be done, I devote all my energy to getting it done.</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strive as hard as I can to be successful in my work.</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I work, I do so with intensity.</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue (Unrotated)</td>
<td>7.779</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>2.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>38.893</td>
<td>11.958</td>
<td>10.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Scale Score</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 DISCUSSION

5.4.1 Perks and Irks

The primary objective of Study 2 was to develop measures of the hypothesised perks and irks constructs. Based on the literature review and the findings of Study 1, I postulated that employees will consistently perceive intrinsically motivating job characteristics, leader support, co-worker support, and organisational support as perks. I also hypothesised that workload pressures and resource constraints, autocratic leader behaviour, co-worker shirking and excessive bureaucracy will be consistently perceived as irks. These hypotheses were tested in Study 2 with a large sample of local government employees from 12 different organisations by developing a questionnaire survey and then carrying out a Q-
sort-type procedure and factor analysis to: (a) determine whether these constructs were consistently identified as perks and irks; (b) develop a methodologically sound measure of these constructs; (c) establish whether they loaded consistently onto their intended perks and irks factors; and (d) establish whether employee perceptions of perks and irks varied according to demographic and work status characteristics.

From the initial pool of 141 items generated, 39% of the items were retained. The level of item loss was consistent with the guidelines reported in the scale development literature (Hinkin, 1995, 1998). While there are no strict rules on how many items are required for a scale, Hinkin (1995, 1998) proposed using scales with four to six items to minimise problems associated with having too few items (like low internal consistency, content and construct validity) or too many items (like fatigue and response bias). As few as three items is sufficient to provide adequate internal consistency and a minimum of four items is necessary to test for within-construct item homogeneity in confirmatory factor analysis (Harvey, Billings, & Nilan, 1985; Hinkin, 1995). The perks and irks scales developed in Study 2 contained between three and 12 items. Only one scale had less than four items. The scales for the perks and irks constructs displayed convergent and discriminant validity and had acceptable psychometric properties. While the factor structure of the measures developed differed from that hypothesised, parsimonious and methodologically sound perks and irks measures resulted from this research.

It was difficult to adequately demonstrate the construct validity of the perks and irks measures developed in Study 2 as this evidence needs to be built over time across multiple samples. However, relatively high factor loadings, internal reliabilities that all exceeded acceptable standards, items loading on their expected factors with no evidence of items cross-loading substantially, and the inter-item correlations suggested sound internal structures for these constructs. Also, the pooled item perks EFA results and the pooled item irks EFA results provided evidence of discriminant validity for the perks constructs and for the irks constructs measured. In addition, these constructs had significant, though weak to moderate, correlations with three variables with which they were expected to be related. These results suggested reasonable cross structures for these measures. Thus, collectively these results provided preliminary evidence of the construct validity of the scale measures developed. I now turn to discussing those constructs that were consistently identified as perks and irks in Study 2. These are discussed in the context of the existing literature and the Study 1 qualitative interview findings.

Five constructs were consistently identified as perks instead of the four hypothesised. These were challenging work, team-oriented leadership, co-worker support,
support for flexible work arrangements, and recognition for good performance. Three constructs were consistently identified as irks rather than the four hypothesised. These were co-worker shirking, autocratic leader behaviour and power-orientation. These perks and irks factors represented a parsimonious description of salient non-monetary work environment characteristics that public sector employees consistently perceived as perks and irks.

Perhaps the most unexpected finding from Study 2 was that “enriched job design” failed to emerge as a dimension of the intrinsically motivating job characteristics construct. This outcome, however, seemed to be a potential measurement problem rather than one of enriched job design not being consistently perceived as a perk. While the literature review and the Study 1 findings pointed to challenging work and enriched job design as two types of perks under the intrinsically motivating job characteristics theme, only challenging work was empirically supported by Study 2. In the Study 1 qualitative interviews, both challenging work and enriched job design attracted similarly extensive amounts of comment by respondents and so were identified as major perks sub-themes. Also, the initial EFA of the items intended to measure the intrinsically motivating job characteristics construct, pointed to a potential second factor representing enriched job design. However, a clean factor for this construct did not emerge. Several items intended to measure this construct cross-loaded with the challenging work factor and other items had low factor loadings (<0.4). The deletion of some of the problematic items resulted in the remaining items measuring enriched job design loading on a single factor together with the items designed to measure challenging work. Most of the items tapping enriched job design, however, had much lower factor loadings than those tapping challenging work and so were not retained.

One possible explanation of this single factor outcome is that intrinsically motivating job characteristics may actually represent a uni-dimensional construct. While this explanation is contrary to Hackman and Oldham’s (1975) multi-dimensional conceptualisation of intrinsically motivating job characteristics, it does concur with the job characteristics research findings of Dunham (1976) and Harvey, Billings and Nilan (1985). These researchers found Hackman and Oldham’s job characteristics dimensions were strongly correlated. Dunham (1976) also reported that the measures of autonomy and variety could not be empirically discriminated. Dunham questioned the widely accepted multi-dimensionality of the intrinsically motivating job characteristics construct and purported a single factor measure as the most parsimonious. Harvey et al. (1985) concurred with this claim when a goodness-of-fit index emphasising parsimony was used as the criterion. However, Dunham (1976) and Harvey et al. (1985) did not examine challenging work as a job characteristic in their research, so their findings cannot be directly compared with mine.
While challenging work and autonomy may be closely linked, these two constructs have been empirically differentiated in prior research (Amabile et al., 1996; Buelens & Poelmans, 2004; Chiaburu & Baker, 2006; Frese et al., 1996; James & James, 1989). Thus, an alternative explanation for the outcome obtained in Study 2 may be one of scale design. The scale items may not have adequately tapped the enriched job design construct to sufficiently differentiate it from challenging work. Nevertheless, as the qualitative interviews in Study 1 and the literature provided reasonable support for enriched job design as a perk, it seems that further work on the intrinsically motivating job characteristics construct measure is warranted. This is necessary to improve the factor loadings on the enriched job design items to either demonstrate that these items do actually form part of the intrinsically motivating job characteristics perks construct, or to successfully discriminate this measure from challenging work.

A second unexpected outcome was the form of the organisational support construct that emerged in Study 2. The items generated to tap this construct were aimed at measuring systems, policies and procedures, and acts of the organisation that collectively signal to employees that they are valued and cared about by the organisation (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Indicators of organisational support from which employees were expected to form a general perception of organisational support included recognition and reward for good performance, provision of flexible work arrangements, value placed on work-life balance, the creation of a supportive atmosphere in the workplace and company sanctioning of limited personal use of the organisation’s resources (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shinn, 2004). Even though the definition of organisational support has the two facets of valuing employee contributions and caring about employee well-being, the uni-dimensionality of organisational support has been supported over many studies as reported by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002).

Contrary to this literature, the organisational support items in my research formed two factors. I labelled these “support for flexible work arrangements” and “recognition for good performance”. These factors had a moderate to strong positive correlation (Kendall’s Tau-b = .43) but this was not so strong as to suggest that they were tapping the same construct. These two factors were also identified in the Study 1 qualitative interview findings as two perks under the organisational support sub-theme. This bi-dimensionality of the organisational support construct concurs with the two definitional facets of organisational support and was consistent with Rhoades and Eisenberger’s (2002) suggestion that both facets should be represented in shortened organisational support scales.
In the light of the comments on flexible work arrangements made in the Study 1 qualitative interviews, it was surprising that the item “provides flexible work arrangements (e.g. rostered days off, summer hours of work, flexi-time and job-sharing)” neither loaded cleanly on the support for flexible work arrangements factor, nor had an adequate factor loading to justify its retention. In addition, since the support for flexible work arrangements factor reflects the organisation’s concern for employee well-being, it was somewhat surprising that at least some of the items representing a supportive atmosphere (i.e. “encourages and helps its people balance work, family and non-work responsibilities”; “focuses on making work a place people like and enjoy”) did not load on this factor. One possible reason for this may be that the flexible work arrangement practices identified as perks in the support for flexible work arrangements factor were perceived as encompassing these aspects of organisational support. Alternatively, this result may have been because several of the non-loading items were framed in more specific terms whereas the items forming the support for flexible work arrangements scale specifically linked this flexibility to a general personal benefit. Nevertheless, with only three items in the support for flexible work arrangements scale, this measure would benefit from further development and refinement (Harvey et al., 1985; Hinkin, 1995).

The failure of items relating to company sanctioning of limited personal use of the organisation’s resources to emerge as an element of organisational support is perhaps somewhat less surprising. Comments relating to this aspect of organisational support emerged from a prompted interview question in Study 1. In response to this question, while many respondents reported this to be a perk, there was some contention over the appropriateness of this practice in the organisation. These divergent views are represented in the following two statements relating to this question in the Study 1 qualitative interviews:

- Well you know you were getting something, a bit extra from the Shire, so that made you feel as though you wanted to put in a bit extra as well.
- ... why should ratepayers subsidise repairs ... or use of machinery whereas as a private person you wouldn’t be able to get it ... So I’m not in agreeance [sic].

The loss of most of the items representing this element of organisational support at the early stage of the Q-sort-type procedure analysis, indicated that a display of organisational support in this manner is not consistently perceived as a perk by employees. Despite these unexpected outcomes and the fact that two separate factors emerged, in most respects the form of the organisational support perks that emerged cohered with how this construct is conceptualised in both the literature and by the Study 1 participants.
A third interesting outcome was that power-orientation but not bureaucracy emerged as a defining element of the irk I called “excessive bureaucracy”. Core features of bureaucracy are conservatism, centralisation, formalisation and risk aversion. With these features come the unintended consequences of poor communication, lack of cooperation, and inflexibility (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Some researchers claim that these factors form impediments to at least some facets of discretionary work effort (Amabile et al., 1996; Bateman & Crant, 1999; Mark C. Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Frey, 1993; Katz & Kahn, 1978). This assertion received support in the Study 1 qualitative interviews (see Section 4.3.2 in Chapter 4) but was not supported by the Study 2 findings. In the Q-sort-type procedure stage of the Study 2 analysis, survey items relating to conservatism, functional silos, mediocrity of performance and formalisation of rules and procedures mostly attracted moderately negative to neutral ratings as an irk. In contrast, more than half of the survey respondents rated things such as “playing political and power games”, “shifting personal responsibilities (i.e. passing the buck)”, “not communicating important information”, “being obstructive”, “criticising new ideas” and “focussing on people’s mistakes” as very negative work environment characteristics.

The lack of support for bureaucracy being an irk, however, is not entirely surprising. As discussed in Chapter 2, Adler and Borys (1996) differentiated between alienating and enabling forms of bureaucracy. These authors maintained that bureaucracy will most likely have negative work behaviour outcomes when it is perceived as coercive. Similarly, Filer (1990) contended that in a world of divergent preferences, it is often difficult to predict how employees will perceive a work environment characteristic. While bureaucracy may be perceived as overly restrictive by some employees (i.e. coercive) and thereby inhibit discretionary work behaviours like taking initiative, it can also be perceived to provide role clarity, raise employee certainty and generate perceptions of fairness (i.e. enabling) which can contribute positively to a work environment (Organ et al., 2006). These explanations are consistent with prior empirical research in which perceptions of bureaucracy have been found to be significantly related to some facets of discretionary work effort in some studies (Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001, 2003) but not in others (Karambayya, 1990; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000). Consequently, given the divergent values of employees towards the opposing features and consequences of bureaucracy, it seems that the public sector employees in my research did not perceive the features of bureaucracy measured in this study as sufficiently restrictive or coercive to consistently perceive bureaucracy as an. To some degree this perception may have been reinforced by the industry sector in which my research was conducted, in that public sector employees are possibly more exposed to bureaucratic constraints due to the nature of this sector relative to the private sector, and so
these employees may be more accepting of these constraints. As the goal of my research was to identify common perks and irks, it is appropriate that bureaucracy was excluded in the final analysis. Bureaucracy may, however, be an idiosyncratic irk which could be the subject of future research.

In contrast to bureaucracy, power-orientation involves the use of authority or influence by individuals in an organisation to advance self-interest. This includes political, self-serving and manipulative actions that can cause destructive internal competition, political problems and a fear of challenging the views of others. These behaviours create a work environment that may be perceived by employees as disturbing and threatening (Cropanzano et al., 1997; Randall et al., 1999) or coercive (Adler & Borys, 1996). Thus, power-orientation is more likely than bureaucracy to be conceived as potentially personally harmful and so was consistently perceived as an irk by employees.

Likewise, the failure of workload pressures and resource constraints to be consistently identified by employees as an irk reflected the fact that these job characteristics are not universally experienced as negative. When these scale items were subjected to a factor analysis, eight of the 12 items formed a single factor with 61% explained variance and had an internal reliability of .91. Thus, the items had good factor structure. However, none of the items survived the first stage of the Q-sort-type procedure analysis for classification as an irk. This outcome conflicts with the Study 1 findings, but concurs with results reported in the literature.

Workload pressures and resource constraints construct was identified as an irk in the Study 1 qualitative interviews, but empirical research on the relationship between this factor and discretionary work effort has produced inconsistent findings. In some studies workload pressures and resource constraints were found to be related to various forms of discretionary directed effort (Amabile et al., 1996; Hornsby et al., 2002; Hui et al., 1994; Ohly et al., 2006), while others reported no such relationship. This inconsistency in the research has been attributed to the possibility that the relationship between workload pressures and resources constraints and the level of discretionary work effort may be curvilinear (Amabile, 1996; Ohly et al., 2006; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000). That is, while workload pressures and resource constraints may inhibit the opportunity or ability of employees to successfully undertake tasks, the employee’s perception of this factor as an irk may depend on the level at which it occurs.

At low levels, workload pressures and resource constraints may be perceived as unchallenging and contribute to boredom and demotivation in which case it may be perceived by some employees as an irk. At moderate levels, however, this factor may
present a challenge and motivate employees to seek out creative solutions to this constraint in which case it may be identified by some employees as a perk. There was some support for this interpretation in the analysis of the Study 1 data as shown by the following sample of statements by participants.

- I never ever felt as if I was giving more than 50% ... you’re there if something goes wrong, but if nothing went wrong you were just basically waiting for something to go wrong ... I was just turning to mud – unfit, unhealthy ... there was just a total lack of job satisfaction.

- I always feel a bit flat after you’ve had a fair bit of responsibility placed on you ... and all of a sudden you’re back to your normal role ... you feel a bit flat because you know you’ve had yourself fired up and motivated and the pressure has been really on and all of a sudden that’s taken away and you’re back to normal.

- Certainly the lack of resources is a big deal for us in our area. I’ve learned to deal with that. Initially it was quite a slap in the face [laugh] ... but it leads on like with every negative, there’s some amazing positives. The creative side of this department is amazing. We beg, borrow, steal resources to make things happen ... it’s a case you just learn that just because it’s a no it doesn’t mean it’s not going to happen ...

Excessive levels of workload pressures and resource constraints, however, may cause many employees to feel overwhelmed and demotivated, and so may again be identified as an irk (Amabile, 1996). The items used to measure workload pressures and resource constraints may not have adequately captured the idea of this job stressor being at an excessive level.

At a broad level, the Study 2 findings confirmed co-worker support and leader support (relabelled team-oriented leadership) as perks, and co-worker shirking and autocratic leader behaviour as irks. With the exception of some minor differences in the forms taken to what was anticipated, these results seemed to concur with how these constructs are conceptualised in the literature and with the Study 1 qualitative interview findings.

In my research, co-worker shirking emerged as a uni-dimensional factor. The overall scale content of this construct seemed consistent with the way effort lowering behaviour is commonly conceptualised in the literature. However, agreement on the factor structure of this construct is much less clear. Effort lowering behaviour in work situations has been described in broad terms as withdrawal behaviour (Eder & Eisenberger, 2008) and withholding effort behaviour (Kidwell & Robie, 2003). It can take many forms including shirking, job neglect, social loafing and free-riding (Judge & Chandler, 1996; Kidwell & Robie, 2003; Mulvey & Klein, 1998). These forms of effort lowering behaviour are closely related, frequently overlap and have been used interchangeably in the literature (Kidwell & Robie, 2003). Social loafing and free-riding, for example, have been described as special cases of shirking (Kidwell & Robie, 2003). Possibly with the exception of research by
Kidwell and Robie (2003), effort lowering behaviour is typically conceptualised as a uni-dimensional construct. Much of this research, however, has examined specific forms of withdrawal behaviour or has used short scales to tap this construct (Eder & Eisenberger, 2008; Mulvey & Klein, 1998). While Kidwell and Robie (2003) provided some evidence of the multi-dimensionality of this construct, many of the factors that emerged in their research comprised only two items (raising a question of scale stability), many items did not load on their intended constructs, the factors were reported to be strongly correlated and, to the best of my knowledge, their research has not been replicated to confirm this multi-dimensionality.

Thus, given the overlapping nature of the forms of withholding effort, their relatively high correlation and the absence of convincing evidence of multi-dimensionality, it seemed most plausible for the co-worker shirking construct to form a single factor. My Study 2 findings supported this expectation. The uni-dimensionality of the co-worker shirking construct was also supported by how this irk was conceptualised by the interview participants in Study 1. The identification of co-worker shirking as an irk concurs with research findings that support a spillover effect of co-worker shirking on the level of effort by other employees (Blau, 1995; Eder & Eisenberger, 2008; Kerr, 1983; Mulvey & Klein, 1998; Schnake, 1991; Williams & Karau, 1991). Also, this global view of co-worker shirking as an irk is consistent with Schnake’s (1991) finding that a spillover effect on employee effort can occur even in co-acting settings, that is, when employees in similar job roles are working on individual, not group tasks.

While it was anticipated that the co-worker support construct would potentially have two dimensions, teamwork (i.e. co-workers working cooperatively and supporting each other) was not empirically differentiated from co-worker feedback (i.e. feedback that displays acknowledgement and appreciation of co-worker contributions). This outcome suggests that constructive feedback, recognition and appreciation from co-workers are perceived as other elements of teamwork. Thus, in their overall evaluation of co-worker support, employees do not distinguish between acts of cooperation and helping which are functionally supportive, and expressions of appreciation or encouragement that are psychologically supportive.

In the Study 1 qualitative interviews, teamwork formed the dominant co-worker support sub-theme and so this Study 2 result is generally consistent with these findings. The uni-dimensionality of the co-worker support construct is also consistent with how organisational support (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) is conceptualised in the literature. That is, employees form a global view of how much their
contributions are valued and their well-being is cared about. Through social exchange processes, employees exchange their commitment, loyalty and effort for the support received. Employees do, however, distinguish between the source of the support they receive and direct their work behaviours accordingly (Bishop et al., 2000). For this reason, co-worker support should be differentiated as a perk from other forms of support like team-oriented leadership and organisational support leader (Organ et al., 2006). Thus, perceptions of co-worker support should enhance an employee’s commitment to other team members and induce greater levels of discretionary work effort, most likely by reciprocating the support received from co-workers. In contrast, perceptions of team-oriented leadership should enhance an employee’s commitment to his/her leader and is likely to induce him/her to reciprocate in some way. This may be by helping his/her leader or generally supplying greater discretionary work effort on behalf of his/her leader (Organ et al., 2006). Similarly, organisational support ought to enhance an employee’s organisational commitment and induce behaviours likely to benefit the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Similar to the findings on co-worker support, in Study 2 employees did not appear to discriminate between the psychological and instrumental (functional) aspects of supportive leader behaviour (i.e. the team-oriented leadership and autocratic leader behaviour constructs), as was suggested by the Study 1 findings. In Study 2, team-oriented leadership emerged as a unitary factor that encompassed both psychological support (“makes me feel like a valued team member”) and instrumental support (“willingly shares his/her knowledge and expertise with me”) by the leader. Similarly, autocratic leader behaviour was found to comprise a single factor representing a mix of psychological impediments (“focuses on my mistakes rather than recognising any of the good things I do”) and functional impediments (“frequently takes over and interferes in the work I am doing”). Despite this outcome, the content of both scales seemed compatible with the way that these constructs have been conceptualised by other researchers in the literature and the content of the Study 1 qualitative interviews.

On deliberating the relabelling of leader support to team-oriented leadership, it was evident that this outcome was supported by the Study 1 qualitative interviews. In their comments about their immediate supervisor, many respondents attested the importance of their leader being team-oriented as a source of their work motivation. This is evidenced by the following sample of statements taken from Study 1:
• He’s very inclusive. He’s very team-oriented.
• ... we do have that mutual respect [that] is probably a motivator for me ... I feel like a more valuable member of the team.
• ... you know you’re working as a team and ... when the outcome is achieved ... my manager always puts my name on it as well ... knowing that everybody else under her has been busy compiling ... she’ll always put down every person involved.

These conceptualisations of leader support and autocratic leader behaviour as single factor constructs is consistent with the conceptualisations of the organisational support and co-worker support constructs discussed earlier. Furthermore, the conceptualisation of leadership as a single factor perk (in the form of team-oriented leadership) or a single factor irk (in the form of autocratic leader behaviour) is consistent with research which suggests that employees form a global view of their leaders, seeking to determine whether they are personally beneficial or personally harmful. This conception of these leader behaviour constructs is compatible with other similar concepts like supervisory encouragement (Amabile et al., 1996), supervisor support (Johnstone & Johnston, 2005; Russo & Waters, 2006), supportive management/ supervision (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Burke, Borucki, & Hurley, 1992; Parker et al., 2006), rigid and inflexible management (Brown & Leigh, 1996), and abusive supervision (Tepper et al., 2004). Thus, while a distinction between the psychological and instrumental elements of the leader support and autocratic leader behaviour constructs were not supported, the resulting scales were generally consistent with the outcomes of Study 1 and how similar constructs have been conceptualised by some researchers in the literature. In my research, however, the psychological aspects of leader behaviours as perks and irks seemed particularly important.

To recap, the ultimate purpose of my program of research is to delineate a set of non-monetary work environment characteristics that are important determinants of the level of employee discretionary work effort. I called these perks and irks. In contrast to other existing work environment constructs that are not linked to any specific work behaviour, I limited the domains of the perks and irks constructs to those work environment characteristics that are related to discretionary work effort, either directly or indirectly. Study 2 was designed to progress the development of parsimonious and methodologically sound measures of these constructs. This study identified five perks and three irks that employees commonly perceive as most important in affecting their level of discretionary work effort. The most salient perks confirmed by my research are challenging work, co-worker support, team-oriented leadership, support for flexible work arrangements and
recognition for good performance. The most important irks confirmed are autocratic leader behaviour, co-worker shirking and power-orientation of the organisation. These perks and irks are strongly relational in nature in that they involve relationships between the employee and his/her manager, co-worker and organisation. The content of these constructs highlighted the importance of the psychological aspects of these relationships in motivating discretionary work effort. Together, the Study 1 and Study 2 results also highlighted the dominance of perks as important non-monetary work environment characteristics perceived to affect discretionary work effort.

5.4.2 Discretionary Work Effort

The pre-test results for the time, intensity and direction facets of the discretionary work effort construct, confirmed that these constructs can be empirically differentiated for a sample of public sector employees. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time that these three constructs have been examined in a single study. All three scales were found to have sound psychometric properties. That is, they had relatively high factor loadings, all items loaded on their expected factors, and their Cronbach’s alpha internal reliabilities met acceptable standards. The internal reliabilities obtained were comparable to those previously reported in the literature (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Chiaburu & Baker, 2006; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Yoon et al., 2001). The Study 2 results, combined with the Study 1 findings indicated that discretionary work effort can be meaningfully conceptualised in terms of the three facets – time, intensity and direction. Thus, these findings extend our understanding of this construct by providing a more complete conceptualisation of this important construct. These findings also indicate that these three scales, together with a well established measure for helping which will be used in Study 3 as a second indicator of the direction facet of discretionary work effort, can be confidently employed in testing my model of discretionary work effort without any further modification.

5.4.3 Supplementary Analysis Findings

To reduce the potential for spurious relationships between variables being identified in organisational and work behaviour research, it is a common practice to include a variety of individual and work situation characteristics as control variables. To gain a better insight to those non-monetary work environment characteristics that were consistently identified by employees as perks and irks, a post-hoc analysis was undertaken to consider the effects of gender, age, work status, tenure, job type (inside versus outside staff) and management status. As reported in Section 5.3.1.7, gender and job type were the two main employee characteristics that appeared to be most consistently related to perceptions of perks and irks.
While both genders were in general agreement on what things they perceived as perks and irks, the female respondents gave higher ratings on perks and lower ratings on irks than did the male respondents. That is, women typically perceived the irks as more irksome and the perks as stronger perks than did the men. One possible interpretation of this result is that women generally value non-monetary rewards more than men do. This possibility is in accordance with the economic theory of compensating wage differentials (Smith, 1979). This theory implies that, as reflected through employee job choices, women value non-monetary rewards more and monetary rewards less than men (Filer, 1985; Ross, 1996).

While it was not a stated aim of Study 2, data were also gathered on employee attitude toward monetary reward. An analysis of these results provided evidence supporting the claim that males rate the importance of monetary reward more highly than females. This finding was again consistent with the theory of compensating wage differentials.

Similarly, the differences found in employee perceptions of perks and irks based on job type reflected their relative importance to employees in different job roles rather than whether they were actually identified as perks and irks or not. Overall, outside staff rated perks as less of a perk and irks as less irksome than did inside staff. One possible interpretation of this result is that employees in blue-collar and trades work roles place a lower value on perks and irks than their white-collar and professional counterparts. If this is the case, monetary reward should have greater salience for employees in blue-collar and trades work roles than non-monetary rewards, as measured by perks and irks. A comparison of outside and inside staff attitude toward monetary reward, however, provided no evidence of this. Alternatively, this difference may reflect that the outside staff have less exposure to perks and irks, and so, have less strong perceptions of them.

Differences in perceptions of the importance of perks and irks are of research interest. According to organisational and job fit theory, an employee will evaluate his or her actual work environment relative to the importance placed on perks and irks. Thus, when a perk or an irk is of greater importance to an employee, it is likely to have a greater effect than his/her level of discretionary work effort. The findings from the post-hoc analyses suggested that if gender and job type were included as control variables in Study 3, it might dilute or counteract the effect of differences in employee perceptions of perks and irks experienced in the workplace by factoring out these differences, and thereby render a significant relationship between perks and irks (and monetary reward) and the level of discretionary work effort undetectable (Johns, 2006, p.391). Thus, while there are justifiable grounds for including gender and job type as control variables, there seems to also be good reason for not controlling for these variables (Johns, 2006; Rousseau & Fried, 2001). Rather, these employee characteristics might be considered as potential main effect or moderator
variables that could be built into a more complex model of discretionary work effort and examined as part of future research.

From a research perspective, these results are significant in that the salient perks and irks that emerged from Study 2 could be affected by the gender mix and the job type mix represented in the sample of respondents. It is difficult to know how representative the sample was of the overall local government employee population as no relevant statistics could be sourced from the industry. From a practical management perspective, these differences in perceptions of perks and irks suggest that employers should have greater success in motivating females than males, and inside staff than outside staff, by providing more perks and taking actions to minimise the presence of irks in the workplace. Also, if these perceptions are consistent across industries and occupations, then workplaces that have a greater proportion of females and employees in white-collar and professional work roles should benefit from increasing the provision of perks and minimising the presence of irks in order to increase the level of discretionary work effort.

5.4.4 Contributions of Study 2

Study 2 was the vehicle for developing methodologically sound measures of the perks and irks constructs. This research served to quantitatively test the hypothesised perks and irks and to determine whether these constructs are consistently identified as perks and irks by employees. In developing parsimonious measures of these constructs, my research has extended the literature in several ways. From a theoretical perspective, this study provided an important step towards refining our understanding of the nature of perks and irks from the employee’s perspective. Furthermore, my research provided preliminary evidence that the perks constructs and the irks constructs can be discriminated. This will be tested further in Study 3 using CFA and employing the criteria recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

In addition to extending our understanding of perks and irks, Study 2 provided preliminary evidence that the time, intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort can be empirically discriminated. This will also be tested further in Study 3 using CFA. This result added strength to the findings of the qualitative research undertaken in Study 1 in which the interview participants confirmed these facets in their discussions about discretionary work effort. Again, to the best of my knowledge, no prior research has simultaneously assessed these three facets of discretionary work effort in the same study or demonstrated that it is empirically possible to discriminate between them. By including these three facets of discretionary work effort we should be able to improve our understanding and measurement of discretionary work effort and better integrate findings from the OB and
economics literatures. In addition, this research indicated that the time, intensity and direction scales used to measure discretionary work effort appear to be as relevant to a public sector setting as they are to the private sector setting in which prior research employing these scales has been conducted. Thus, the discretionary work effort measure used is likely to have broad application in a wide range of research settings.

In relation to my own research, the enhanced understanding of the nature of the perks and irks constructs gained from Study 2 enabled me to further refine my model of discretionary work effort prior to testing it in Study 3. My revised model is depicted in Figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1: Refined Model of Discretionary Work Effort for Empirical Testing

In summary, the findings of Study 2 provided the necessary groundwork for testing my model of discretionary work effort in Study 3. It informed this research by developing parsimonious and psychometrically sound measures of the perks and irks constructs which are central to my model. It also enabled me to refine my model of discretionary work effort by improving my understanding of the nature of the key variables comprising the model. Furthermore, it enabled the less well established discretionary work effort scales to be pilot tested in a public sector setting to ensure their suitability for my research context. Also, as these scales had not previously been used in a single study, Study 2 provided preliminary evidence that the constructs comprising this measure are empirically distinct.
5.5 STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

5.5.1 Study Limitations

There were three key limitations associated with this study. Firstly, all the data were collected at a single point in time, from a questionnaire. This approach introduces the potential problem of common method bias in my research, although as discussed above, this factor does not appear to have had a substantive impact on the data. Secondly, Study 2 was not designed to comprehensively tap the full perks and irks domains in the measures developed. Rather, it tested only what appeared to be some of the most salient perks and irks. There are certain to be additional factors that would legitimately come under the domains of perks and irks but were not identified in this study. Thirdly, my research design did not include replicating the study with an independent sample to establish the construct validity of the perks and irks measures developed as recommended by Hinkin (1995, 1998).

5.5.2 Directions for Further Research

The findings of Study 2 provided several directions for further research. Firstly, while the perks and irks measures developed generally appeared to have sound psychometric properties, additional research to further refine some of the scales and to more comprehensively tap the domain of the perks and irks constructs may be warranted. The support for flexible work arrangements scale, for example, comprised only three items and one of these had a factor loading below the 0.7 criteria established for this study. This scale, therefore, needs further empirical work to improve the robustness of the scale and to improve the coverage of the content for this construct. Future research could also revisit those constructs that failed to meet the criteria for retention but for which the initial EFA results seemed to point towards additional factors. This research might include constructs such as enriched job design and bureaucracy.

Secondly, the stability of the factor structure of the perks and irks measures needs to be tested across different samples. While there is little reason to believe that local government employees differ systematically in their perceptions of perks and irks from other public sector employees or from private sector employees (perhaps with the exception of the public service motive which is well documented in the literature), replication of this research with samples of different groups of employees is warranted. Since confirmatory factor analytic techniques are more rigorous and these can be employed to test hypotheses on the number of factors and the pattern of factors across samples, this would be the technique of analysis to use in studies aimed at replicating this research (Harvey et al., 1985). CFA will also provide a more stringent test, and thus, stronger empirical evidence of the discriminant
validity of the perks and irks constructs. Likewise, CFA will enable to discriminant validity of the facers of discretionary work effort to be confirmed.

While Study 2 importantly explored, clarified and refined our understanding of the perks and irks constructs, it is still necessary to establish the relationship between the instrument variables and measures of discretionary work effort. Thus, a third avenue for further research will be to test if the perks and irks that emerged in Study 2 are in fact significantly related to discretionary work effort. For example, research needs to be undertaken to examine the link between the five perks and three irks measures developed in Study 2 and the three facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. time, intensity and direction).

The next stage of my research program will address two of the directions for further research identified. Firstly, Study 3 will re-test the factor structure of the perks and irks constructs developed in Study 2 through a follow-up a questionnaire survey with the same target population. While the data gathered in Study 3 will measure actual perks and irks experienced in the work place rather than perceived perks and irks as identified in Study 2, it was expected that these constructs should be similarly conceptualised. The re-test of the perks and irks scales will enable further refinement of the instrument developed in Study 2. Study 3 will also provide further empirical evidence for assessing the validity of the perks and irks instrument measures and the discretionary work effort construct. Secondly, in testing my model of discretionary work effort in Study 3, this research will establish if the perks and irks that emerged in Study 2 are in fact significantly related to the level of discretionary work effort. Study 3 is the focus of the next chapter.
Chapter 6

Testing the Model of Discretionary Work Effort

This chapter presents the third and final study of my program of research. Through a combination of qualitative research in Study 1 (see Chapter 4) and quantitative research in Study 2 (see Chapter 5), the research question “what non-monetary work environment characteristics do employees commonly perceive as perks and irks?” was addressed. For my research, perks are defined as the positive non-monetary work environment characteristics and irks are defined as the negative non-monetary work environment characteristics.

These first two studies provided a more well-informed understanding of perks and irks by firstly ascertaining what employees commonly perceive as perks and irks, and then developing quantitative measures of these constructs. Study 2 confirmed that challenging work, team-oriented leadership and co-worker support are consistently perceived as perks. While organisational support did not emerge in Study 2 as a single perk as expected, support for flexible work arrangements and recognition for good performance were identified as separate perks. This was compatible with past research in that these are recognised features of organisational support. Study 2 also confirmed autocratic leader behaviour, co-worker shirking and one dimension of excessive bureaucracy as perceived irks.

In identifying autocratic leader behaviour as a salient irk, my research reinforced the view proposed by Amabile et al. (2004) that negative leader behaviour is a potentially potent influence on employee work behaviour. It provided the opportunity to test if this negative leader behaviour affects discretionary work effort more than positive leader behaviour, as proposed by these researchers. The identification of co-worker shirking as a perceived irk was consistent with the “sucker effect” reported in the shirking literature (Kerr, 1983) and was compatible with Williams and Karau’s (1991) suggestion that over time the “sucker effect” will dominate any “social compensation effect”. Finally, while excessive bureaucracy was not found in Study 2 to comprise the two separate dimensions of bureaucracy and power-orientation as expected, the power-orientation dimension was confirmed as a perceived irk. Thus, Study 2 provided insight to what aspects of Adler and Borys’s (1996) coercive type of bureaucracy might be most alienating and therefore likely to affect employee motivation and discretionary work effort. It also added to the limited research on how this type of organisational impediment is perceived by employees, thereby extending the prior work in the entrepreneurship literature (Amabile et al., 1996; Hornsby et al., 2002).
Study 3 builds on these preceding studies by empirically testing my model of discretionary work effort via quantitative research. This model was progressively refined through these prior studies (see Chapter 4 and Chapter 5). Specifically, Study 3 tests if the perks and irks that employees said motivated them to expend discretionary work effort, are actually related to the level of discretionary work effort reported by employees. In addition, Study 3 tests if perks and irks moderate the relationship between monetary reward and self-reported levels of discretionary work effort. Thus, Study 3 addresses research questions 2 and 3, namely:

RQ 2: How are perks, irks and monetary reward related to an employee’s level of discretionary work effort?
RQ 3: Do perks and irks moderate the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort?

Another aim of Study 3 was to cross-validate and, if necessary, refine the perks and irks measures developed in Study 2 and to cross-validate the discretionary work effort measurement model. While Study 2 measured employee perceptions of salient perks and irks, Study 3 measured the level of perks and irks experienced by employees in their work environment. This change in how the Study 2 measures were used in Study 3 meant that it was important to check if the factor structure of the perks and irks measures supported the constructs that they were intended to operationalise. Therefore, the Study 2 measures were cross-validated by testing the fit of the Study 2 measurement model on the Study 3 data using CFA. In addition, the factor structure of the discretionary work effort measurement model that was extended in Study 3 to include a second indicator of the discretionary directed effort was assessed using CFA.

This chapter commences with a review of the theory underpinning Study 3. From this discussion hypotheses are formulated. An overview of the method used is then provided. Here I discuss the research participants, the procedure, the measures, the questionnaire design and administration, and the data analysis techniques employed for Study 3. This is followed by the presentation of the results. This section firstly presents the CFA results for the measurement models for the central constructs in this study. The findings relating to the hypothesised relationships in my research model of discretionary work effort are then presented. Next, I provide a discussion of the Study 3 research findings. Finally, the theoretical and practical contributions of Study 3, its limitations and the opportunities for further research are considered.
6.1 THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

In Chapter 2 it was argued that the level of perks and irks present in the workplace will be related to the employee’s level of discretionary work effort. It was also contended that monetary reward will be related to an employee’s level of discretionary work effort. Below, I provide an overview of the theoretical arguments and empirical evidence supporting the hypothesised relationships posed in my model. I also propose a framework for classifying work environment characteristics (i.e. perks, irks and monetary reward) with a view to testing whether different classes of work environment characteristics differentially relate to the different facet measures of discretionary work effort.

6.1.1 Perks and Discretionary Work Effort

As previously noted, having identified what employees perceive as perks in the previous two studies, I now look at whether these perks actually relate to discretionary work effort. To do this the first step was to examine prior evidence from the literature to support this hypothesis. The following discussion provides an overview of this literature for each of the potential perks. A more detailed review of this literature can be found in Chapter 2.

Challenging Work

The first perk identified from the first two studies was “challenging work”. This was defined as the degree to which the work provides personal challenge and opportunities to tackle new tasks, to use and extend one’s skills and to learn new things. Thus, this perk involves promoting employee growth and skill development by designing work that provides challenge, meaning, autonomy, and variety (Hackman & Oldham, 1976, 1980; Hamel, 2000; Parker & Wall, 1998; Parker et al., 2001; Skinner, 2000). Across the OB, entrepreneurship, economics and workaholism literatures, there are both theoretical rationales and empirical evidence supporting a relationship between challenging work and discretionary work effort. For example, within the OB literature, according to needs theories of work motivation (Herzberg, 2003 [1968]; Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1961), challenging work will be related to discretionary work effort because it is intrinsically satisfying and allows employees to attain higher order needs such as self-actualisation. There is strong empirical evidence for this perk being related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort in both the OB literature (Bateman & Crant, 1999; Chiaburu & Baker, 2006; Crant, 2000; Frese et al., 1996; Frohman, 1997, 1999; Janssen, 2001; Ohly et al., 2006; Parker et al., 2006; Warr & Fay, 2001) and the entrepreneurship literature (Amabile, 1997; Amabile et al., 1996; Burnside, 1990). In contrast, in the economics literature challenging work has been related to the intensity facet of discretionary work effort (Goldsmith et al., 2000) and in the workaholism literature it has been related to the time facet of discretionary work effort (Buelens &
Poelmans, 2004; Burke, 1999d; Burke et al., 2004; Spence & Robbins, 1992). Overall, there are strong grounds for challenging work to be related to discretionary work effort, particularly the direction and intensity facets.

**Team-oriented Leadership**

Team-oriented leadership was the second perk identified in Study 2. This perk refers to leader behaviour that encourages and builds team play amongst work group members, and demonstrates support and concern for all members of the work group. This conceptualisation fits what Amabile et al. (2004) called positive leader behaviours in that these behaviours include supporting members of the work group, valuing individual contributions, providing a good work model, giving positive and timely feedback, and being open to team member ideas (Amabile, 1997).

Team-oriented leadership should create a work environment in which a high quality leader-employee relationship forms thereby developing a sense of belonging in employees. The emphasis on team play should promote perceptions of fairness as well as greater cooperation, group identity and feelings of responsibility towards the attainment of group goals. It should also build feelings of mutual respect, confidence and trust in the leader. Employees are likely to see the support provided by the leader as helpful and evoke a perception that the leader is concerned with his/her personal welfare. According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), this should lead to the employee wanting to or feeling that he/she ought to reciprocate by expending discretionary work effort. To the extent that the leader is consistent in his/her behaviours, this should increase employee trust in and liking of the leader, the hallmarks of a high quality leader-employee relationship (Organ et al., 2006).

While there is a strong theoretical argument for team-oriented leadership and similar positive leader behaviours being positively related to at least some facets of discretionary work effort, the empirical support has been patchy (see Chapter 2). Nonetheless, various studies have reported management support, a conceptually similar concept to team-oriented leadership, being positively related to several similar and often overlapping forms of discretionary directed effort, including personal initiative (Ohly et al., 2006), proactive behaviour (Frohman, 1999; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Parker et al., 2006; Scott & Bruce, 1994), creativity and innovation (Amabile, 1999; Amabile et al., 2004), and corporate entrepreneurship (Hornsby et al., 2002). It has also been reported to be positively related to affiliative ERBs (Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Schnake, Cochran, & Dumler, 1995; Schnake, Dumler, & Cochran, 1993; Smith et al., 1983 368; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000) that I also identified as a form of discretionary directed effort. Thus, the literature provides reasonable
support for expecting this perk to be related to at least the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

**Co-worker Support**

A third perk identified from the first two studies was co-worker support. This perk refers to the extent to which members of an employee’s work group value his/her contributions and show concern for his/her well-being through acts of constructive support and feedback. Amongst the key indicators of co-worker support that emerged in Study 2 were support and help provided by work group members, individual contributions valued by co-workers, commitment of work group members, and trust. Like leader behaviours, co-worker behaviours can influence how an employee perceives and experiences the work environment (Organ et al., 2006). It should, therefore, be related to at least some facets of discretionary work effort.

Organ et al. (2006) argued that perceptions of the team’s supportiveness should induce greater work effort through a process of reciprocity. The principle of reciprocity reflects the mutual support co-workers provide each other in a supportive team environment. Co-worker support builds perceptions of being valued and cared about and fosters feelings of acceptance and belonging to the group. This builds commitment towards the group and its goals, and encourages the employee to reciprocate (Bishop et al., 2000; Organ et al., 2006). Thus, strong co-worker support should motivate the employee to contribute more discretionary work effort.

Work group support and related concepts such as group cohesiveness and high quality team-member exchange have been found to be related to various facets of discretionary work effort. For example, Amabile et al. (1996) found that perceived work group support was associated with more creative and innovative acts. Similarly, Parker et al. (2006) found co-worker trust was correlated with individual proactive behaviour. Also, Bateman and Organ (1983) reported a positive correlation between co-worker support and ERB, while Podsakoff et al. (1993) reported a positive correlation between group cohesiveness and conscientiousness, and other ERB research (Bommer et al., 2003; Deckop et al., 2003) found individual ERB was correlated with the level of co-worker ERB. All of these work behaviours represent forms of discretionary directed effort. Thus, there is already considerable empirical evidence to support a relationship between co-worker support and the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

**Organisational Support**

In Study 2 organisational support emerged as two separate perks. These were “support for flexible work arrangements” and “recognition for good performance”. Support
for flexible work arrangements was defined as the extent to which an organisation is prepared to be flexible in the way it adheres to rules and procedures on how an employee meets his or her job requirements. The key indicators of support for flexible work arrangements were being able to work from home on occasions and trading off personal time to attend to personal matters during work time. Support for flexible work arrangements that fosters work-life balance has been proposed as an important element of organisational support (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Shinn, 2004).

Support for flexible work arrangements signals to employees a willingness by the organisation to provide them with the assistance they need to perform their job well. It indicates that the organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Therefore according to social exchange theory, having freedom and flexibility in work arrangements should be reciprocated by the employee through a willingness to exert discretionary work effort to compensate for time taken to tend to non-work commitments. This flexibility, for example, may induce an employee to take the initiative to develop more efficient and effective ways of working so he/she can better balance his/her work and non-work commitments.

Support for flexible work arrangements can, however, potentially have two opposing effects on discretionary work effort (Organ et al., 2006). On the one hand, it can reduce role clarity if it fails to make the organisation’s expectations clear. It may also create perceptions of inequitable treatment and unfairness due to perceptions that not everyone is playing by the same rules (Rousseau, 2001). This may undermine trust in the organisation and reduce satisfaction, and thereby discourage discretionary work effort. On the other hand, this flexibility may signal the organisation’s willingness to consider differences in individual needs and to accommodate employees in how they meet their work requirements. This can create a feeling of obligation toward the organisation and encourage employees to want to reciprocate by doing whatever is required to help the organisation meet its goals. Where this latter force is stronger than the former, an employee should exert higher levels of discretionary work effort.

There appears to be no clear evidence, however, on which opposing force should dominate. In fact, very few empirical studies seem to have specifically addressed support for flexible work arrangements as a separate element of organisational support. Research on workaholics, for example, has provided some evidence that an organisation’s support for work-life balance covaries with workaholism (i.e. a high level of discretionary work effort) amongst those workaholic types who derive enjoyment from work (Burke, 2000, 2001c). Most studies, however, have investigated the broader concept of organisational support. This
research indicates that organisational support is positively related to various forms of the direction facet of discretionary work effort (Bishop et al., 2000; Eisenberger et al., 2001; Eisenberger et al., 2002; Lynch et al., 1999; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, the empirical evidence most strongly supports a positive relationship with the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

The second organisational support perk, “recognition for good performance”, refers to the extent to which an organisation recognises and rewards high effort and performance. The main indicators of this perk in Study 2 were recognition of outstanding performance and good ideas, promoting employees for good performance, and a willingness to invest in employee development. Machlowitz (1980) argued that recognition and reward for effort and good work provide “psychic income” that motivates workaholics to exert extraordinarily high amounts of discretionary work effort. Furthermore, by recognising and rewarding effort and good performance, an organisation can strengthen the performance-reward expectancies of employees. Vroom (1964) argued that this is an important factor in work motivation. Employees need to believe that effort and good performance lead to valued outcomes. Recognition for good performance also communicates to employees how much the organisation values their contributions, and thus, it should make employees more willing to exert discretionary work effort to assist the organisation in achieving its goals.

There is strong empirical support for recognition for good performance being related to some facets of discretionary work effort. In the OB and entrepreneurship literatures, for example, recognition for good performance has been found to covary with various forms of discretionary directed effort such as creative and innovative behaviour (Amabile, 1997; Amabile et al., 1996; Janssen, 2001), corporate entrepreneurship (Hornsby et al., 1999; Hornsby et al., 2002; Kuratko et al., 1990), change-oriented ERB (Choi, 2007), and affiliative forms of ERB (Van Dyne et al., 1994). Similarly in research on workaholics, Peiperl and Jones (2001) linked recognition and rewards with the willingness of workaholics to invest high levels of discretionary work effort (time and intensity). Also, in the economics literature Akerlof and Yellen (1990) concluded that recognition and reward for good performance was associated with the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. Therefore, this empirical evidence supports recognition for good performance being positively related to discretionary work effort. While it suggests a broad effect across the different facets of discretionary work effort, the strongest evidence appears to be for a relationship with the direction facet.
6.1.2 Irks and Discretionary Work Effort

In the pursuing discussion I provide an overview of the theoretical and empirical evidence supporting a relationship between the potential irks identified in the first two studies and discretionary work effort. A more comprehensive discussion of this literature can be found in Chapter 2.

Autocratic Leader Behaviour

The first irk identified was “autocratic leader behaviour”. This was defined as behaviours by the manager or supervisor that negatively affect the employee’s psychological and/or emotional state or make it difficult for the employee to perform his/her job. Amongst the key indicators of this irk were having a leader who is controlling and interferes in the employee’s work, focuses on mistakes, does not communicate important information, and ridicules employee suggestions. This negative leader behaviour is conceptually similar to the constructs of non-contingent punishment and abusive supervision that have been previously investigated as distinct constructs from a low level of leader support. Non-contingent punishment involves the leader administering punishment for reasons other than poor effort or performance (Organ et al., 2006) while abusive supervision refers to the leader’s sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours (Tepper, 2000).

From a theoretical perspective, it has been contended that negative leader behaviour breaches the psychological contract between the leader and employee and so undermines employee trust and loyalty (Frey, 1993; Tomer, 1981). Abusive leader behaviour that publicly humiliates an employee can lower his/her self-esteem and decrease discretionary work effort. Based on social exchange theory and the norms of reciprocity, it is plausible that negative leader behaviour will be perceived as unfair and contribute to feelings of mistrust and dislike for the leader (Organ et al., 2006), and thereby contribute to negative reciprocity (Gould-Williams, 2007; Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2003). That is, negative or hostile behaviours by the leader are reciprocated with negative responses by the employee such as lower discretionary work effort.

Leader behaviour theories and research have mostly focussed on positive rather than negative leader behaviours (Amabile et al., 2004). Thus, whilst there are good theoretical arguments to support autocratic leader behaviour as an irk that is distinct from a low level of positive leader behaviour like team-oriented leadership (see Chapter 2), empirical research on negative leader behaviour is limited. Most of the studies uncovered related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort. In the OB literature, for example, negative leader behaviours like non-contingent punishment and abusive supervision are reported to be negatively related to some forms of the direction facet of discretionary work effort like
affiliative ERBs (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1996a; Tepper et al., 2004; Zellars et al., 2002). Also in the entrepreneurship literature, in a qualitative study of leader behaviour, Amabile et al. (2004) found negative leader behaviour was potentially more potent than positive leader behaviour in affecting creative and innovative acts, also forms of discretionary directed effort. In the economics literature, only one empirical study was found in which Drago (1991) reported that intensive supervision (an indicator of a negative leader behaviour) was negatively related to discretionary work time. Despite the limited empirical research found in the literature, however, there seems to be reasonable theoretical arguments and some consistent support for autocratic leader behaviour being negatively related to discretionary work effort, particularly the direction facet.

**Co-worker Shirking**

The second irk identified was “co-worker shirking”. This irk was defined as co-workers failing to give 100% effort to their job or not carrying their weight when working on a group task. It includes co-workers neglecting their own work through frequent absence, lateness, breaks or poor quality work. Research on the impact of co-worker shirking on employee discretionary work effort has been a relatively recent development. In this research, perceived loafing (i.e. co-worker shirking) is the perception that one or more group members contribute less effort than others (Comer, 1995). Based on my Study 2 findings, however, co-worker shirking was conceptualised more broadly to encompass both group and co-acting work settings.

According to equity and justice theories, if an employee perceives his or her co-workers are contributing less effort than other members of the work group and yet receive similar rewards, this creates feelings of injustice, lowers satisfaction and negatively affects work motivation which reduces employee work effort (what is called the “sucker effect”). The employee is likely to perceive the work group as less cohesive and be less willing to help other members of the work group, particularly those members who are perceived to shirk. Therefore, theoretically it seems plausible that co-worker shirking should decrease the employee’s level of discretionary work effort because by lowering their own effort, they re-establish the balance between the rewards they receive and the effort they contribute relative to their shirking co-workers.

The empirical research on co-worker shirking, however, has found evidence of both reduced employee discretionary work effort supporting the notion of a “sucker effect” (Mulvey & Klein, 1998), and increased discretionary work effort supporting the notion of a “social compensation effect” (Williams & Karau, 1991). Evidence supporting a “sucker effect”, however, seems more extensive and has been reported to exist in both disjunctive
and co-acting groups. Also, Williams and Karau (1991) conceded that either the “sucker effect” or the “exit option” (i.e. voluntary turnover) is likely to dominate over time. Perceived loafing research reporting a loss of work motivation and a “sucker effect” supports the classification of co-worker shirking as an irk (Blau, 1995; Eder & Eisenberger, 2008; George, 1992; Kerr, 1983; Mulvey & Klein, 1998; Schnake, 1991; Williams & Karau, 1991). Studies in the ERB literature have also found that when co-workers withhold ERB this decreases the ERB by others in the work group (Bommer et al., 2003; Deckop et al., 2003) which is consistent with classifying co-worker shirking as an irk. Therefore, there is already some evidence to support a negative relationship between co-worker shirking and discretionary work effort.

**Power-orientation**

The final irk identified was “power-orientation”. This irk refers to the degree to which an organisation is perceived by its members to be characterised by destructive internal competition, political problems and a fear of challenging organisational members in positions of authority or influence. The indicators of this irk were shifting responsibilities and blame onto others, playing political power games, criticising new ideas and poor communication. Power-orientation has been identified in the literature as an organisational impediment, in that it is an organisational characteristic that impedes employee engagement in various work behaviours (Amabile et al., 1996).

Theoretically, there are strong arguments for power-orientation being negatively related to discretionary work effort (Adler & Borys, 1996; Cropanzano et al., 1997; Ferris & Kacmar, 1992). Political problems, negative criticism and severe sanctions on failure and non-conformity increase the perceived risks of engaging in non-conforming behaviours as well as lowering the perceived benefits. Within a social exchange and reciprocity framework, a high power-orientation within an organisation fails to foster a sense of personal responsibility, loyalty, commitment to the organisation and satisfaction. This should create feelings of “negative reciprocity” (Gould-Williams, 2007; Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2003) that is, negative or hostile behaviours by members of an organisation are reciprocated with negative responses by the employee. Thus theoretically, power-orientation should decrease at least some facets of discretionary work effort, other things being equal.

Only three articles were found in the literature that directly addressed the effect of power-orientation on discretionary work effort (Amabile et al., 1996; Cropanzano et al., 1997; Randall et al., 1999). Two of these studies (Amabile et al., 1996; Cropanzano et al., 1997) reported that power-orientation (organisational politics and internal political problems) was negatively related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort. The
third study (Randall et al., 1999) found power-orientation to be negatively associated with the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. These empirical findings are consistent with Adler and Borys’s (1996) contention that when organisations are perceived as coercive in the way they relate to employees, employees will become alienated and respond negatively by lowering discretionary work effort. Thus, while the empirical evidence supporting a negative relationship between power-orientation and discretionary work effort is scant in its volume and scope, the research findings seem to be sufficiently consistent that, supported by strong theoretical arguments, gives good reason for it being a potential irk.

In summary, even though the prior research on determinants of discretionary work effort is not entirely consistent, there appear to be sound theoretical grounds for the five perceived perks and three perceived irks identified in the prior two studies actually being related to the level of discretionary work effort. Interestingly, in the literature, perks have attracted considerably more research attention than irks. This pattern of research mirrored my own finding in Study 1, in that fewer salient irks than perks emerged from this research and the volume of qualitative comment on irks overall was substantially less than that on perks. The relative paucity of research on the relationship between these negative work environment characteristics and the level of discretionary work effort made it more difficult to present convincing evidence for autocratic leader behaviour, co-worker shirking and power-orientation being negatively related to discretionary work effort. Nonetheless, this presents a potential gap in the literature and an opportunity for my research to make a substantive contribution to the discretionary work effort literature.

6.1.3 Monetary Rewards and Discretionary Work Effort

The role of money as a motivator of employee work effort has long been a point of contention both within and across the behavioural science disciplines, and perhaps arguably none more than between economics and psychology. While the wage incentive lies at the heart of economic models of work motivation and discretionary work effort, in the OB literature money is viewed as having a much less central role and often only a temporary effect. Thus, as a multidisciplinary study addressing the question of what motivates discretionary work effort, it seemed important for my research to consider the potential influence of monetary reward as well as the perks and irks previously discussed.

Economic models of work effort identify income earned as instrumental in enabling people to purchase goods and services that satisfy their needs (Hicks, 1932 [1968]; Robbins, 1930; Spencer, 2005). The decision to supply discretionary work effort involves an economic exchange relationship, whereby higher levels of monetary reward motivate employees to supply more discretionary work effort (time and intensity). Thus, according to
the dominant economic theories of discretionary work effort (Akerlof, 1982; Alchian & Demsetz, 1972), there should be a positive relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort (see Chapter 2 for a more detailed discussion).

Some recent economic studies, however, have challenged this commonly held view that wages and discretionary work effort (the intensity facet) are positively related (Campbell III & Kamlani, 1997; Chang, Huang, & Lai, 2002). While Drago (1991) provided a theoretical argument and empirical evidence showing pay and discretionary work effort are positively related, Chang, Huang and Lai (2002) provided a theoretical argument to explain empirical evidence for higher wages not increasing worker effort in an environment where overtime is regularly available and workers have the discretion of supplying overtime hours. They argued that increased monetary reward will have an ambiguous effect on the level of discretionary work intensity due to two opposing forces. One force acts to induce employees to increase their supply of discretionary work intensity. This is the higher cost of losing one’s job if caught shirking when wages are increased. The other force is the tendency for the higher wage to motivate employees to supply more discretionary work time but to also lower their level of discretionary work intensity (assuming work averse employees) to avoid a decrease in overall satisfaction associated with greater level of discretionary work effort.

In the workaholism literature, where employees who contribute excessively high amounts of discretionary work time are the focus of research, Harpaz and Snir (2003) also noted that there are opposing views on the importance of monetary reward as a motivator of discretionary work effort. These authors suggested that income is an important work outcome for many people. They found that people with an economic orientation (i.e. a preference for instrumental or economic rewards) were motivated by the instrumental rewards obtained from work. Similarly, Douglas and Morris (2006) contended that individuals with a strong desire for goods and services will be motivated to work long and hard in expectation of gaining greater monetary reward that will enable them to purchase the tangible and intangible goods to meet their needs. They claimed that for materialistic employees there will be a positive relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work time. This argument was consistent with Harpaz and Snir’s (2003) notion of economic orientation. Harpaz and Snir found empirical support for an individual’s economic orientation being positively related to the total hours worked per week. Similarly, Buelens and Poelmans (2004) reported money was a motivator for workaholics who derived high enjoyment from their work (i.e. enthusiastic workaholics and work enthusiasts). This literature suggests that the effect of monetary reward on discretionary work effort depends, at least in part, on employee attitudes but that for many employees monetary reward will have a positive association with discretionary work effort.
In contrast to these perspectives, in the OB literature, research has commonly focussed on non-monetary determinants of discretionary work effort. ERBs as a form of the direction facet of discretionary work effort, by definition, are not directly rewarded. This implies that employees are unlikely to form expectations of receiving monetary reward by channelling effort into ERB. Thus, ERB researchers have not generally investigated monetary reward as a predictor of discretionary work effort. Based on the generally accepted definition of ERB, this omission is perhaps not surprising. This conceptualisation of ERB, however, has recently been challenged (Hui, Lam, & Law, 2000). It has been determined that supervisors factor ERB into job performance appraisals (MacKenzie et al., 1991; Podsakoff et al., 1997), that supervisors consider ERB in putting a dollar value on performance (Orr, Sackett, & Mercer, 1989), that ERB is related to rewards including pay increases and promotions (Haworth & Levy, 2001; Hui et al., 2000; McAllister et al., 2007; Schnake & Dumler, 1997), and that employees may engage in ERB to create a more positive impression of themselves (Bolino, 1999). As a result there have been calls for further research into the relationship between this form of discretionary directed effort and rewards, including those with instrumental value (Hui et al., 2000; Schnake & Dumler, 1997).

Conflicting theories suggest that the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort may be quite complex depending on employee attitudes and what facets of discretionary work effort form the focus of the theories. For example, whilst the economics literature provides some evidence to suggest that monetary reward will be related to the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort, until recently it has been assumed that monetary reward does not have an impact on the direction facet of discretionary work effort.

The need for a more fine-grained view of the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort may also apply to the relationships between perks and irks and discretionary work effort. The preceding review revealed that the literature has focussed on particular facets of discretionary work effort for certain perks and irks. For example, co-worker support has been investigated as a predictor of the direction facet of discretionary work effort rather than the intensity or time facets. This pattern of findings raises the possibility that different types of work environment characteristics may be differentially related to different facets of discretionary work effort. Thus, while Study 3 was designed to address research questions two and three, an additional interesting and related question arose from what the current literature tells us and my reflection on the Study 2 findings. This question is: “Are there different classes of work environment characteristics that relate differentially to the different facets of discretionary work effort?”
A Classification Framework for Work Environment Characteristics

In the economics literature, Ash (2000) developed a rational sociality framework of individual behaviour to bridge the gap between economics and OB models. This framework aligns with the multidisciplinary approach taken in my research. As such, it provides a potential framework within which different classes of work environment characteristics might be positioned and related to the different facets of discretionary work effort.

Thus, using Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework I formulated a more refined set of hypotheses on how perks, irks, and monetary reward will relate to the different facets of discretionary work effort. While the primary aim of Study 3 was to test if perks, irks and monetary reward are actually related to the level of discretionary work effort as proposed by my research model, a secondary objective was to test the propositions implied by this classification framework. That is, I tested if particular types of work environment characteristics (i.e. perks, irks and monetary reward) are more strongly related to different facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. time, intensity and direction). The following discussion provides an overview of the rational sociality framework and an explanation of how I positioned the work environment characteristics investigated in my research within this framework to help predict how they will relate to the different facets of discretionary work effort.

According to the rational sociality theoretical framework, the individual is a two-self person, that is, each person has a “rational economic self” and a “social self”. The rational economic self makes decisions that maximise personal self-interest. For the rational economic self, people matter only because of their instrumental value, that is, they provide a means for achieving other valued ends. The social self makes decisions that maximise social self-interest by maintaining membership of relationships that promote one’s sense of self. Ash (2000) contended that individual behaviour involves a mix of rational economic self and social self relationship decisions.

Within this framework, relational goods (Gui, 1996, 2000) are inherent in the social relationships people form. Relational goods are intangible, non-monetary outcomes that arise from interpersonal relationships. Examples include trust, recognition, acceptance, reputation, social approval, support and cooperation. These relational outcomes may be positive or negative. They can also have intrinsic value (i.e. they are valued in their own right and so represent an end in themselves) and/or instrumental value (i.e. they represent a means to an end and not an end in themselves) (Ash, 2000; Gui, 1996). Relational goods inherent in working relationships can only be consumed while working in the organisation. So, the more one works in the organisation the more the employee can consume the
relational goods inherent in working relationships. This can motivate (or demotivate in the case of negative relational goods) employees to supply work effort (Mosca et al., 2007). Thus in the context of my research, employees will be motivated to invest in discretionary work effort where this enables them to maximise the benefits enjoyed from the relationships formed at work.

Ash (2000) contended that while economics researchers tend to reduce interpersonal relationships to relational goods that only enter the employee’s utility function indirectly (Gui, 1996; Uhlaner, 1989), some relationships have intrinsic value (i.e. are valued ends in themselves) in which case they directly enter a person’s utility function. Thus, he proposed that people can choose to form one of two different types of relationship, namely, primary or secondary. The motivation to form a primary relationship comes from its intrinsic value, although instrumental outcomes can also be a by-product of this type of relationship. As the benefits of a primary relationship enter the individual’s utility function directly, this type of relationship should have a stronger direct influence on behaviour as the motivators are more proximal. In contrast, the principal motivation to form a secondary relationship is instrumental, that is, the relationship is viewed as a means of achieving other ends. The benefits of a secondary relationship enter a person’s utility function indirectly, and thus, this type of relationship should have a weaker influence on behaviour as the motivators are more distal. Ash also posed the possibility of “mixed motive” relationships, that is, relationships where both intrinsic and instrumental considerations motivate their formation with neither dominating the decision. At this point, however, I do not incorporate this latter idea into the framework that I use for my research.

**Positioning Work Environment Characteristics in the Rational Sociality Framework**

Ash (2000) identified work groups and organisations as examples of groups in which a person may form primary and/or secondary relationships. Thus, to relate Ash’s framework to my own research, it suggests that primary work relationships should have a stronger effect on an employee’s level of discretionary work effort than secondary work relationships. To the best of my knowledge, however, Ash’s framework has not been empirically tested in a work context.

Nonetheless, Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework is compatible with the subjective utility, efficiency wage and principal agent models from the economics literature. It is also congruent with expectancy theory as well as the equity, justice and reciprocity theories in the OB literature. Each of these theories and models, individually or in various combinations, has been used and empirically supported to explain the determinants of some facets of discretionary work effort. Ash’s rational sociality framework also bears some
semblance to the positive-negative social exchange model used by Gould-Williams (2007) in which he compared the effect of positive and negative relationships on the level of work motivation and discretionary work effort of local government employees. Although negative relationships have attracted little research attention, Gould-Williams posited that negative exchange relationships like hostile leader behaviour should theoretically result in negative norms of reciprocity developing (Gouldner, 1960), and thereby, lower levels of motivation and discretionary work effort. He noted, however, that in practice this rarely occurs. Organ (1990) suggested that negative relationships may not affect discretionary work effort due to employee concern about their future employability and work environment being adversely affected if they decrease their work effort. This suggests that employees will behave in a way that is personally beneficial.

Ash’s rational sociality framework extends this view to explain why negative relationships will have a weaker or no effect on discretionary work effort. He noted that for primary relationships to endure, its participants must be committed to agreed norms of behaviour, responsibilities and obligations which, if breached, will lead to participants withdrawing from the relationship. Withdrawal from a primary relationship implies that the employee may either completely sever his/her relationship with the organisation and its members (i.e. choose voluntary turnover) or may remain with the organisation but form a secondary relationship for the instrumental benefits that it can provide like job security, ability to support dependents and being able to remain living in the community. Ash’s framework suggests that negative relationships are most likely to be secondary as they are harmful to a person’s sense of self and so cannot have intrinsic value. In a primary relationship the social self determines the employee’s work effort choice. This decision aims to maintain membership of the primary relationship and to gain more of the relational goods inherent in it. In contrast, in a secondary relationship the rational economic self dominates the employee’s work effort decision to maximise his/her personal benefits. Thus, it is contended that the weaker (or non-existent) relationship found between negative relationships and discretionary work effort results from the instrumental benefits of a secondary relationship being more distal and only having an indirect effect on employee work behaviour.

Within the context of my own research, the perks and irks identified involve relationships that employees have with the organisation and its members (i.e. supervisors and co-workers) that can motivate or demotivate their discretionary work effort. While job characteristics like challenging work, and organisational factors like support for flexible work arrangements, recognition for good performance, and power-orientation, do not directly involve interpersonal relationships with specific others, these work environment
characteristics are determined by the employer and/or managers (Levinson, 1965; Liden et al., 2000; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In the literature on organisational support, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) asserted that employees assign human-like characteristics to an organisation and that the actions of its representatives (i.e. managers) are perceived as indicators of the organisation’s intent. The moderate to strong correlations found in my research between employee perceptions of leader behaviours and job and organisational characteristics identified as perks and irks, is consistent with the argument that managers shape the design of the job and organisational practices. Thus, job design and organisational characteristics which are determined by managers are likely to be perceived by employees as an extension of their relationship with the organisation.

Therefore, perks represent positive relationships that engender a sense of certainty and psychological safety which increases the expected benefits and lowers the expected costs of investing in the relationship through greater discretionary work effort. According to Ash’s (2000) framework, this promotes the employee’s “sense of self” giving the relationship intrinsic value. The “social self” is likely to dominate decisions with intrinsic relational considerations motivating the employee’s work behaviour. Thus, perks are expected to involve primary relationships that enter the employee’s utility function directly and thereby can be expected to have a stronger effect on discretionary work effort.

In contrast, irks represent negative relationships that produce uncertainty and psychological harm. This increases the expected costs and lowers the expected benefits from the relationship which will discourage the employee from investing in it through discretionary work effort. Employees might normally be expected to respond in a way that will enable them to avoid the costs associated with irks (Herzberg, 2003 [1968]; Vroom, 1964). Voluntarily leaving the organisation may seem like the most rational response. Negative relationships have been found to be positively related to voluntary turnover (Gould-Williams, 2007; Tepper, 2000). The voluntary exit option, however, depends on the employee’s job mobility (i.e. alternative employment opportunities and social, economic and logistical considerations of changing jobs) (Tepper, 2000). The importance of these types of considerations was evident in the comments of one employee in the Study 1 qualitative interviews. This person reported being in negative relationships with his manager and co-workers but had chosen to remain in the job. He commented:

It’s always good to go home. Yeah I enjoy living here. We’ve just bought ourselves a place. It’s taken me two and a half years to … find a property …

It’s awful here. You know, you feel why should I put in any effort when the others aren’t? Why should I put my head on the chopping block when nobody else is?
I am also not pulling my weight and I am not saying that I am better than anybody else …
But I did have standards before I come here and they have fallen substantially … which
I’m not too happy about. … but who gives a rats.

… I’m not happy here … I’m happy living here but I’m not happy working here and if I
could find something else to do for the same money I certainly would. (26)

These comments indicate that instrumental considerations are the principal motivator for this
employee remaining in the job, and so suggest that he has formed a secondary relationship
with the organisation and its members. Thus, if an employee chooses to remain working in
an organisation where there are substantial irks, the “rational economic self” is likely to
dominate decisions with instrumental considerations motivating work behaviour. Thus, irks
are expected to involve secondary relationships which are instrumental in obtaining other
benefits. As these benefits enter the employee’s utility function indirectly, they can be
expected to have a weaker influence on discretionary work effort.

In his rational sociality framework, Ash (2000) does not explicitly identify monetary
reward with a particular type of relationship. However, this can be inferred from economic
theory and Ash’s treatment of income in his framework to position monetary reward as a
work environment characteristic. In economic theory, monetary reward is an economic
variable with instrumental value. It is the outcome of an employment relationship that the
employee has with an organisation. In Ash’s rational sociality framework, monetary reward
is represented as a constraint on consumption. It enters the individual’s utility function
indirectly through the individual’s consumption of goods and services purchased with the
income earned from working. Thus, monetary reward is the instrumental benefit that
motivates the employee to form an economic exchange relationship with an organisation in
the form of an employment contract. It is financial in nature and can be easily contracted
(Mosca et al., 2007). As the principal motivation for forming this work relationship is
instrumental, it is a secondary relationship. This type of secondary relationship in which
monetary reward is the principal motivator, however, is distinctive from the secondary social
relationship described by Ash as the latter involves a social exchange that cannot be
contracted. This difference in the nature of the relationship, suggests that a secondary
relationship formed for instrumental financial outcomes may affect different facets of
discretionary work effort than a secondary relationship formed for instrumental non-
financial outcomes. Thus, I extended Ash’s framework to incorporate monetary reward as a
separate class of secondary relationship, namely, instrumental financial. As monetary reward
involves a secondary relationship and its benefits enter the employee’s utility function
indirectly, this work environment characteristic should also have a weaker effect on
discretionary work effort than a primary relationship.
To recap, within the rational sociality framework, I have argued that perks involve primary relationships. These form a class of what I will call “intrinsic relational” work environment characteristics. The term “intrinsic” reflects the intrinsic value of this type of relationship as proposed by Ash (2000) and the term “relational” emphasises the social interpersonal, non-contractible nature of the relationship. In addition, I argued that irks involve secondary relationships. These form a class of what I will call “instrumental relational” work environment characteristics. Here the term “instrumental” reflects that instrumental considerations are the principal motivation for the formation of this type of relationship and again the term “relational” emphasises the social interpersonal, non-contractible nature of the relationship. Finally, I argued that monetary reward is a class of work environment characteristic that involves a secondary relationship that is motivated by instrumental financial considerations and can be contracted. Thus, I classify monetary reward as an “instrumental financial” class of work environment characteristics. Within the rational sociality framework I envisaged that the instrumental and relational classes of work environment characteristics are likely to promote or encourage different facets of discretionary work effort. Thus, drawing on existing theories of discretionary work effort in the economics and OB literatures, I now consider which of the different classes of work environment characteristics are more likely to promote or encourage which facets of discretionary work effort.

Positioning Discretionary Work Effort in the Rational Sociality Framework

According to conventional economic models of work effort, the work effort decision is viewed as a time allocation problem involving an income-leisure trade-off. That is, to supply more discretionary work time, an employee must forego leisure time. Higher monetary reward earned from supplying more discretionary work time enables the employee to satisfy other needs through the purchase of goods and services. Thus, it is this instrumental consideration that motivates employees to supply more discretionary work time. Therefore, I propose that the instrumental class of work environment characteristics should have a stronger effect in encouraging employees to supply more discretionary time to work and so discretionary work time can be positioned as an instrumentally-oriented facet of discretionary work effort. Furthermore, economic theory emphasises that the time allocation decision between work and non-work activities is based principally on economic considerations. Thus, monetary rather than relational (non-monetary) work environment factors are proposed to relate more strongly to the time facet of discretionary work effort.

In contrast, according to the gift-exchange approach to the efficiency wage theory of discretionary work effort (Akerlof, 1984; Akerlof & Yellen, 1990) in the economics literature, discretionary work intensity is contended to be related to both monetary reward
and non-monetary relationship factors in the work environment. Unlike time, the intensity facet of discretionary work effort is less visible, more difficult to monitor and not easily specified in an employment contract. Thus, it might be expected to be less influenced by monetary than non-monetary considerations. Also, some prior empirical research suggests that monetary reward is not strongly related to the intensity facet of discretionary work effort (Drago, 1991; Frey, 1997). In addition, the OB literature presents discretionary work intensity as a work behaviour that is affected by a variety of socially based work environment characteristics. Therefore, I propose that the relational class of work environment characteristics should have a stronger effect in encouraging employees to supply more intensity of effort and so it seems that discretionary work intensity should be positioned as a principally relationally-oriented facet of discretionary work effort.

Similarly, in the research on ERBs and proactive behaviours like creativity, innovation and personal initiative in the OB and entrepreneurship literatures, these forms of discretionary directed effort are commonly embedded in social cognitive and social exchange theories which are relationally-oriented. Prior empirical research has suggested that employee relationships with managers, co-workers and the organisation are important in affecting the direction in which employees channel their discretionary effort (Amabile et al., 1996; Hornsby et al., 2002; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1996a). Thus, I posit that relational classes of work environment characteristics should be more strongly related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort and so this facet of discretionary work effort should also be positioned as relationally-oriented.

While Ash (2000) did not apply his rational sociality framework to employment relationships he identified working relationships as a potential area of application by suggesting that individuals may form primary and secondary relationships with work groups and organisations. Thus, extending his framework to this application based on the positioning of the different work environment characteristics and the facets of discretionary work effort outlined above, the framework predicts that both the instrumental and relational classes of work environment characteristics will be related to work behaviours such as discretionary work effort. I predict that the relational classes of work environment characteristics (intrinsic and instrumental) will relate most strongly to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort while the “instrumental financial” class of work environment characteristics (i.e. monetary reward) will relate most strongly to the time facet of discretionary work effort. Also, I expect that the “intrinsic relational” class of work environment characteristics (i.e. perks) will relate more strongly to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort than the “instrumental relational” work environment characteristics (i.e. irks).
6.1.5 How Monetary Rewards and Perks and Irks Relate

In examining how monetary rewards, perks and irks relate to the level of discretionary work effort, a further important consideration is how monetary rewards, and perks and irks relate to each other. This matter underlies research question 3 on whether the monetary rewards-discretionary work effort relationship is moderated by perks and irks. In Chapter 1 (see Section 1.2.1), I drew attention to Frey’s (1993; 1997) theory of personal motivation where he posited that when employees perceive their work environment as “controlling”, higher levels of monetary reward will ‘crowd out’ (i.e. weaken or eliminate) intrinsic motivation and discretionary work effort. Alternatively, when employees perceive their work environment as “supportive”, there could be a ‘crowding-in’ (i.e. strengthening) effect so that higher levels of monetary reward will increase employee worker motivation and discretionary work effort. Frey’s theory proposes that the nature of the non-monetary work environment will moderate the monetary rewards-discretionary work effort relationship. Thus, to rule out the possibility of a moderation effect obscuring the true relationship between monetary rewards and discretionary work effort, I tested Frey’s propositions.

In the context of my research, Frey’s (1993; 1997) theory suggests that the monetary rewards-discretionary work effort relationship will depend on the level of perks or irks. Since perks include a supportive work environment, monetary rewards should have a stronger relationship with discretionary work effort when the level of perks are high than when perks are low. In addition, since irks include a controlling work environment, monetary rewards should have a weaker relationship with discretionary work effort when irks are high than when they are low. These hypotheses were tested in this third study.

6.1.6 Research Hypotheses

Based on the conceptualisations of work environment characteristics (i.e. perks, irks and monetary reward) and discretionary work effort developed in literature and the arguments presented above, five research hypotheses were tested in Study 3. The first four of these hypotheses addressed research question 2 on how perks, irks and monetary reward relate to discretionary work effort. The first hypothesis tested the validity of perks and irks by testing whether the perceived perks and irks identified in Study 2 are actually related to discretionary work effort. Hypotheses 2-4 also address the relationship between the perks and irks with discretionary work effort, but these hypotheses were specifically designed to test the validity of the rational sociality framework posited as a classification system for these work environment characteristics. That is, these more refined hypotheses are about
how these classes of work environment characteristics should relate to the different facets of discretionary work effort. Thus, it was hypothesised that:

**Hypothesis 1:**
(a) Perks will be positively correlated with at least one facet of discretionary work effort; and (b) Irks will be negatively correlated with at least one facet of discretionary work effort.

**Hypothesis 2:**
“Instrumental financial” work environment characteristics (monetary reward) will be more strongly related to instrumentally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. discretionary work time) than to relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort).

**Hypothesis 3:**
“Relational” work environment characteristics (perks and irks) will be more strongly related to the relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. discretionary work intensity, and discretionary directed effort) than to instrumentally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. discretionary work time).

**Hypothesis 4:**
Perks (i.e. “intrinsic relational” work environment characteristics) will be more strongly associated with the relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort) than will irks (i.e. “instrumental relational” work environment characteristics)

Further, to address research question 3 on how monetary reward, perks and irks relate to each other in influencing the level of discretionary work effort, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested.

**Hypothesis 5a:** Perks will moderate the positive monetary reward-discretionary work effort relationship in that this relationship will be stronger when perks are high than when perks are low.

**Hypothesis 5b:** Irks will moderate the positive monetary reward-discretionary work effort relationship in that this relationship will be weaker or negated when irks are high than when irks are low.

Figure 1 summarises the hypothesised relationships between perks, irks and monetary rewards, and discretionary work effort that were tested in Study 3.
6.1.7 Testing the Research Model

Perks and irks are central constructs in my research model of discretionary work effort (depicted in Figure 6.1). These constructs were drawn from the economists’ notion of “net perquisites”, defined as the net non-monetary rewards and costs an employee associates with his/her job (Douglas, 1989; Douglas & Shepherd, 2000; Morris & Douglas, 2004). Specifically, the perks and irks in my research represent the sets of positive and negative non-monetary work environment characteristics that form the net perquisites construct. While “net perquisites” represent a higher-order construct, it seemed inappropriate to employ higher-order constructs in most of my analyses for several reasons.

Firstly, Hair et al. (2010) pointed out that using a higher-order factor has the disadvantage of not being able to test the relationships between the first-order factors and other constructs. As a central aim of Study 3 was to confirm if the first-order perks and the first-order irks actually relate to at least one of the facets of discretionary work effort, a first-order level of analysis seemed most appropriate. Secondly, in my research model the set of first-order perks were postulated to affect discretionary work effort positively whereas the set of first-order irks were postulated to affect discretionary work effort negatively. In addition, Ash’s rational sociality framework provided a theoretical basis for grouping these work environment characteristics in a way that potentially allows us to better explain their effect on discretionary...
work effort (see Section 6.1.4). Therefore, there seemed to be sound conceptual arguments for separating the perks and irks constructs in my investigation. Hair et al. (2010) contended that higher-order factors should only be used when all of the first-order constructs are expected to covary and affect other key constructs in the same way. To the extent that perks and irks can be shown through my research to have a differential effect on discretionary work effort, they provide a meaningful way of categorising the expected impact of positive and negative work environment factors on discretionary work effort.

6.1.8 Control Variables

In prior discretionary work effort research it has been common practice to control for a variety of individual and work situation characteristics to reduce the potential for systematic biases and finding spurious relationships between the predictor and criterion variables under investigation (Choi, 2007; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). This is especially the case where there is sound theoretical and empirical support for these characteristics being related to the phenomenon of interest.

In Study 2 (see Chapter 5), I found employee perceptions of perks and irks varied with gender and job type. These employee characteristics, however, only affected the strength to which non-monetary work environment characteristics were perceived as perks and irks and not whether they were consistently identified as perks and irks. Therefore in Study 3, I collected information on gender and job type. I also measured age, work status, organisational tenure and management status as these are commonly used in motivational research and there seemed to be sound theoretical grounds for these variables being related to discretionary work effort. In selecting what characteristics to include as control variables, I considered whether these variables were likely to dissipate genuine relationships between the key predictor variables in my model and the level of discretionary work effort (Johns, 2006). I opted to control for the four variables gender, age, work status and organisational tenure, but not for job type and management status based on the following rationale.

Gender - Claims of gender differences in discretionary work effort persist even though these differences are likely to have changed or diminished over time (Piercy, Lane, & Cravens, 2002). Women are purported to allocate less time and energy to work than men (Becker, 1985; Maume, 2006; Mincer, 1985), exhibit weaker job attachment in situations where they have the discretion to choose their hours of work, (Maume, 2006), engage in more effort-intensive non-work activities and so economise on effort expended in paid work (Becker, 1985), face the prospect of lower monetary rewards from each hour of work, and work fewer hours (Becker, 1985; Burke, 1999e) and choose part-time employment (Bielby & Bielby, 1988). Empirical support for gender differences in discretionary work effort,
however, seems inconsistent. Some researchers have found that women limit their discretionary work effort (Choi, 2007; Maume, 2006; Warr & Fay, 2001); while others have reported that women allocate more discretionary work effort than men (Bielby & Bielby, 1988; Major, McFarlin, & Gagnon, 1984; Spence & Robbins, 1992); and still others found no significant gender relationship (Alotaibi, 2001; Chan & Schmitt, 2002; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Piercy et al., 2002; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001, 2003). Podsakoff et al. (2000) considered that on plausible theoretical grounds, the finding that gender is not consistently related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort (i.e. ERB) is surprising and encouraged additional research on the influence of this variable. They noted that women exhibit greater empathetic concern and perspective taking, while males have a greater economic orientation and emphasise quid pro quo. These gender differences may contribute to males and females engaging in discretionary work effort in different ways. Despite the inconsistent empirical findings, there appear to be reasonable grounds for gender covarying with discretionary work effort or at least some of its facets. Thus, it seems reasonable to include gender as a control variable.

**Age** - Age is posited as the most robust and strongest predictor of work attitudes and behaviour (Rhodes, 1983). It has been used as an indicator of life-cycle and career stage (Maume, 2006; Rhodes, 1983) and reported to correlate with job involvement (Maume, 2006) which should covary with discretionary work effort. Age-related differences in work ethic, needs and values, job characteristics, and the level and types of rewards preferred have also been reported (Bielby & Bielby, 1988; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Maume, 2006). These factors should also relate to discretionary work effort. ERB research has shown inconsistent results with some studies reporting a positive relationship between age and the direction facet of discretionary work effort (Choi, 2007; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), and others finding no relationship (Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Parker et al., 2006; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001; Warr & Fay, 2001). In a study of self-reported work effort of private and public sector employees, Frank and Lewis (2004) found that older workers reported working harder than younger workers. Frank and Lewis also reported that the proportion of similar employee cohorts reporting maximum work effort had declined between 1989 and 1998. These findings offered empirical support for the belief that employee work ethic has declined over time, thereby suggesting that younger employees should have a weaker work ethic than older employees. While the empirical findings reported here are somewhat inconsistent, there appear to be plausible arguments for age being related to discretionary work effort, and so this variable was included as a second control variable in my study.

**Work status** - According to human capital theory, employers provide fewer incentives to part-time employees than to full-time employees because they expect fewer
benefits in return. Part-time and casual employees work fewer hours, and so, are less likely to get as much monetary reward, recognition, training and other forms of intangible benefits (Hipple, 1998, 2001; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2003). They are also more likely to develop an economic rather than a social exchange relationship with their employers and so are likely to contribute less discretionary work effort than their full-time counterparts (Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001). Part-time employment has been found to be associated with lower self-reported levels of work effort (Bielby & Bielby, 1988; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001, 2003). Stamper and Van Dyne (2001, 2003) found that part-time employment status in the services sector was differentially related to different forms of discretionary directed effort. Collectively, these findings suggest that work status may have a differential influence on the different facets of discretionary work effort and so warrant inclusion as a control variable.

Organisational tenure - Longevity with an organisation is often considered to build higher levels of organisational commitment and job involvement (Cohen, 1995; Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972; Joiner & Bakalis, 2006) as stronger social exchange relationships are established with the employer over time. While greater organisational commitment and loyalty may not manifest itself in greater discretionary work effort in terms of extra time spent at work (Scott et al., 1997), it may influence other facets of discretionary work effort. In the ERB literature, for example, while organisational tenure has been found to covary positively with several forms of discretionary directed effort (Lynch et al., 1999; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Williams & Anderson, 1991; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), some empirical studies have found no significant relationship (Deckop et al., 2003; Lynch et al., 1999; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Williams & Shiaw, 1999). Based on the theoretical arguments and studies where organisational tenure has covared with discretionary directed effort, it seems reasonable to include this factor as a control variable. While organisational tenure might be expected to correlate with age, the correlation between these two control variables was only moderate to strong (0.42) for my sample. Thus, it was included as an additional control variable.

As several individual and work status characteristics have been identified as having an impact on perceptions of perks and irks as well as on discretionary work effort, I decided to do the analyses both including and excluding these control variables to check if it affected the substantive findings of my research. The regression results reported include these variables as control variables. The results excluding the control variables are only reported if they changed the substantive findings of the analysis.
While there also seemed to be reasonable theoretical and empirical grounds for management level and job type being related to discretionary work effort, I elected not to control for these two variables in Study 3. I anticipated that employees holding a management role within the organisation would not only receive higher levels of monetary reward, but were also likely to have greater exposure to perks such as more challenging tasks, greater responsibility and greater flexibility in work arrangements. I also expected that with the higher level of authority associated with management positions, these employees were more likely to face greater job demands and would have more opportunity to engage in some forms of discretionary work effort (e.g. taking charge). Similarly, employees in blue collar and trades job roles in local government (i.e. the outside staff) typically receive lower levels of monetary reward, may have less exposure to perks and, because of the nature of their job, may have less opportunity to engage in discretionary work effort. An examination of the qualitative interviews in Study 1 also suggested that this group of employees may have greater exposure to at least some irks in the workplace (e.g. autocratic leader behaviour). This possibility was suggested by the significantly greater proportion of participants in this type of job role who commented on irks. Thus, if these characteristics were treated as control variables, then potentially important relationships in my research model may not be revealed (Johns, 2006).

6.2 METHOD
6.2.1 Participants

The target population for Study 3 was the same as that reported for Study 2 (see Section 5.2.1). A second questionnaire was distributed to all employees in the same 12 local government organisations. Employees who had not participated in Study 2 were nonetheless encouraged to complete and return a questionnaire. Sixty-nine percent of the Study 3 respondents indicated they had participated in Study 2.

A total of 2171 questionnaires were distributed and 508 responses were returned (a 23.4% response rate). After assessing the amount and pattern of missing data, 500 cases (23.0%) were retained for further analysis. The level and pattern of responses from the 12 participating organisations were comparable to Study 2. The response rates for the different organisations in this study ranged from 10% to 71% with a median of 29%. In Study 2, the overall response rate was slightly higher (25.6%), the range of response rates was slightly narrower (i.e. 15% to 66%) and median response rate was similar (25.5%).

Nearly 60% of participants were male. All age categories were represented with nearly one-third of participants aged between 40 and 49 years which was representative of the median age for local government employees in the state. Most participants (84%)
worked full-time and about 60% had five years or less tenure with the organisation. Almost 60% were in non-supervisory roles and both indoor staff (76%) and outside staff (24%) were represented in the sample. While outside staff might typically be expected to be male, the correlation between gender and outside staff was only 0.38. About two-thirds of participants worked in rural/regional locations. Overall, the Study 3 participant profile closely mirrored that for Study 2. The only exception was the gender mix, in that this study had more male respondents (59.8% compared with 52.0%) than Study 2. As limited demographic data was available for the local government employee population in the state, it was difficult to determine the representativeness the respondent group. However based on the limited information available, this cohort appeared to provide a reasonable cross-section of the target population. Table 6.1 summarises of the characteristics of the 500 study participants.

### TABLE 6.1: Profile of the Study 3 Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Participant Characteristics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants (n = 500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30 years</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60+ years</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure with the Organisation</td>
<td>Up to 5 years</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time/casual</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Level</td>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside/Outside Staff</td>
<td>Inside staff</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside staff</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75+% outside work)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Capital city/metropolitan</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural/Regional</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 Procedure

The data for Study 3 were collected from a questionnaire administered two months after the Study 2 questionnaire. The procedure for administering the Study 3 questionnaire mirrored the approach employed in Study 2 (see Chapter 5). The questionnaire was distributed to all employees in the 12 organisations over a six week period between early April and mid-May 2006. The questionnaire was distributed via internal mail distribution channels. To maximise the response rate, two reminders were sent out at two weekly intervals, the benefits of participation and support from the two peak industry bodies (i.e. the Western Australian Local Government Association and the Local Government Managers Association) were highlighted in the information provided, and an assurance of confidentiality of responses was given. Respondents could return their completed questionnaires directly to me during a site visit (where this was permitted), by mail using the reply paid envelope provided, or if preferred, by email.

The Study 3 questionnaire was designed to measure the level of perks and irks experienced by employees, their self-reported level of discretionary work effort and their demographic and work situation characteristics (see Section 6.1.3). Since both the predictor and criterion variables were measured through self-reports, common method variance was a potential problem that needed to be addressed. In an effort to minimise the likelihood of this being an issue, I used a combination of procedural and statistical techniques proposed in the literature (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). The procedural techniques of psychological separation, participant anonymity, item construction and random ordering of sets of items were incorporated into the design of the questionnaire. The statistical techniques used were Harman’s one-factor test and the more conservative common method variance latent factor CFA test (see Section 3.3.3 in Chapter 3 and Section 5.2.5.4 in Chapter 5). This was undertaken as a supplementary data analysis procedure.

Psychological separation was fostered in two ways. Firstly, the cover letter attached to the questionnaire gave a short cover story that linked the first survey that had been implemented two months earlier with the current survey. This story was intended to make it appear that the key connection was principally between these temporally separated data collections rather than the measures in the current questionnaire. This should have reduced the perceived relevance and salience of the information gathered in the different parts of the Study 3 questionnaire. The time lag between the two surveys should have greatly reduced the ability of participants to retrieve information that might bias the responses by repeat participants in the Study 3 survey. A second technique was to provide a brief commentary between the different sections of the questionnaire. This aimed to shift the respondent’s focus and thinking into a new direction so as to detach the relevance and salience of the
preceding items from what followed. Also, as the questionnaire was quite lengthy, I suggested the participants take a short break before progressing with the next section which contained items measuring the criterion variables. This aimed to create a small degree of temporal separation between responses relating to the predictor variable measures and the criterion variable measures. In addition, the different constructs measured also used longer rather than very short scales. This assists in lessening the influence of previous responses. These strategies can help to control for common rater bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

To reduce evaluation apprehension assurances were given that participation was entirely voluntary, that no-one in the organisation would have access to the responses, that participant responses would remain confidential and that there were no right or wrong answers to the statements. Further, participants were not required to provide identifying information on the questionnaire. These strategies are useful in controlling for social desirability, acquiescence and leniency biases (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The main techniques used to reduce bias caused by the measurement items themselves and their context within the measurement instrument included carefully following the guidelines for good item construction (i.e. avoid complex, ambiguous and double-barrelled items, and providing examples), using different response formats with different anchors for the predictor and criterion variables, avoiding bipolar numerical scale values and providing verbal labels for numerical scales (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Following data collection, several techniques were used to analyse the responses provided by the survey participants. These included missing data analysis, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and reliability analysis, correlation analysis and hierarchical regression analysis (see Section 6.2.6).

6.2.3 Measures

A combination of previously published measures and new scales developed as part of my program of research were included in the questionnaire. The relevant predictor variables were the level of perks and irks present in the workplace, and monetary reward. The relevant criterion variable was discretionary work effort. The scales used to measure each variable are described below, along with the information that was collected on individual and work situation characteristics.

Perks and Irks

The perks and irks measures were based on the perceived perks and irks scales developed in Study 2 (see Chapter 5). The perks scales were challenging work (7 items), co-worker support (9 items), team-oriented leadership (12 items), recognition for good performance (4 items) and support for flexible work arrangements (3 items). The irks scales
were co-worker shirking (11 items), autocratic leader behaviour (5 items) and power-orientation (4 items).

The items in each scale were adapted to measure the level of perks and irks present rather than the extent to which these constructs were perceived as perks and irks as was the case in Study 2. This shift mainly involved changing the statements preceding the lists of items measuring each set of variables. In Study 2, the leading statement for the perks and irks measures was: “Thinking about [insert the relevant non-monetary work environment characteristic], how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) would you personally find each of the following”. Respondents then rated each item on a 7-point Likert scale using the descriptors (1) very negative; (2) moderately negative; (3) slightly negative; (4) neutral; (5) slightly positive; (6) moderately positive; and (7) very positive. In Study 3, to assess the level of perks and irks present the leading statement was modified to “For your present work environment how accurate or inaccurate is each of the following statements [insert the relevant non-monetary work environment characteristic statement]”. Participants then rated each item on a 7-point Likert scale using the descriptors (1) very inaccurate; (2) moderately inaccurate; (3) slightly inaccurate; (4) neither accurate nor inaccurate; (5) slightly accurate; (6) moderately accurate; and (7) very accurate.

I expected the level of perks and irks present to have the same factor structure as in Study 2. Thus, these measurement models were subjected to CFA, using the findings from Study 2 to specify the initial model. The CFA results for the perks and irks measurement models are reported in the results section of this chapter (see Section 6.3.1.1). After adjustments were made to improve model fit while ensuring the content validity was maintained, the respecified perks and irks measurement model consisted of challenging work (5 items), co-worker support (6 items), team-oriented leadership (7 items), recognition for good performance (4 items) and support for flexible work arrangements (3 items), co-worker shirking (7 items), autocratic leader behaviour (5 items) and power orientation (4 items). Each of the respecified perks and irks scales were highly correlated with their original scales, and thus, appeared to reflect their original meanings. The Cronbach’s alpha internal reliabilities for the scales used in subsequent analyses were challenging work (.89), co-worker support (.87), team-oriented leadership (.94), recognition for good performance (.81), support for flexible work arrangements (.71), co-worker shirking (.91), autocratic leader behaviour (.85) and power-orientation (.78).

To test the hypothesised model of discretionary work effort, a scale score was calculated for each perk and irk measure by averaging the relevant scale items. In addition, to test the moderation effects of perks and irks on the monetary reward-discretionary work
effort relationship a composite perks measure was calculated by summing the scale scores for all five perks and a composite irks measure was calculated by summing the scale scores for all three irks. The composite perks score represented a “supportive work environment” index and the composite irks score represented a “controlling work environment” index as proposed by Frey’s crowding-out theory of work motivation (see Chapter 2).

**Monetary Reward**

The monetary reward variable was measured with a single question. Respondents were asked to indicate their total yearly income (inclusive of base pay, overtime pay, any bonuses or allowances, any paid time off and any other direct payments but excluding indirect benefits that formed part of a ‘package’ such as a company car, company superannuation contributions and conferences) by choosing an option from the response categories provided. There were 10 income response categories. The first category was under $30,000, the top category was over $120,000, and the 8 categories in between represented $10,000 intervals. For the data analyses, this variable was converted to a dummy variable based on a series of dichotomous categorical variables.

**Discretionary Work Effort**

As outlined in the literature review (see Chapter 2), discretionary work effort is a multi-dimensional construct. It has three facets, namely, time, intensity and direction. Briggs and Cheek (1986) suggested that sub-scales of a potentially unitary construct may be important if they are conceptually meaningful and have empirical utility, that is, if they are differentially related to other measures. As described above, one of the aims of this study was to establish whether perks, irks and monetary reward are differentially related to the different facets of discretionary work effort. To achieve this end, I required measures for each of the facets of discretionary work effort. As no single established measure was found in the literature, I used a combination of scales developed by different researchers.

To measure the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort, I used two scales developed by Brown and Leigh (1996). As the direction facet is also multi-dimensional, I decided to use two scales to represent the two broad forms of discretionary directed effort, namely, challenging and affiliative ERB. Morrison and Phelp’s (1999) 10 item taking charge at work scale was selected as the exemplar of challenging ERB, and Podsakoff et al.’s (1990) 5 item helping scale was chosen as the exemplar of affiliative ERB (see Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion on each of these scales).

As the time and intensity facets and the taking charge measure of the direction facet of discretionary work effort were less well established and had been used in fewer studies, these measures were pre-tested in Study 2 (see Section 5.2.3 in Chapter 5). The exploratory
factor analysis (EFA) results showed that each scale formed a single factor, was empirically distinct and had acceptable internal reliabilities. Furthermore, as Brown and Leigh’s (1996) time and intensity scales were developed to measure work effort rather than discretionary work effort, I decided to check if these two scales correlated with an alternative unidimensional measure of discretionary work effort developed by Lynch and Eisenberger (1999). If the time and intensity scales were indeed tapping the discretionary work effort domain, then they should be significantly correlated with this alternative general measure of discretionary work effort which was collected in Study 2 providing a temporal separation for these measures. I tested the correlation between the general measure of discretionary work effort and the time and intensity measures using data from participants whose questionnaire responses from the two studies could be matched (N = 291). The correlation analysis revealed that the general discretionary work effort measure correlated significantly both with Brown and Leigh’s measure of work time (r = .33, p < .001), and their measure of work intensity (r = .43, p < .001). Based on Cohen’s guidelines (Cohen, 1988; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), the correlations were moderate to strong for both samples. Thus, I concluded that Brown and Leigh’s time and intensity scales were adequately tapping the discretionary work effort construct.

All of the discretionary work effort items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale using: (1) strongly disagree; (2) moderately disagree; (3) slightly disagree; (4) neutral; (5) slightly agree; (6) moderately agree; (7) strongly agree as the scale anchors. Participants were asked to think about their present job and to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Some items had to be re-worded slightly from Brown and Leigh’s (1996) original wording because they were being used for self-reporting.

The measures were subsequently subjected to CFA to assess the quality of the posited discretionary work effort measurement model prior to using these measures in the correlation and regression analyses. The CFA results are presented in the results section of this chapter (see Section 6.3.1.2). The discretionary work time, discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort (taking charge) measures needed to be respecified to provide an adequate fit while ensuring the content validity was maintained. A correlation analysis of the original and revised scales indicated that the original meanings of these constructs were retained. Scores for each facet measure were calculated by averaging the items in each scale. The Cronbach’s alpha internal reliabilities for the measures were discretionary work time (.81), discretionary work intensity (.84), discretionary directed effort (taking charge) (.87) and discretionary directed effort (helping) (.76).
Demographic Measures

In this study gender, age, work status and organisational tenure were used as control variables. Gender was measured through a dichotomous variable. Age was measured with a categorical variable in 10 year blocks with the lowest category being under 20 years and the highest category being 60+ years. Work status was measured through a dichotomous variable (full-time versus part-time/casual). Organisational tenure referred to the number of years the employee had been with the organisation and was measured using the categories under 1 year, 1-2 years, 3-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16+ years. These categories were subsequently combined into five year blocks for the analyses.

6.2.4 Questionnaire Design and Administration

The cover letter provided with the Study 3 questionnaire outlined the purpose of the study and gave a short cover story aimed at creating psychological separation (see Section 6.1.2). All employees were invited to participate in the Study 3 survey even if they had not returned the Study 2 questionnaire. Instructions on how to complete and return the questionnaire were given and the importance of reading the instructions carefully and answering all questions were emphasised.

The questionnaire (which is reproduced in Appendix 4) was divided into three main sections. Section one contained the perks and irks measures. Section two consisted of the measures of discretionary work effort and monetary reward. Section three comprised the demographic and work situation questions.

Section one commenced by explaining the purpose of the questions. It also provided instructions on how to complete this section of the questionnaire and gave a description of key terms (organisation, work area, manager/supervisor and co-workers). The items in this section were divided into four groupings, labelled “my present job”, “my immediate manager/supervisor”, “my co-workers” and “my organisation”. The rationale underpinning the structure of the questionnaire was the same as that outlined in Study 2 (see Chapter 5). To shift the participant’s focus and thinking into a new direction and to detach them from the previous set of statements, section two of the questionnaire also commenced with a brief commentary.

Most questionnaires were returned by reply paid mail. The response rate was higher for organisations that permitted an on-site visit (an average of 52% compared to an average of 14% where no on-site visit was possible). Despite this difference, 58% of the total responses came from organisations that permitted an on-site visit and 42% came from the organisations where no on-site visit was possible. A comparative analysis of the responses to
questions suggested there were no distinctive differences between the two groups of respondents that were likely to affect the representativeness of the sample.

6.2.5 Non-response Bias

As participation was voluntary, there was potential for non-response error (i.e. systematic differences between respondents and non-respondents) affecting the study findings. For this reason, I applied a modified form of the extrapolation method proposed by Armstrong and Overton (1977) to test if earlier and later respondents answered the survey questions in a significantly different way. If significant differences exist between early and late respondents, then potential differences between late respondents and the pool of non-respondents are likely, indicating a non-response bias. The modification I applied to the extrapolation method followed the approach used by Monson (2005) whereby the results were analysed as a continuous sample over the period of the survey, rather than breaking the sample into artificial waves. Thus, the scores for each construct were regressed on the order of response using the respondent ID number (which was progressively recorded) along with the date of return as the questionnaires were received. In this way I tested for any linear trends in the data over time. At a 1% level of significance, only one significant difference was found. This was for the age variable, suggesting a non-response bias for younger employees (i.e. this group was less inclined to respond). From this analysis, I concluded that non-response bias was unlikely to be a significant source of error in this study.

6.2.6 Analysis

The analysis of the Study 3 data was undertaken in several stages. Firstly, a missing data analysis was conducted. Next, CFAs were carried out on the perks, irks and discretionary work effort measures. Finally, correlation and hierarchical regression analyses were undertaken to test the hypotheses associated with my research model of discretionary work effort. The following discussion outlines how each stage of analysis was conducted.

Missing Data Analysis

To evaluate the extent of missing data for Study 3, I used the same approach and criteria for assessment as used in Study 2 (see Section 5.2.5.1 in Chapter 5). The overall level of missing data in Study 3 was very low. Across all items, the highest level of missing data for any one item was 3.1%. Three-quarters of the cases had no missing data for any measures and 97% of the cases had less than 10% of data missing. The assessment of missing data resulted in 8 cases being eliminated (1.5% of the total) leaving 500 cases for further analysis. Missing values were imputed using maximum likelihood estimation.
Anderson and Gerbing (1988) argued that while EFA is a useful preliminary factor analytic technique for constructing measurement scales, the more stringent CFA technique is required to demonstrate uni-dimensionality of a construct, to test the factor structure of a measure and to refine scale measures. They recommended assessing the quality of a measurement model using CFA prior to testing the theoretical model. Thus, before testing the hypothesised relationships in my research model of discretionary work effort, I firstly evaluated the goodness-of-fit and discriminant validity of my perks and irks measurement model and my discretionary work effort measurement model.

The structure of my perks and irks measurement model and my discretionary work effort measurement model was based on the results of my literature review and my Study 1 and Study 2 findings. The perks and irks measurement model comprised five perks and three irks factors that were all correlated (see Appendix 5) and the discretionary work effort measurement model comprised three correlated factors (see Appendix 6). Using AMOS, the Study 3 data were subjected to a progressive CFA using the Maximum Likelihood estimation technique. Each measurement model was specified according to the standard CFA procedure, namely, with each indicator loading on only one latent factor, the measurement errors being independent and latent factors being correlated (Kline, 1998). The quality of each measurement model was assessed in two stages. Firstly it was tested for goodness-of-fit to establish if there was an acceptable fit with the data. If poor fit was evident the model was respecified based on a combination of theoretical, content and statistical considerations, and then re-estimated. Anderson and Gerbing (1998) noted that, in practice, measurement models often require some respecification. Secondly, each model was evaluated for construct validity. This stage checked for convergent and discriminant validity.

To assess the model fit, I used Kline’s (1998) guidelines for reporting and assessing goodness-of-fit. Here I examined the chi-square ($\chi^2$), degrees of freedom, the normalised chi-square ($\chi^2$/df ratio), CFI and RMSEA goodness-of-fit parameters, and used the following cut-off criteria: $\chi^2$/df (<3); CFI (> .90); and RMSEA (< .06). Where these criteria were not met, I checked the size of the loadings of each indicator and the patterns of large standardised residuals and modification indices to consider if the model fit could be improved. The criteria used for identifying potential problematic measurement items were standardised loadings less than .5, the absolute value of standardised residuals greater than 4 (with those between 2.5 and 4 also given some attention), and the largest modification indices. Problematic items identified were then assessed for item content to ensure that if it was eliminated it would not compromise the meaning of the measure.
Convergent validity was assessed by examining the standardised loading estimates, the average variance extracted (AVE) and the construct reliabilities following procedures suggested by Hair et al. (2010). The criteria for determining evidence of convergent validity were standardised loadings of 0.5 or higher, AVEs of .5 or higher and construct reliabilities of .7 or higher. Discriminant validity between the constructs in each measurement model was assessed using Fornell and Larcker’s (1981a; 1981b) recommended procedures. This approach allows for the possibility that measurement error will vary in magnitude across items. The test compares the amount of variance extracted by each construct (i.e. the AVE values) relative to the correlation squared for pairs of constructs to see if the AVE values for each pair of constructs exceed the correlation squared. This shows whether each latent construct explains more of the variance in its indicators than it shares with the other constructs.

An additional CFA was undertaken to test the quality of the perceived perks and irks measurement models with the Study 2 sample data. This was done for two reasons. Firstly, the Study 2 measures had only been tested using EFA and not the more rigorous CFA technique. Secondly, it was necessary to check the fit of the respecified perks model with the Study 2 data.

_Hypothesis Testing - Correlation and Regression Analysis_

To test the five hypotheses associated with my research model of discretionary work effort, correlation analysis and regression analysis were employed. Prior to undertaking these analyses, each variable was tested for normality and the presence of outliers. In this process, six cases were identified as potentially problematic outliers. Thus, two sets of analyses were conducted, one with all cases included, and a second with the suspect cases removed. There appeared to be no change to the substantive findings of the correlation and regression analyses, and so, the results reported below are those using all the data.

Furthermore, a visual examination of the distributions of the scores and the descriptive statistics indicated that some variables suffered a mild to moderate degree of non-normality. Thus, both Pearson and Kendall’s tau-b correlations were calculated and reported in the results section. Also, as the normality assumption required for regression analysis was contravened, the measures were transformed employing approaches suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996). I used both logarithmic and square root transformations in an effort to bring these distributions closer to normality as these techniques most suit data that is slightly to moderately skewed. The transformed data provided almost identical results to those obtained using the original data. Thus, the findings for the untransformed data are
presented in the results section as the interpretation of transformed data can be problematic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

To test the relationships between perks, irks, monetary reward and discretionary work effort, pairwise hierarchical regression analysis was employed. The control variables were entered in the first step and the predictor variables in the second step. A separate analysis was conducted for each facet of discretionary work effort regressing it on each predictor variable. Thus, nine pairwise regressions were conducted for each facet measure of discretionary work effort. This approach was used because several of the perks and irks variables were moderately to strongly correlated. This made collinearity a potential concern. This approach, however, limited my ability to evaluate the unique effects of the independent variables in affecting discretionary work effort.

To test the relationships posited in Hypotheses 2-4, the strength of association of the different predictor variables with the different facets of discretionary work effort was examined. This required making across regression comparisons. In these I examined both the pattern of significant relationships as well as the size of effects between the predictor and the criterion variables (Huberty, 2002; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1982). Comparing the size effects of different predictors, however, is not easy. This is especially the case when the predictors are correlated and are in different metrics (Johnson & LeBreton, 2004). These were both issues in my analysis as several predictors were correlated and a different metric was used for the perks and irks variables to that used for monetary reward. A common practice in research has been to compare standardised beta coefficients to identify differences in effect size and to address issues of different metrics. However, this approach has attracted strong criticism (Frone, 2007; Greenland, Maclure, Schlesselman, Poole, & Moregenstern, 1991; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991; Willet, Singer, & Martin, 1998). Willett, Singer and Martin (1998) argued that only unstandardised beta weights can be directly compared and only for predictors measured in the same units. Also, traditional effect size indices such as squared correlations and squared beta weights have been shown to yield inconsistent and ambiguous results (Johnson & LeBreton, 2004). While there are newly emerging techniques for statistically testing the relative effects of different predictors, these techniques are still in their infancy and still require predictors to be measured in the same units (Budescu & Azen, 2004; Johnson & LeBreton, 2004).

Thus, to address hypotheses 2-4, I chose to use a more qualitative method of evaluation rather than taking a strict statistical approach. This involved using a combination of approaches. Firstly, whilst recognising the issues associated with making strict statistical comparisons of traditional indices, I examined the pattern of significant relationships, beta
weights and changes in R-squared to see if there was a tendency for these to vary in line with my hypotheses. I refer to this analysis of the data as the ‘statistical testing approach’. Then, I examined the pattern of relationships using an effect size correlation (r) criteria that measures the magnitude of the effect without relying on significance testing (Becker, 2008; Coe, 2002). In this second approach I used standard cut-off criteria based on those initially suggested, albeit reluctantly, by Cohen (1988) to categorise the effect sizes as small, medium or large. The standard effect size r-criteria used were: “small” r > .100; “medium” r > .243; and “large” r > .371 (Becker, 2008; Coe, 2002). Rosenthal and Rubin (1979, 1982) cautioned that in using such guidelines, the practical importance of effects in some contexts may be greatly underestimated. Cohen himself emphasised that these cut-offs should not be adhered to stringently. I refer to this analysis of the data as the ‘effect size correlation criteria approach’. Lastly, combining these two approaches, I considered if the differences in the patterns of relationships were large enough and consistent enough to provide indicative support for my hypotheses.

Finally, to test whether perks and irks moderated the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort, a moderated regression analysis was conducted using recommended procedures (Aiken & West, 1991; Baron & Kenny, 1986; Cox, 2005). Here, each facet of discretionary work effort was regressed on monetary reward along with the hypothesised moderator variable and a product term representing the moderation effect. In one set of analyses, the individual perks constructs and then a composite perks score was tested as moderators. Then in another set of analyses the individual irks constructs and then a composite irks score was tested as moderators.

Due to the relatively large number of regression analyses conducted for this study, familywise error became a potential concern. To address this potential problem, the p-value for significance testing was adjusted using the Bonferroni correction technique (Cohen & Cohen, 1983; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The level of significance for testing my hypotheses was set at .001 to provide an overall familywise error of .05. However, as this correction technique can be quite stringent, I also assessed if any additional relationships became significant using a more relaxed significance level of .005. There was little change in the substantive findings under this relaxed significance level criterion with only two relationships affected. Thus, the findings for a significance level of .001 are reported.

6.2.7  Self-reports and Common Method Variance

Since this study had a cross-sectional research design in which all of the measures were collected from the same source (self-report), there was potential for common method variance to inflate the observed relationships constructs. Spector (1987) argued that common
method variance is more of a problem in research that uses single item rather than multi-item measures or measures that are poorly designed and not validated. My research almost exclusively used multi-item measures and included several established measures from the literature. Furthermore, I employed the same procedural and statistical techniques as used in Study 2 to help minimise this problem (see Section 3.3.3 and Section 5.3.1.6 in Chapter 3).

Harman’s single-factor test was undertaken as a statistical procedure to test for common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). All 59 items measuring the five perks constructs, the three irks constructs and the four facet measures of discretionary work effort were subjected to a CFA. The results from this test indicated that a single factor model did not provide a good representation of the data ($\chi^2_{(1652df)} = 11062, p < .001; CFI = .437; RMSEA = .107$). In comparison, the full 12 factor measurement model produced an acceptable fit ($\chi^2_{(1586df)} = 2867, p < .001; CFI = .922; RMSEA = .040$). Furthermore, a Chi-square difference test between these two models was significant ($\Delta\chi^2_{(66df)} = 8195, p < .001$), indicating that the full 12 factor measurement model had a significantly superior fit to the data than the single-factor model. Based on these results I concluded that common method variance was not a major problem in Study 3.

6.3 RESULTS

The Study 3 results are outlined in two sections: one describes the CFA results testing the quality of the perks and irks measurement model and the discretionary work effort measurement model, and the other describes the correlation and regression analyses testing the hypothesised relationships.

6.3.1 Measurement Model Validation

6.3.1.1 Perks and Irks Measurement Model

To assess the quality of the perks and irks measurement model I progressively subjected the perks and irks measures to CFA. First, each of the perks and irks constructs was tested separately. Seven separate CFAs were conducted for four of the five perks constructs and the three irks constructs to assess their uni-dimensionality and fit with the Study 3 sample data. A CFA was not conducted for the “support for flexible work arrangements” perk as this construct only had three indicators whereas CFA requires a minimum of four indicators (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Hair et al., 2010). Next, all five perks were subjected to CFA in a single measurement model. Likewise, all three irks were subjected to CFA in a single measurement model. Here I assessed how well each of the specified measurement models fit the data. Finally, a combined perks and irks measurement models with the five perks constructs and the three irks constructs together was subjected to
CFA. Here I assessed the average variance extracted and the discriminant validity for each of the eight perks and irks constructs.

In each of these analyses, where the fit indices indicated that there was not an acceptable fit, I considered whether or not the model should be respecified and reestimated to provide a better quality measure. Model respecification was based on empirical and theoretical considerations. Initially, I assessed how well the items measuring a construct fit the data by examining the model fit indices to see if they met the criteria for acceptable model fit (Kline, 1998). Where the model fit was not acceptable, the patterns of large modification indices and standardised residuals were examined to identify potentially problematic items (Kline, 1998). Having identified potentially problematic items, the content of these items was then examined to see if they overlapped with other items in the scales and the extent to which they were required to adequately tap the content domain of the construct they were measuring based on their theoretical conceptualisation and definition for this research. Where it was felt that the meaning of the construct would not be compromised by removing an item, this was done to improve the fit of the measurement model to obtain a better quality measure. To test if the refined scale adequately reflected the original meaning of the construct it was intended to measure and that it retained acceptable internal reliability, I conducted correlation and internal reliability analyses for the scores for the original scale (i.e. using all the items from Study 2) and the revised scale. The respecified measurement model was used for subsequent analysis as long as a strong correlation and an acceptable internal reliability were retained to indicate that the revised scale was still consistent with the theoretical conceptualisation of the construct it was measuring. I now turn to present the findings from these analyses.

**Perks Measurement Model**

When the original five correlated factor perks measurement model based on the measures developed in Study 2 was tested, the perks model did not exhibit an adequate fit with the Study 3 data. Using the decision guidelines described above, I respecified and reestimated the model. Two of the seven challenging work items, five of the 12 team-oriented leadership items and three of the nine co-worker support items were deleted from further analysis. The respecified perks measurement model retained 25 of the original 35 items. All of the perks items deleted were from scales that had between 7 and 12 indicators. I chose to remove these items was because most of them seemed to overlap with other items in their respective scales. Also, the meanings of the measures seemed to be adequately retained in that they were strongly correlated with the original scales and they maintained good internal reliabilities (see Table 6.3). The lowest correlation between the scale scores for
the original measure and the scale scores for the revised measure was .971 for Study 3 and .982 for Study 2. Thus, the refined scales provided more parsimonious measures.

Furthermore, by removing these items from these measures, the perks measurement model was substantially improved. This improvement was demonstrated in the goodness-of-fit indices. Also, a subsequent Chi-square difference test confirmed that the respecified perks measurement model provided a superior fit with the sample data ($\Delta \chi^2_{(\Delta DF = 285)} = 1125.296; p < .001$). The perceived perks measurement model (i.e. the Study 2 perks constructs) was then re-analysed with the refined scales to check the fit with the Study 2 data. The respecified perks measurement model had good fit with the Study 2 sample data ($\Delta \chi^2_{(\Delta DF = 285)} = 1182.85; p < .001$). Overall, it was felt that the items retained adequately covered the content of the constructs being measured and that the refined perks measurement model provided a better quality model. The CFA results for the perks measurement model are summarised in Tables 6.2 to 6.3. Thus, this refined model was used in subsequent analyses.

**Irks Measurement Model**

Next, a three correlated factor irks measurement model was tested and was found to display an adequate fit with the Study 3 data. While the original irks model had an adequate fit with the Study 3 data, when subjected to CFA technique, it did not adequately fit the Study 2 data. Thus, the original irks measurement model was respecified and retested for quality of fit with both the Study 2 and Study 3 data. Based on the guidelines used for respecification, four of the 11 co-worker shirking items were removed due to their high modification indices and correlation residuals. The refined irks scales appeared to reflect their original meanings, in that they were strongly correlated with the original scales, they maintained acceptable item content and they still had good internal reliabilities. The correlation between the original co-worker shirking scale and the revised co-worker shirking scale was .985 for both Study 2 and Study 3. In addition, the twice respecified irks measurement model had good fit with both the Study 2 ($\Delta \chi^2_{(\Delta DF = 66)} = 439.013; p < .001$) and the Study 3 ($\Delta \chi^2_{(\Delta DF = 66)} = 261.665; p < .001$) data without compromising the content of the resulting measures. The CFA results for the irks measurement models are summarised in Tables 6.2 to 6.3.
Table 6.2: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for the Perks and Irks Measurement Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 3 – Level of Perks and Irks Present Goodness-of-Fit Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement Models</th>
<th>Chi-square ($\chi^2$)</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom (df)</th>
<th>Normalised Chi-square ($\chi^2$/df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original 5-Factor Perks Model (35 items)</td>
<td>1775.868</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3.229</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5-Factor Perks Model (25 items)</td>
<td>650.572</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original 3-Factor Irks Model (20 items)</td>
<td>437.479</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.620</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 3-Factor Irks Model (16 items)</td>
<td>175.814</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5-Factor Perks and 3-Factor Irks Measurement Model</td>
<td>1504.887</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 2 – Perceived Perks and Irks Present Goodness-of-Fit Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement Models</th>
<th>Chi-square ($\chi^2$)</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom (df)</th>
<th>Normalised Chi-square ($\chi^2$/df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original 5-Factor Perks Model (35 items)</td>
<td>1804.435</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3.281</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5-Factor Perks Model (25 items)</td>
<td>621.585</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original 3-Factor Irks Model (20 items)</td>
<td>722.229</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.325</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 3-Factor Irks Model (16 items)</td>
<td>283.216</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.804</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5-Factor Perks and 3-Factor Irks Measurement Model</td>
<td>1538.847</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3: Correlations and Internal Reliabilities of the Original and Revised Perks and Irks Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perks and Irks Constructs</th>
<th>Study 3 Level of Perks and Irks Present</th>
<th>Study 2 Perceived Perks and Irks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Original Scale Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging Work</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-oriented Leadership</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker Support</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker Shirking</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perks and Irks Constructs</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Original Scale Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging Work</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-oriented Leadership</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker Support</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker Shirking</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Perks and Irks Measurement Model

The final stage of my analyses brought together the five perks and three irks in a single correlated factor measurement model. The CFA results showed that the respecified perks and irks measurement model had an adequate fit with the Study 3 data in that the normalised Chi-square (i.e. $\chi^2_{(DF = 751)}$) was less than three, the CFA exceeded 0.9 and the RMSEA was less than 0.06. This measurement model was also found to have a good fit with the Study 2 data when subjected to CFA. The goodness-of-fit indices for these measurement models for both studies are also reported in Table 6.2.

As further evidence of construct validity, all the standardised loadings were statistically significant and exceeded 0.5 with most exceeding 0.7. This confirmed that all the indicators were strongly related to their relevant constructs. Also, all of the latent perks and irks constructs explained more than 50% of the variance extracted (i.e. AVE > .5) except for power-orientation which had an AVE very close to this level (see Table 6.4). As recommended by Hair et al. (2010), the construct reliabilities were also calculated and these were all found to above 0.7. This suggested good reliability for all measures. Together, these results generally provided evidence of convergent validity. The results also showed that generally the perks and irks perks and irks constructs were empirically distinct. There was evidence, however of one perk-irk pair possibly being on the same dimension. It appeared that the “team-oriented leadership” perk and the “autocratic leader behaviour” irk may not be distinct although the data was not completely clear. The AVE for team-oriented leadership (.681) exceeded the correlation squared (.569) for these two constructs but the AVE for autocratic leader behaviour was slightly lower (AVE = .535).
Table 6.4  Average Variance Extracted and Construct Reliabilities for the Combined Perks and Irks Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perks and Irks Constructs</th>
<th>Study 2 Perceived Perks and Irks</th>
<th>Study 3 Perks and Irks Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Reliability</td>
<td>Average Variance Extracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-oriented leadership</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for flexible work arrangements</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for good performance</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leader behaviour</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-orientation</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker shirking</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As these results showed that the refined measures in the combined perks and irks measurement model were generally sound, these were used in the subsequent analyses. The full CFA results of the combined perks and irks measurement model for Study 3 are in Appendix 5.

6.3.1.2 Discretionary Work Effort Measurement Model

To assess the quality of the discretionary work effort measurement model, a correlated factor model comprising the time, intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort was tested using the same approach outlined for assessing the perks and irks measurement model. The measurement model with the original scales from the literature did not exhibit an adequate fit with the Study 3 sample data. Thus, I again considered whether to respecify and reestimate the measurement model taking into account theoretical and empirical considerations. The CFA results for the discretionary work effort measurement model are summarised in Table 6.5.

Table 6.5: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for the Discretionary Work Effort Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet Scales of Discretionary Work Effort</th>
<th>Original Measurement Model (25 items)</th>
<th>Revised Measurement Model (18 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>1057.452</td>
<td>343.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>3.916</td>
<td>2.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I found that by removing two of the five discretionary work time items, one of the five discretionary work intensity items and four of the 10 taking charge items measuring the direction facet of discretionary work effort, the discretionary work effort measurement model was substantially improved. The items eliminated had high modification indices and correlation residuals and could be removed without compromising the meaning of the constructs being measured. This was evident from examining the correlation and internal reliability results for the original scales and the refined scales (see Table 6.6). The refined scales were strongly correlated with the original scale and maintained acceptable internal reliabilities (as measured using Cronbach’s alpha). The lowest correlation was .948 and the lowest internal reliability for the refined scales was .763. The goodness-of-fit indices indicated that the refined discretionary work effort measurement model provided quality measures for the facets of this construct. Also, a Chi-square difference test ($\Delta \chi^2_{(\Delta DF)}$) confirmed a superior fit for the respecified measurement model ($\Delta \chi^2_{(\Delta DF = 140)} = 714.115; p < .001$). See Appendix 6 for the full CFA results of the hypothesised measurement model for discretionary work effort.

**Table 6.6: Correlations and Internal Reliabilities of the Revised Discretionary Work Effort Facet Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet Measures of Discretionary Work Effort</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Original Scale Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Revised Scale Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Work Time</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Work Intensity</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Directed Effort (Taking Charge)</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The construct validity of the measures of the facet measures of discretionary work effort were also assessed using the same approach as employed in evaluating the validity of the perks and irks constructs in the previous section. All the standardised loadings were statistically significant and all but one loading exceeded 0.5 with more than half the loadings exceeding 0.7. Also, all of the latent constructs explained more than 50% of the variance extracted except for the “helping” measure of the discretionary directed effort facet (see Table 6.7). The helping construct had an AVE of .411 which is below the recommended level (Hair et al., 2010). However, this measure has a long history of empirical testing using CFA and it has been reported to have good psychometric properties across many prior studies in a variety of contexts (Organ et al., 2006) so it was retained unchanged. All construct reliabilities were over 0.7 indicating good reliability for all measures. Together, these results generally provided evidence of convergent validity.
Table 6.7  Average Variance Extracted and Construct Reliabilities for the Discretionary Work Effort Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary Work Effort Measures</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Work Time</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Work Intensity</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Directed Effort</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Taking Charge</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Helping</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, each facet of discretionary work effort (time, intensity and direction) was found to be empirically distinct (see Appendix 6). The “taking charge” and “helping” measures of the direction facet, however, did not meet the criteria for discriminant validity. The AVE for taking charge (.534) exceeded the correlation squared (.472) between these two measures but the AVE for helping was lower (AVE = .411). The factor loadings and AVE for the helping measure in my research were lower than in prior research (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Thus, it appears that these two constructs may not be well discriminated for my sample. However, the distinction between the two measures was retained because they had been dominant and distinct sub-themes in the Study 1 qualitative interviews and they have previously been discriminated in a private sector setting (Morrison & Phelps, 1999).

Overall, the CFA and correlation analyses provided further empirical evidence of the construct validity of the time, intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort. Having tested and improved the measurement models for the key constructs in my research model of discretionary work effort, the study hypotheses were then tested.

6.3.2  Testing the Research Model of Discretionary Work Effort

Table 6.8 presents the correlations, means and standard deviations for all of the study variables. All variables displayed reasonable variability as indicated by the standard deviations. Based on Cohen’s (1988) guidelines, the five perks were moderately (> .3) to strongly (> .5) positively correlated with an average correlation of .44. The three irks were moderately positively correlated with an average correlation of .32. Between the perks and irks variables, the strength of correlations varied greatly. Several perks and irks had strong correlations. This was perhaps not surprising as these constructs included two leader behaviour variables (r = -.67) and two co-worker behaviour variables (r = -.58). Monetary reward was significantly but weakly correlated with three of the five perks and one of the three irks. The average inter-correlation was .10. The four control variables (i.e. gender, age, work status and organisational tenure) were significantly correlated with at least some predictor variables and at least one facet of discretionary work effort.
Table 6.8: Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations and Scale Reliabilities

| Variables                                      | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       | 6       | 7       | 8       | 9       | 10      | 11      | 12      | 13      | 14      | 15      | 16      | 17      |
|------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Discretionary Work Time                       | .818    | .215*** | .140*** | .086*   | .133*** | .006    | .011    | .043    | -.020   | -.008   | -.009   | .062    | .183*** | -.019   | .088    | .116**  | .124*** |
| Discretionary Work Intensity                  | .291*** | (.831)  | .257*** | .360*** | .297*** | .253*** | .251*** | .184*** | .149*** | -.164***| -.131***| -.146***| -.040   | .193*** | .112**  | -.107*  | -.012   |
| Discretionary Directed Effort – Taking Charge | .194*** | .363*** | (.872)  | .385*** | .253*** | .183*** | .172*** | .201*** | .144*** | -.123***| .038    | .096*** | .150*** | .041    | .062    | .077    | .014    |
| Discretionary Directed Effort – Helping       | .124*   | .460*** | .556*** | (.774)  | .196*** | .203*** | .283*** | .207*** | .189*** | -.104***| -.058   | -.129***| -.060   | .149*** | .054    | -.084   | .024    |
| Challenging Work                              | .149**  | .384*** | .329*** | .272*** | (.892)  | .441*** | .253*** | .267*** | .361*** | -.348***| -.195***| -.187***| .147*** | .098*   | .073    | -.028   | -.017   |
| Team-oriented Leadership                      | -.018   | .287*** | .206*** | .232*** | .609*** | (.937)  | .336*** | .287*** | .427*** | -.525***| -.268***| -.247***| .035    | .109**  | -.042   | -.101*  | -.111** |
| Co-worker Support                             | .033    | .322*** | .250*** | .392*** | .365*** | .406*** | (.874)  | .209*** | .260*** | -.140***| -.466***| -.005   | .097    | .041    | -.111** | -.047   |
| Support for Flexible Work Arrangements        | .043    | .230*** | .274*** | .301*** | .393*** | .396*** | .293*** | (.743)  | .402*** | -.242***| -.138***| -.133***| .118*** | .106*   | -.035   | -.076   | -.092*  |
| Recognition for Good Performance              | -.043   | .196*** | .185*** | .246*** | .500*** | .566*** | .354*** | .539*** | (.819)  | -.314***| -.336***| -.216***| .078    | .078    | .012    | -.073   | -.122** |
| Autocratic Leader Behaviour                   | .031    | -.188***| -.131** | -.102   | -.497***| -.668***| -.267***| -.314***| -.386***| (.851)  | .218*** | .255*** | -.064   | .142*** | .006    | .057    | .068    |
| Power-orientation                             | -.012   | -.202***| .057    | -.074   | -.314***| -.380***| -.212***| -.210***| -.463***| (.790)  | .225*** | .056    | .009    | -.076   | .128**  | .057    |
| Co-worker Shirking                            | .093    | -.147***| -.112   | -.160***| -.256***| -.295***| -.578***| -.170***| -.272***| .297*** | .325*** | (.895)  | .071    | -.102*  | -.051   | .058    | .039    |
| Monetary Reward                               | .253*** | .201    | .196*** | .044    | .191*** | .054    | .047    | .176*** | .130**  | -.067   | .016    | -.138** | -.162***| .069    | .459*** | .042    |
| Gender                                        | -.034   | .229*** | .054    | .165*** | .120*   | .104    | .100    | .124*   | .100    | -.142** | -.013   | -.110   | -.202** | -.078   | -.313** | -.071   |
| Age                                           | .139**  | .137**  | .107    | .075    | .072    | -.071   | .054    | -.041   | .025    | .038    | -.091   | -.128** | -.081   | -.047   | .342*** |
| Job Status                                    | .109    | -.136** | .059    | -.094   | -.034   | -.097   | -.109   | -.099   | -.086   | .057    | .171*** | .067    | .414*** | -.313** | -.063   | .093    |
| Org. Tenure                                   | .131*** | -.015   | .023    | .011    | -.031   | -.112** | -.062   | -.122** | -.158***| .093    | .071    | .040    | .062    | -.086   | .420*** | .111    |

**MEAN** 4.35 5.95 5.58 5.82 5.33 5.27 5.46 4.81 4.69 2.50 4.20 2.72 3.03 0.40 0.84 3.80 1.67
**S.D.** 1.50 0.88 0.89 0.79 1.27 1.43 1.11 1.31 1.27 1.41 1.39 1.37 1.70 0.49 0.37 1.09 0.98

Significance test criteria: */p < .05; */p < .01; **/p < .005; ***/p < .001
Pearson correlations on the lower diagonal; Kendall’s Tau-b correlations on the upper diagonal; Construct (composite) reliabilities in parentheses along the diagonal.
* Variable correlations approximated treating variable measures as interval scales.
  * Coded as 0 = male and 1 = female.
  * Coded as 0 = part-time/casual and 1 = full-time.
The facets of discretionary work effort were mostly moderately to strongly correlated. The strongest correlation was between the two direction measures of discretionary work effort (.56). Interestingly, discretionary work intensity was more strongly correlated with the measures of discretionary directed effort (.36 for taking charge and .46 for helping) than it was with discretionary work time (.29).

There were very few significant correlations between the control variables (gender, age, job status and organisational tenure), and perks, irks, monetary reward and the facets of discretionary work effort. Organisational tenure was negatively correlated with the “recognition for good performance” perk, job status was positively correlated with the “power-orientation” irk, and gender and job status were both positively correlated with monetary reward. Age was the only control variable that was significantly correlated with any of the facet measures of discretionary work effort. This variable had a weak to moderate correlation with the intensity facet of discretionary work effort and one measure of the direction facet of discretionary work effort. Overall, these correlations suggest that the control variables are unlikely to obscure any true relationships between perks, irks, monetary reward and the facets of discretionary work effort.

As a first step in determining if Hypothesis 1 was supported, I looked at the correlations between the perks and irks and each of the facets of discretionary work effort (see Table 6.8). In Hypothesis 1 I postulated that the perks would be positively correlated and that the irks would be negative correlated with at least one facet of discretionary work effort. All five perks and all three irks were significantly correlated with at least one of the facets of discretionary work effort in their predicted directions. All five perks had a significant positive relationship with the intensity and the direction facets of discretionary work effort. These correlations were moderate. All three irks had significant negative correlations with the intensity facet of discretionary work effort and one irk was significantly negatively related to one of the measures of the direction facet of discretionary work effort. These correlations, however, were mostly relatively weak. Overall, the five perks had a stronger and more consistent relationship with discretionary work effort than the three irks. None of the perks and irks were significantly correlated with the time facet of discretionary work effort. These correlation results were consistent with Hypothesis 1. Therefore, they provided a preliminary validation of the perks and irks constructs. However, because the control variables also correlate with discretionary work effort, the regression analyses are required to provide a further test of Hypothesis 1.
6.3.2.1 Validation of the Perks and Irks

As a further test of Hypothesis 1, pairwise hierarchical regression analyses were carried out, testing the control variables and each of the perks and irks as predictors of the facets of discretionary work effort. These analyses were designed to reveal the effect of each perk and each irk on the different facets of discretionary work effort. The results of these analyses are reported in Table 6.9.

Hypothesis 1a, in which I posited that the perks variables will be positively related to at least one facet of discretionary work effort, was supported. All five perks were significantly positively related \((p<.001)\) with the intensity and direction facets of effort. After controlling for gender, age, work status and organisational tenure, each perk explained between 2.5% and 12.7% of the variation in discretionary work intensity, between 3.4% and 10.2% of variation in the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort, and between 4.9% and 14.3% of variation in the helping measure of discretionary directed effort. There was no evidence, however, of a significant relationship for any of the perks with discretionary work time. “Challenging work”, however, showed some evidence of having a marginally significant \((p<.005)\) positive relationship with discretionary work time, although this perk explained only 2.1% of the variation in the time facet of discretionary work effort compared with between 6.6% and 12.7% of the variation in the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort.

Hypothesis 1b, in which I posited that the three irks variables will be negatively related to at least one facet of discretionary work effort, was only partially supported. After controlling for gender, age, work status and organisational tenure in the regression analyses, only the “autocratic leader behaviour” irk and the “power-orientation” irk explained significant variance in the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. These two irks explained between 2.5% and 3.2% of the variation in discretionary work intensity. There was no strong evidence, however, of these irks being significantly related to the time or the direction facets of discretionary work effort. There was no evidence of “co-worker shirking” explaining significant variance in any of the facets of discretionary work effort. The findings suggested, however, a marginally significant \((p<.005)\) relationship between “co-worker shirking” and the helping measure of the direction facet of discretionary work effort although the beta coefficient and the change in R-squared were of low practical significance. Thus, while autocratic leader behaviour and power-orientation were confirmed as irks, the evidence supporting co-worker shirking as an irk was marginal.
### Table 6.9: Pairwise Regression Results – Perks and Irks on the Facets of Discretionary Work Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Control Variables</th>
<th>Discretionary Work Time</th>
<th>Discretionary Work Intensity</th>
<th>Discretionary Directed Effort (Taking Charge)</th>
<th>Discretionary Directed Effort (Helping)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>β₁</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>4.56**</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.118†</td>
<td>1.74***</td>
<td>.106†</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 Challenging Work</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>10.78**</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 Team-oriented Leadership</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3 Co-worker support</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4 Support for Flexible Work Arrangements</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5 Recognition for Good Performance</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6 Authoritarian Leader Behaviour</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 7 Co-worker shirking</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>4.60†</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 8 Power-orientation</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05;  *p < .01;  **p < .005;  ***p < .001 (n = 500)

α Step 1 beta coefficients for the control variables; β₁ = standardised beta coefficient.
In addition to validating the perceived perks and irks to test Hypothesis 1, I examined the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort. Monetary reward had a significant positive relationship with two of the four facets of discretionary work effort even after controlling for age, gender, job status and tenure (see Table 6.10). These were discretionary work time ($r = .253$, $p<.001$; $\Delta R^2 = .063$, $\Delta F = 3.71$, $p<.001$); and the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort ($r = .196$, $p<.001$; $\Delta R^2 = .059$, $\Delta F = 3.71$, $p<.001$). Monetary reward accounted for 6.3% of the variation in time facet of discretionary work effort and 5.9% of the variation in taking charge measure of the direction facet of discretionary directed effort.

In summary, all five perks and two of the three irks were significantly related to at least one facet of discretionary work effort after controlling for age, gender, job status and organisational tenure. All the significant relationships were in the predicted directions. Challenging work, team-oriented leadership, co-worker support, support for flexible work arrangements and recognition for good performance were therefore validated as perks providing support for Hypothesis 1a. Autocratic leader behaviour and power-orientation were validated as irks, and thus provided partial support for Hypothesis 1b. Thus, the overall results provided construct validation for seven of the eight non-monetary work environment characteristics investigated. In addition, monetary reward was determined to be significantly related to two of the facets of discretionary work effort.
### TABLE 6.10: Pairwise Regression Results – Monetary Reward on the Facets of Discretionary Work Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Control Variables</th>
<th>Discretionary Work Time</th>
<th>Discretionary Work Intensity</th>
<th>Discretionary Directed Effort (Taking Charge)</th>
<th>Discretionary Directed Effort (Helping)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>βₐ</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>4.56**</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.118†</td>
<td>.174***</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>.106†</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Tenure</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Monetary reward</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>3.71***</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$59,999</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$69,999</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$79,999</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000-$89,999</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000-$99,999</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$120,000</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $120,000</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1p < .05; * p < .01; ** p < .005; *** p < .001 (n = 500)

aStep 1 beta coefficients for the control variables;
bDichotomous variable - under $30,000 income as the reference group; βₛ = standardised beta coefficient.
6.3.2.2 Testing the Classification Framework for Work Environment Characteristics

This section of results focuses on the more sophisticated hypotheses about the pattern of relationships that perks, irks and monetary reward have with the different facets of discretionary work effort. It aims to validate the rational sociality framework adopted as a system for classifying different types of work environment characteristics to predict their effect on the facets of discretionary work effort. To address Hypotheses 2-4, the strength of association of the different predictor variables with the different facets of discretionary work effort was examined using the approach outlined in Section 6.2.6. Table 6.9 presents the unstandardised beta coefficients, changes in R-squared and effect size correlations for the predictor and criterion variables investigated. As noted in Section 6.2.6, only unstandardised beta coefficients can be directly compared and only when variables are measured with the same metric. Thus, only the unstandardised beta coefficients for the perks and irks variables are reported in Table 6.9 as these were measured in the same units.

As previously discussed (see Section 6.1.4), within Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework I classified perks as “intrinsic relational” work environment characteristics, irks as “instrumental relational” work environment characteristics and monetary reward as “instrumental financial” work environment characteristics. In addition, I classified the time facet of discretionary work effort as “instrumentally-oriented” and the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort as “relationally-oriented”.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that monetary reward will be more strongly related to the time facet of discretionary work effort than to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort. Looking at Table 6.11, support for this hypothesis requires the values in the upper left hand section of the table (instrumental financial/instrumentally oriented) to be larger than the values in the upper right hand sections (instrumental financial/relationally-oriented). As predicted, Table 6.11 shows that monetary reward was significantly related to discretionary work time. This variable explained 6.3% of the variation in discretionary work time (p< .001) and had a medium effect size correlation. An unpredicted outcome, however, was evidence indicating a significant association between monetary reward and the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort. This predictor accounted for almost as much variation in this measure of discretionary directed effort (5.9%) as in discretionary work time but the effect size correlation was only “small” (i.e. .1< ESr <.243).
Table 6.11: Pattern of Relationships – Perks, Irks and Monetary Reward on the Facets of Discretionary Work Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Work Environment Characteristics</th>
<th>Criterion Variable – Discretionary Work Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumentally-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary Work Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Financial Rewards</td>
<td>$\beta_u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational (Irks)</td>
<td>Autocratic Leader Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-worker Shirking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power-orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Challenging Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational (Perks)</td>
<td>Co-worker Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team-oriented Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\beta_u$ = unstandardised beta coefficients – NB: The beta coefficients are not reported for monetary rewards as this variable was treated as a 10 category dichotomous variable. This different metric precludes direct comparison of the beta coefficients for monetary rewards with the other variables.

Significance criteria for $\Delta R^2$:  
@ $p < .05$  
* $p < .01$  
** $p < .005$  
*** $p < .001$

ESr* = Effect size correlation using cut-off r-criteria:  
@ small = $r > .1$  
** medium = $r > .243$  
*** large = $r > .371$
Therefore, as postulated, the relationship between monetary reward and the time facet of discretionary work effort was stronger than with the other facets of discretionary work effort. Thus, there is support for Hypothesis 2 indicating that “instrumental financial” work environment characteristics have a stronger relationship with the instrumentally-oriented facet of discretionary work effort than with relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort.

Hypothesis 3 posited that the perks and irks will be more strongly related to discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort than to discretionary work time. As predicted, the perks and irks (in the rows labelled instrumental relational and intrinsic relational in Table 6.11) showed stronger measures of association with the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort than with the time facet. Under the ‘statistical testing approach’ (see Section 6.2.6, pp.254-256), 17 (71%) of the 24 relationships tested between perks, irks and the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort were statistically significant. In addition, under the ‘effect size correlation criteria approach’ (see Section 6.2.6, p. 256), 22 (92%) of the 24 relationships examined between perks, irks and the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort had at least a “small” effect (.1 < ESr < .243) and nearly half had “medium” (.243 < ESr < .371) to “large” (ESr > .371) effects. In comparison, there was little evidence suggesting that these relationally-oriented work environment characteristics were related to discretionary work time. None of the 8 relationships between perks and irks and the time facet of discretionary work effort was statistically significant under the statistical testing approach, and only 1 (12.5%) of these 8 relationships had a “small” effect size under the effect size correlation criteria approach. Thus, this evidence appears to lend substantial support to Hypothesis 3 indicating that “relational” work environment characteristics (i.e. perks and irks) have a stronger relationship with relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. intensity and direction) than with instrumentally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. time).

Hypothesis 4 postulated that the perks will be more strongly associated with discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort than will the irks. Looking at the middle and bottom rows and the right hand column headed relationally-oriented of Table 6.11, the values for the perks are consistently larger and have more statistically significant relationships than the values for the irks. While all of the analyses involving the perks have at least a “small” effect size correlation (.1 < ESr < .243) and two-thirds of these are “medium” (.243 < ESr < .371) to “large” (ESr > .371), two of the relationships involving the irks does not meet even the “small” effect size r-criteria (i.e. ESr < .1) and the remaining effect size
correlations are “small” (.1 < ESr < .243). Furthermore, all the beta coefficients for the perks were statistically significant at p< .001 and these predictors explained between 2.5% and 14.3% of the variances in the relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort. In contrast, only two of the nine beta coefficients for the irks were statistically significant at p< .001. The sizes of these beta coefficients and changes in R-squared were generally small and of low practical significance. The strongest associations amongst this class of work environment characteristics were between power-orientation and discretionary work intensity (βu = -.116; ΔR² = .032; p< .001; ESr = small) and autocratic leader behaviour and discretionary work intensity (βu = -.102; ΔR² = .025; p< .001; ESr = small). Thus, this pattern of relationships supports Hypothesis 4 indicating that “intrinsic relational” work environment characteristics (i.e. perks) have a stronger relationship with relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. intensity and direction) than do the “instrumental relational” work environment characteristics (i.e. irks).

Overall, the two different approaches used to assess the strength of association between the predictor and criterion variables and the general pattern of relationships seemed to provide highly consistent results. Groups of variables with a large number of statistically significant relationships, higher beta weights and large changes in R-squared generally matched the effect size correlations that met the r-criteria cut-offs for medium and strong effects. The exception was in the findings of the analyses for autocratic leader behaviour and co-worker shirking, where the two approaches yielded different results. As reported in Table 6.11, under the significance testing approach, autocratic leader behaviour had a non-significant relationship (βu = -.046; ΔR² = .006; p> .05) with the helping measure of discretionary directed effort. Yet, under the effect size correlation approach, this irk had a “small” effect (.1< ESr < .243) rather than “no effect” (ESr <.1). Similarly, under the significance testing approach using p< .001, co-worker shirking was not consistently related to any facet measures of discretionary work effort. The strongest association was with the helping measure of discretionary directed effort. Under the effect size correlation approach, however, co-worker shirking had a “small” effect on the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort. The general pattern of relationships was one in which the five perks had larger beta weights, larger changes in R-squared, more statistically significant relationships and larger effect size correlations than the other predictors, across all facets of discretionary work effort except the time facet. As predicted, monetary reward (classified as an instrumental financial work environment characteristic) was the most important predictor of the time facet of discretionary work effort. Collectively, the Study 3 findings appeared to offer preliminary support for the social rationality
framework as a system for classifying different types of work environment characteristics to predict their effect on discretionary work effort.

6.3.2.3 Moderation Effects of Perks and Irks on Monetary Rewards

To test the moderation effects of perks and irks on the monetary reward-discretionary work effort relationship posited in Hypotheses 5a and 5b, two sets of moderated regression analyses were run. In model 1, after entering the control variables and the composite perks and the monetary reward variables into the model, the interaction between composite perks and monetary reward was tested for each of the facets of discretionary work effort. In model 2, after entering the control variables and the composite irks and the monetary reward variables into the model, the interaction between composite irks and monetary reward was tested for each of the facets of discretionary work effort. Table 6.12 summarises the results of these analyses. As can be seen in Step 3 of each of these models, no significant interaction effects were evident for any of the facet measures of discretionary work effort. However, as Hair et al. (2010) suggested that higher-order factors should be used only in testing relationships with constructs of the same level of abstraction, I carried out further analyses to check that these findings were reliable. In these analyses, the interaction effects were tested with the first-order perks and irks measures rather than the composite perks and irks measures. The results of these analyses were consistent with those reported in Table 6.12 for the composite perks-monetary reward interaction and for the composite irks-monetary reward interaction, in that none of the interaction effects were statistically significant. Thus, neither hypothesis 5a nor 5b was supported.
### TABLE 6.12: Interaction Results – Composite Perks, Composite Irks and Monetary Reward on Discretionary Work Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Discretionary Work Time</th>
<th>Discretionary Work Intensity</th>
<th>Discretionary Directed Effort (Taking Charge)</th>
<th>Discretionary Directed Effort (Helping)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1:</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>ΔF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 – Control Variables</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>4.56**</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>11.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 – Composite Perks</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>3.34***</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>8.03***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 – Composite Perks x</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>2.35***</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>5.99***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td><strong>R² and F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2:</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>4.56**</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>11.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 – Control Variables</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>3.65***</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>2.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 – Composite Irks</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Reward</td>
<td><strong>R² and F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Model – <strong>R² and F</strong></td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>2.58***</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>3.62***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05      ** p < .01       *** p < .001       n = 500
6.4 DISCUSSION

The empirical findings outlined in the previous sections improve our understanding of the nature of perks and irks and their relationship with discretionary work effort, as well as the differing nature of the facets of discretionary work effort. All five perks and two of the three irks were confirmed to be significantly related to discretionary work effort, thereby validating their construct validity. Perks and irks, as well as monetary reward, contributed to discretionary work effort. Furthermore, different classes of work environment characteristics (perks, irks and monetary reward) were found to have unique patterns of relationships with the various facets of discretionary work effort as posited by the rational sociality framework. Also, neither perks nor irks were found to moderate the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort. In the following discussion I examine some of the most significant findings in greater detail to identify how they extend our understanding of the relationship between work environment characteristics and discretionary work effort.

“Intrinsic Relational” Work Environment Characteristics

As predicted, perks (the “intrinsic relational” work environment characteristics) were most strongly related to the relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (the intensity and direction facets). My research findings suggest that perks do involve primary relationships in that they were more strongly related to discretionary work effort than either the “instrumental relational” (irks) or the “instrumental financial” (monetary reward) classes of work environment characteristics which were posited to involve secondary relationships. Therefore this finding provides the first known empirical test of Ash’s rational sociality framework and his notion of primary and secondary relationships in a work context.

It is worth noting that within the “intrinsic relational” class of work environment characteristics, the variance explained by each perk in the analyses with the relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort varied substantially. Overall, “challenging work” and “co-worker support” were more strongly related to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort than the other three perks. “Team-oriented leadership” was most strongly related with the intensity facet of discretionary work effort, and the organisational characteristics of “support for flexible work arrangements” and “recognition for good performance” were most strongly related to the direction facet of discretionary work effort. Thus, these research findings further extend the literature on discretionary work effort by providing greater insight to specifically how these different perks affect discretionary work effort. Given the strength and
relative pervasiveness of the effects of challenging work and co-worker support on discretionary work effort, these two perks are perhaps most worthy of further comment.

The challenging work perk had the strongest and most pervasive relationship with the facets of discretionary work effort. While this perk was most strongly related to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort, it also had a marginally significant (p=.001) positive relationship with the time facet although the effect size correlation was small. Finding challenging work to be strongly related to discretionary work effort is consistent with my Study 1 qualitative interview findings where challenging work attracted a large amount of comment from a very broad group of participants. It was amongst the top three perks and irks sub-themes identified in this earlier study (see Chapter 4). In their comments about this perk, the study participants talked about challenging work providing them with a “sense of achievement” and a feeling of “self-satisfaction”. Also, in Study 2 work that provides opportunities to use one’s skills and abilities, to be creative and to use one’s own initiative, and is personally interesting was identified in the Q-sort-type procedure as a very strong perk for a high percentage of study participants.

Both Herzberg’s (2003 [1968]) two-factor theory and the job characteristics model (Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1980) emphasise the importance of intrinsic job characteristics in work motivation. Challenging work demands mental and/or physical effort to meet the challenges the job presents. It also provides employees with the opportunity and freedom to use their own initiative, skills and abilities to solve work related problems and to seek new and better ways of undertaking tasks (Organ et al., 2006), thereby promoting personal growth and development, achievement and self-actualisation (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Herzberg, 2003 [1968]; Maslow, 1954; Parker et al., 2001). This motivates the employee to invest a high level of discretionary work effort. My research findings indicate that this extra effort is largely in the form of greater work intensity and effort directed towards taking charge behaviour. The strong relationship found between challenging work and the taking charge measure of the direction facet of discretionary work effort is also consistent with prior empirical research (Amabile et al., 1996; Frese et al., 2006; Frese et al., 1996; Hornsby et al., 2002; Ohly et al., 2006). My research extends this prior work by more explicitly identifying that this extra effort is invested across all the facets of discretionary work effort, although only modestly for discretionary work time.

While co-worker support was most strongly related to the helping measure of discretionary directed effort, it also had a relatively strong and significant relationship with discretionary work intensity and the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort.
According to the norms of reciprocity, help and support received from co-workers will be reciprocated in some unspecified way and time by the recipient of that support. Bishop, Scott and Burroughs (2000), however, contended that employees distinguish between support that comes from different sources and respond by directing their attitudes and work behaviours accordingly. In addition, social exchange theorists suggest that if the support received from others is provided voluntarily then it is more highly valued (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Since discretionary directed effort is a voluntary work behaviour, this might be expected to reinforce the tendency for employees to reciprocate co-worker support by specifically directing effort towards helping co-workers, thereby strengthening the relationship between co-worker support and discretionary work effort. My finding that co-worker support has the strongest relationship with helping others is consistent with these views and prior ERB research on this form of discretionary directed effort (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1996a). However, it also extends this prior work by indicating that while the reciprocation of the support from co-workers is most strongly directed towards those who provide that support through discretionary directed effort, there is also a broader investment of extra effort into other facets of discretionary work effort. This extra effort may not specifically benefit the source of the support received but is likely to benefit the organisation and/or other members of the work group.

“Instrumental Relational” Work Environment Characteristics

In looking at the pattern of relationships between irks (the “instrumental relational” work environment characteristics) and the relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort, there were also some interesting findings. As predicted, irks were most strongly related to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort. However as predicted by the rational sociality framework, their relationships were considerably weaker and less pervasive in their effect on discretionary work effort than perks. This outcome suggests that irks do involve secondary rather than primary relationships. “Autocratic leader behaviour” and “power-orientation” were, however, the only two irks significantly related to discretionary work effort and this relationship was with the intensity facet. In contrast, “co-worker shirking” only had a marginally significant relationship (p=.003) with the helping measure of the direction facet of discretionary work effort. Given the paucity of prior research on these irks, my findings provide some important and useful insights to how these negative work environment characteristics relate to discretionary work effort.

As previously mentioned, while irks should theoretically decrease discretionary work effort, in practice they are reported to have a fairly limited effect. This outcome is contrary to
Amabile et al.'s (2004) suggestion that negative leader behaviour may have a more potent effect on employee work behaviour than positive leader behaviour. It is also contrary to my findings in Study 1 in which I concluded that negative leader behaviours are potentially more important than positive leader behaviours in affecting discretionary work effort (see Chapter 4). The weak effect of irks on discretionary work effort, however, is consistent with Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework and his notion of secondary relationships. As posited, irks represent negative relationships between the employee and the organisation and/or its members. Thus, when employees are in a negative relationship, rational self-interest dominates work effort decisions rather than social self-interest. Employees are less likely to respond to negative relationships by lowering discretionary work effort because they are aware that this may have negative consequences on their current work environment and/or their future employability (Gould-Williams, 2007; Organ, 1990; Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2003). Thus, they continue to behave in a way that maximises personal gain.

Gould-Williams (2007) reported that for a sample of local government employees negative leader relationships were unrelated to discretionary work effort. In his research, however, discretionary work effort was measured by helping behaviour which is a form of the direction facet of discretionary work effort. Consistent with Gould-Williams findings, I also found autocratic leader behaviour was not significantly related to the helping measure of discretionary work effort. However, my research findings revealed that negative relationships between employees and their leader (autocratic leader behaviour) as well as between employees and their organisation (power-orientation) are related to the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. Therefore, my research extends this prior work by providing greater insight to how employees might respond in situations where they have negative work relationships.

The fact that irks were found to be related to the intensity facet but not the direction facet of discretionary work effort suggests that employees may respond to negative relationship exchanges in more subtle ways to minimise detection and thereby protect their personal self-interest. This possibility is consistent with the rational sociality framework in that in a secondary relationship, rational self-interest dominates decision-making to maximise personal gain. Discretionary work intensity is, perhaps arguably, less detectable than the more observable direction facet of relationally-oriented discretionary work effort and so can be decreased by small amounts without detection. The effect size correlations and the explained variances in discretionary work effort explained by autocratic leader behaviour and power-orientation
indicated that the effect on discretionary work intensity is significant though relatively small which supports this contention.

The potential irk that displayed an unexpected pattern of relationship with discretionary work effort was co-worker shirking. Overall, this irk had small effect sizes with the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort but only a marginally significant relationship with the helping measure of discretionary directed effort. The possibility of a true relationship between co-worker shirking and the helping measure of discretionary work effort was supported by the findings of the qualitative interviews in Study 1 in which several participants reported that even though they may keep their own work effort in terms of time and intensity the same or even increase it to compensate for shirking co-workers, they were more inclined to not help those members of their work group who shirk. Nevertheless, the non-significant and small effect size relationship between co-worker shirking and discretionary work effort found in Study 3 brings into question whether or not this predictor meets the criteria for this variable to be classified as an irk.

The questionable relationship between co-worker shirking and discretionary work effort may reflect the competing effects the “social compensation effect” (Williams & Karau, 1991) and the “sucker effect” (Kerr, 1983) of co-worker shirking reported in the literature (see Chapter 2). That is, employees may hold different beliefs about co-worker shirking reflecting these two different views, and thus, these beliefs may function as moderators of the co-worker-discretionary work effort relationship. The Study 1 findings support this notion in that the interview participants reported a mix of responses to co-worker shirking that included both increasing their own level of discretionary work effort (the social compensation effect) and lowering their own level of discretionary work effort (the sucker effect). Since both effects may be present in a group of employees, the overall effect on discretionary work effort is neutral or small as found in Study 3. In this situation, co-worker shirking would only function as an irk when the “sucker effect” is dominant for people. On the other hand, given the fairly marginal significance and relatively small size of the co-worker shirking effect, these results may simply indicate that there is no true association between co-worker shirking and discretionary work effort. This idea was also evident in the Study 1 findings, in that another group of participants reported not varying their level of discretionary work effort at all in response to co-worker shirking. Taken together, these findings suggest that co-worker shirking is unlikely to be a common irk but that it may function as an idiosyncratic irk. Therefore, this is an area of research that warrants further investigation.
“Instrumental Financial” Work Environment Characteristics

As predicted, monetary reward (the “instrumental financial” work environment characteristics) had a stronger association with the instrumentally-oriented facet of discretionary work effort (i.e. time) than with the relationally-oriented facets of discretionary work effort (i.e. intensity and direction). Monetary reward, however, only explained a reasonably small amount of variance in discretionary work time (6.3%) although it was found to have a moderate effect size correlation with the time facet.

This relatively low level of explained variance in discretionary work time might reflect the context in which my research was conducted (Johns, 2006). Local government has tight financial and legal constraints relative to the private sector. Thus, it is more limited in its capacity to offer sizeable financial incentives that the efficiency wage theory predicts should increase discretionary work such as above-market wages. Another explanation for this relatively small effect is constraints imposed by organisations like overtime bans or work-life balance policies that might restrict the hours worked (Philip, Slater, & Harvie, 2005). This would reduce the ability of monetary reward to affect discretionary work time. In line with this idea, some researchers have previously questioned the degree to which work time is actually discretionary time (Clarkberg & Moen, 2001; Kahn & Lang, 1991; 1992; Maume & Bellas, 2001; Shank, 1986; Spencer, 2003).

Given the extreme labour shortages in Western Australia at the time that my research was conducted, however, restrictive organisational policies and financial constraints seem an unlikely explanation for this finding. My research finding, however, is consistent with a study conducted by Idson and Robins (1991). These authors reported that while monetary incentives significantly increase voluntary hours worked (i.e. discretionary work time) the effect is not quantitatively large. They concluded that employees’ supply of discretionary work time is fairly insensitive to monetary reward. These findings were for a sample of private sector employees which supports my belief that my finding is unlikely to be related to the industry sector chosen for my research. The idea of employees being relatively insensitive to monetary reward is also consistent with evidence suggesting that employees are “time poor” due to a time-squeeze from non-work demands (Clarkberg & Moen, 2001) that create personal constraints on the ability of employees to voluntarily supply more time even when higher monetary reward is offered. Time pressures from non-work demands increase the monetary value of time for employees and so employers would need to offer substantially more monetary reward to induce them to work extra time. Thus, employees become less sensitive to increases in monetary reward.
Another factor that may have contributed to this finding is how monetary reward was measured in my research. The measure used may have been too broad to adequately detect the extent of relationship between monetary reward and the time facet of discretionary work effort.

My findings on the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work time, however, is generally consistent with the predictions of the rational sociality framework in which I posited that this work environment characteristic involves a secondary relationship. Being principally motivated by instrumental considerations, monetary reward should have a weaker relationship with discretionary work effort than perks because of its indirect influence on employee behaviour. While a direct comparison between these two types of work environment characteristics is not appropriate as they have been measured in different units, the findings appear broadly indicative of monetary reward having a weaker relationship than perks in terms of the relative size of explained variance in discretionary work effort by these variables.

One unexpected finding was the significant relationship between monetary reward and the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort. One reason for this finding might be that higher monetary reward creates a greater sense of obligation or felt responsibility for taking charge at work. Drawing on expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), Morrison and Phelps (1999) argued that the employee’s expectancy of success and their evaluation of the costs and benefits of change-oriented work behaviour are the mediating processes through which felt responsibility is linked to initiative taking. Felt responsibility has been cited in prior research as being related to personal initiative behaviour which is a form of discretionary directed effort (Frese et al., 1996; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). However, to the best of my knowledge no prior research has tested the relationship between monetary reward and the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort or between monetary reward and felt responsibility. Thus, felt responsibility may be a plausible mediator between monetary reward and this direction facet of discretionary work effort and so warrants further investigation.

Another possible explanation for this finding is that this facet of discretionary work effort is affected by a “mixed motive” class work environment characteristics (Ash, 2000). That is, a combination of “intrinsic relational” and “instrumental financial” work environment characteristics may promote the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort with neither factor dominating. The decision to “take charge” may be influenced by relational considerations as well as instrumental financial considerations. For example, an employee might try to improve the way that things are done within his/her work area or within the organisation as a means of reciprocating the support provided by his/her leader. Alternatively, an employee
may feel obligated to take charge to improve the way that things are done within his/her work area or within the organisation out of a sense of obligation because the organisation is compensating him/her financially beyond what might be expected for the job being performed. Either way, the employee may be motivated to take charge for a combination of instrumental considerations like improving his/her opportunity for future advancement in which case rational self-interest underlies the decision to invest discretionary work effort in the form of taking charge, as well as intrinsic relational considerations like reciprocating the support provided by his/her leader or organisation. No theory or prior empirical evidence could be found to suggest which alternative explanation may be more plausible. Either explanation appears to be consistent with the rational sociality framework and so seems possible. Therefore, both of these competing explanations seem worthy of further investigation.

*Moderation Effects of Perks and Irks*

Neither perks nor irks were found to moderate the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort. These findings are contrary to the crowding-out (and crowding-in) theory of motivation posed by Frey (1993; 1997) for which there is prior empirical support. While my research results suggest that monetary reward has an independent, though small, effect on the discretionary work effort, other explanations may be possible.

One possibility is that the measures I used to represent a perceived supportive work environment (i.e. the level of perks) and a perceived controlling work environment (i.e. the level of irks) may not have appropriately tapped these constructs as conceived by Frey. Here I assumed that in a work environment high in perks, higher monetary reward would be seen as a supportive act by the organisation while in a work environment high in irks higher monetary reward would be seen as a controlling act by the organisation. Frey suggested, however, that because these conditions are formulated in terms of subjective perceptions, what is perceived as controlling or supportive may differ across individuals. Therefore, it may be necessary to use objective measures of conditions under which these perceptions typically arise (Frey, 1997). In addition, Frey noted that a crowding-out effect is not necessarily pervasive and that its occurrence may be affected by other factors such as the initial level of intrinsic work motivation and the extent to which an intervention is differentiated between employees. Thus, the omission of some of these contingency factors could have contributed to the lack of evidence of any significant moderation effects.
**Discretionary Work Effort Measure**

Another interesting and notable outcome of Study 3 that was not specifically addressed as part of my research model or the hypothesised relationships, was the substantially lower average score (4.35) for discretionary work time (based on the same Likert scale) and the far fewer significant relationships between this facet of discretionary work effort and the predictors. The pattern and strength of correlations between the predictor variables and the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort in my research were comparable with those reported by Brown and Leigh (1996). Amongst the non-monetary work environment characteristics investigated as predictors of discretionary work effort by these researchers were management support, recognition and challenge. These constructs are similar to the measures of team-oriented leadership, recognition for good performance and challenging work that I investigated. While Brown and Leigh’s study participants were salespeople, they too found that the predictors had fewer and weaker significant correlations with the time facet than with the intensity facet of discretionary work effort. Brown and Leigh’s correlations were also of a similar magnitude to those found in my study. In combination, their findings and mine are consistent with the view mentioned previously that work time may be subjected to more constraints, and thus, less discretionary in nature than other facets of discretionary work such as intensity and direction. It is also more measurable and perhaps more visible than these other facets of discretionary work effort. The constraints on work time may operate not only within the workplace but also externally, when non-work demands on time prevent employees from spending longer hours at work. Nevertheless, my findings suggest that even within these constraints, the management of work environment characteristics can enable the organisation to have some effect on the time employees invest in their work.

**Concluding Comments**

In conclusion, the more qualitative approach taken to test the hypotheses in my model of discretionary work effort introduced an element of subjectivity into the findings. Thus, the conclusions drawn from my research should be viewed as tentative. It is recognised that a more sophisticated form of analysis, perhaps employing one of the newly emerging analytical techniques for evaluating the relative effect of predictors (Johnson & LeBreton, 2004), is warranted in future evaluations of this classification framework to confirm its usefulness as a classification system. This future research however, needs to ensure that a common metric is used for all variables to allow valid comparisons of the relative importance of the predictors of discretionary work effort.
This research makes several contributions in advancing the literature on discretionary work effort. Firstly, it provides us with an enhanced understanding of what constitutes perks and irks and their broad pattern of motivational effect on the different facets of discretionary work effort. Perks and irks, although not explicitly represented in employment contracts, form an employee’s non-pecuniary compensation for the job (Douglas, 1989; Mosca et al., 2007). They have the potential to attract, retain and motivate employees. Traditional status perks (Budman, 1994; Feig, 2004; Lissy, 1991) have taken the form of indirect financial and non-monetary (mostly tangible) rewards as a measure to attract and retain good employees. However, there is a class of perks called “soft perks” that has emerged in the popular management literature (Budman, 1994). These are more broadly based and aim to improve employee productivity. My research provides an expanded understanding of what perks employees commonly seek and what irks they wish to avoid. It also provides empirical evidence of the motivating potential of these perks and irks, and thus, the practical importance of this area of research.

An important theoretical contribution of my research lies in differentiating three the facets of discretionary work effort – time, intensity and direction. In adopting a multidisciplinary approach, I was able to distinguish these three facets of discretionary work effort. To the best of my knowledge, I carried out the first research that has combined these three facets of discretionary work effort in the same study and demonstrated that they can be empirically and practically differentiated. The relatively weak and non-significant correlations between the predictor variables and some facets of discretionary work effort, reinforced by the differential pattern of relationships found in the regression analyses and the effect size correlation analysis, indicates the importance of conceptually and practically distinguishing these facets of discretionary work effort (Briggs & Cheek, 1986).

Much of the prior research evidence on the effect of work environment characteristics on discretionary work effort has focussed on the determinants of the direction facet. There has been much less research on the effects of work environment characteristics on the time and intensity facets. Therefore, a further theoretical contribution of my research is that it addressed this gap in the literature by providing greater detail and insight to how different types of work environment characteristics relate to all of the facets of discretionary work effort. Furthermore, it has added to the rather limited empirical research on work environment characteristics involving negative work relationships like autocratic leader behaviour, co-worker shirking and power-orientation. Also, investigating perks and irks as well as monetary reward simultaneously...
to examine how they relate to the different facet measures of discretionary work effort, was another distinguishing feature of my research.

Furthermore, this study provides the first known empirical test of the rational sociality framework. This framework offers a system for understanding how to manage each facet of discretionary work effort. For example, if an organisation is concerned about improving the intensity or direction facets of discretionary work effort (as opposed, say, to the time facet), this framework and my findings imply that it should focus on strengthening the perks in the work environment, in particular, providing challenging work and fostering co-worker support.

The other important practical implication of this research lies in delineating the unique contribution of perks, irks and monetary reward. The study found that perks, irks and monetary reward are each uniquely associated with the different facets of discretionary work effort. This finding implies that if organisations wish to maximise employees’ contribution to the organisation, they need to pay attention to all three elements of the employees’ work environment. Therefore, this framework for classifying work environment characteristics was a first step towards providing managers with a system for identifying ways they might motivate particular facets of discretionary work effort.

A further contribution relates to the research context in which my research was conducted. Most prior discretionary work effort research has been undertaken in the private sector. How well these findings transfer to the public sector was not well known or understood. My research suggests that public sector employees are motivated to invest discretionary work effort by many of the same work environment characteristics as private sector employees. With the exception of the “public service” perk that emerged in Study 1 but was not tested in subsequent studies due to its idiosyncratic nature, all of the other work environment characteristics tested as perks and irks appeared reasonably consistent with prior research findings for private organisations. In addition, it revealed that public sector employees conceptualise discretionary work effort in a way that is consistent with how this construct has been conceptualised and measured for research in private sector organisations.

6.6 STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

6.6.1 Study Limitations

Two limitations of this study that should be noted were the cross-sectional research design and the use of self-report measures. Being a cross-sectional study, this research was unable to demonstrate causality of relationships. Thus, the direction of the relationships found
can only be theorised. Furthermore, measuring the predictor and criterion variables at the same
time and from the same source creates potential for common method bias to affect the observed
relationships. Due to the type of questions asked in my research, a possible source of common
method bias is social desirability. This refers to “the tendency for some people to respond to
items more as a result of their social acceptability than their true feelings” (Podsakoff et al.,
2003, p.882). Social desirability can produce spurious relationships between variables or act as a
suppressor variable to conceal a relationship. In my research employees were asked to report
how hard they work thereby reflecting their work ethic. Thus, their answers might be influenced
by social desirability. Several procedural measures suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2003) were
used to try to minimise this possibility. These included protecting participant anonymity, stating
there are no right or wrong answers in the cover story in the questionnaire and encouraging
honest answers to all questions although these measures cannot ensure unbiased responses.
While the results of the Harman’s one-factor test conducted suggested that common method
variance was not having a strong effect on the data, this technique can neither eliminate the
problem nor ensure the trustworthiness of this data (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff & Organ,
1986). Thus, any future research that replicates this study should either obtain some measures
from separate sources, or at least collect the measures of the predictor variables and
discretionary work effort at different times (Podsakoff et al., 2003) to provide a more rigorous
test of these relationships.

Also, this study has mainly examined direct relationships between the predictor
variables and discretionary work effort and not the processes through which these relationships
may operate. This may have been a factor contributing to some of the small effect sizes and non-
significant results found. There is, therefore, a need to further develop the model of
discretionary work effort tested in my research to build in greater complexity by representing
potential mediators and/or other moderators. For example, in most analyses co-worker shirking
was only found to have a marginally significant negative relationship with the direction facet of
discretionary work effort. One interesting question that arises from this finding is whether an
employee’s work ethic or attitude towards hard work moderates how he/she responds to co-
worker shirking. This may be an alternative moderator variable to employee beliefs on co-
worker shirking suggested by the social compensation effect previously mentioned.

Another factor that may have influenced the findings of this study is the industry sector
selected. Generally, local government does not have, and is usually unable to provide, a broad
range of financial incentives beyond standard wage/salary income as a motivator. This may have
restricted the range of the monetary reward variable, and thereby limited my ability to test the full extent to which monetary rewards influence discretionary work effort. A comparative study investigating perks, irks, monetary reward and the facets of discretionary work effort in a private sector setting is needed to address this issue and improve the generalisability of my findings. Also, in my research I used total income (base pay as well as overtime pay, bonuses and so forth) to measure monetary reward which represents a fairly crude measure of financial incentives. Total income did not allow me to differentiate between base pay which buys an agreed amount of an employee’s time and extra pay offered to motivate the employee to supply extra hours. This limitation of the data may explain the relatively small effect of monetary reward found and why some of the measured effects were not as predicted.

A final concern with this study was the response rate although this seemed fairly typical of many organisational surveys. While several measures were used to try to maximise the response rate to the survey, I was only able to get about one-quarter of the sample to respond. This may have been partly attributable to the length of the questionnaire and high demands on employee time resulting from heavy workloads brought about by labour shortages at the time that my research was undertaken. However, the preliminary analyses that I carried out on the data, comparing participant responses to questions for organisations with a higher response rate and organisations with a lower response rate suggested that this issue did not affect the representativeness of the data.

### 6.6.2 Directions for Further Research

This program of research, in that it represents a new approach to understanding work environment characteristics, offers ample opportunities for further research. One obvious opportunity is to examine a wider range of perks and irks by relaxing the “common perception” criteria to consider perks and irks that are more idiosyncratic. The decision to focus on those perks and irks that were common to most employees was made in order to provide a manageable scope for this research. However, other perks and irks are still likely to have an important effect on discretionary work effort, even if they are not common in their effects.

It follows that we also need to explore potential moderators of the effects of perks and irks on the facets of discretionary work effort. This possibility was suggested by the Study 2 findings (Chapter 5) where differences in perceptions of perks and irks were found based on the gender and job type of the study participants. Also, in Study 1 (Chapter 4), several interviewees commented that their own work ethic reduced the effect of irks on their level of discretionary work effort.
work effort. While this finding was not reported in the results of Study 1 because individual characteristics were not a focus of the research, this possibility is evident in the comments in the qualitative interviews. Thus, rather than controlling for these variables, they may be examined as potential moderator variables in influencing discretionary work effort and its facets.

Also, as previously suggested, by identifying mediators of these relationships we would develop a better understanding of the mechanisms through which perks and irks influence discretionary work. For example, I previously noted that the marginally significant relationship found between co-worker shirking and the direction facet of discretionary work effort suggests that this potential irk warrants further investigation. According to the “social compensation effect” of perceived loafing (Williams & Karau, 1991), work group members may feel obligated to compensate for the weaker group member/s who shirk. Thus, felt responsibility might be investigated as a potential mediator of the relationship between co-worker shirking and the helping measure of the direction facet of discretionary directed effort. I also previously suggested that felt responsibility might mediate the relationship between monetary reward and the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort to explain the unexpected outcome between these two variables.

Another interesting area for further research that arises from the findings relates to the relatively low sensitivity of the time facet of discretionary work effort to monetary reward. As previously suggested, amongst the factors that could be investigated as potential moderators of the monetary reward-discretionary work time relationship are non-work demands on time, the visibility of time, and organisational policies and practices like restrictions on overtime or work-life balance policies that would constrain discretionary work time. This investigation could be extended to include a more refined measure of monetary reward than was employed in my research and by investigating the monetary reward-discretionary work time relationship in an industry sector in which scope of financial incentives are less constrained.

In summary, Study 3 refined and validated the measurement models for perks, irks and discretionary work effort. It also validated the five perks and two of the three irks that emerged from Study 1 and Study 2. In testing my model of discretionary work effort, the differential pattern of relationships between the different classes of work environment characteristics and the different facet measures of discretionary work effort appeared to fit the posited rational sociality classification framework.
Chapter 7

Discussion and Conclusion

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The central purpose of my program of research was to examine the role of non-monetary work environment characteristics (called perks and irks) and monetary reward as drivers of discretionary work effort. For the purpose of this research, perks (short for perquisites) were defined as the positive non-monetary work environment characteristics. Irks (short for irksome working conditions) were defined as the negative non-monetary work environment characteristics.

This research had two primary objectives. The first objective was to identify what employees commonly perceive as perks and irks and to develop measures for these constructs. The second objective was to test a new motivational model of discretionary work effort. Specifically, I addressed three research questions: (1) What non-monetary work environment characteristics do employees commonly perceive as perks and irks?; (2) How do perks, irks and monetary reward relate to the level of discretionary work effort?; and (3) Do perks and irks moderate the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort? A further question that emerged during my program of research was “Are there different classes of work environment characteristics that relate differentially to the different facets of discretionary work effort?” This was considered in conjunction with the second research question.

From a theoretical perspective, this research arose from an identified need in the literature for new theory development in work motivation to better understand the determinants of discretionary work effort in the contemporary workplace (see Chapter 1). As discretionary work effort is known to positively affect individual performance as well as organisational efficiency and effectiveness (Akerlof, 1984; Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Latham, 2007; Leibenstein, 1966; 1979; Organ, 1988), a more complete understanding of what motivates employees to supply discretionary work effort is of critical importance for enhancing organisational competitiveness and sustainability. From a more practical perspective, this program of research aimed to address concerns raised that too little is being done by managers to increase the discretionary work effort of their employees by providing a basis for
identifying strategies for managers to maximise the potential of their human resources. My program of research comprised three inter-related studies which together advance our understanding of how different types of work environment characteristics affect discretionary work effort.

This chapter draws together the key findings of my program of research from these three studies. It commences with an overview of the key activities that comprised my research. This is followed by a discussion the main research results and the contributions that this program of research makes to the literature by explaining how our understanding of discretionary work effort and its determinants are enhanced. Here, I also consider how this research makes a much needed contribution to public sector motivational research. I then consider the practical implications of this research. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the research limitations and further research directions before drawing some final conclusions.

7.2 OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

My program of research comprised four key activities. As a first step towards identifying common perks and irks, I extensively reviewed the literature on discretionary work effort from organisational behaviour (OB), labour economics, workaholism and corporate entrepreneurship to identify non-monetary work environment characteristics that should influence discretionary work effort. In this review I also brought together the economics and OB literatures on discretionary work effort to refine our understanding of this important construct. This multi-disciplinary review of the literature enabled the development of a more comprehensive definition of the discretionary work effort concept and provided a more complete list of potentially important perks and irks for the research.

The literature review provided a structure for conducting the second stage of my research. This involved an exploratory qualitative study using interviews with a small sample of employees to explore their experiences of high and low discretionary work effort and what they perceived to be the perks and irks driving that effort. By using a qualitative methodology in this study, I was able to gain a deeper understanding of those non-monetary work environment characteristics perceived to be most important. This data also provided valuable information that could be triangulated with the findings of the two quantitative studies that followed. This first study also explored employee perceptions of the meaning of discretionary work effort. Morrison (1994) argued that to be able to explain what drives discretionary work effort, we must understand how employees define what is discretionary and what is non-discretionary as this is
an important factor that affects their work behaviour. This study largely confirmed the perks and irks identified from the literature. It also provided an understanding of how public sector employees define discretionary work effort and confirmed the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort as comprising the three facets of time, intensity and direction. This allowed me to expand my research model to more clearly define its variables. Chapter 4 provides a detailed discussion of this study and its findings.

Next, a second study aimed at developing measures of these perks and irks was conducted. This quantitative study checked the convergent and discriminant validities of the perks and irks constructs and refined them in preparation for testing my research model of discretionary work effort. This study also tested and confirmed that the time, intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort could be empirically discriminated. This second study built upon the first one by delineating those non-monetary work environment characteristics that employees perceive to positively and negatively affect their level of discretionary work effort. Measures of these perks and irks were developed, thereby operationalising these constructs. Our understanding of the perks and irks constructs was further refined by revealing that some perks and irks that have received little prior research attention may be important determinants of discretionary work effort. Chapter 5 details this study and its key findings.

I then conducted a third study that tested a new motivational model that articulated the relationships amongst perks, irks, monetary reward and discretionary work effort. I entered this study with a list of five perks, three irks and four measures of the facets of discretionary work effort. The five perks were labelled challenging work, team-oriented leader behaviour, co-worker support, support for flexible work arrangements and recognition for good performance. The three irks were named autocratic leader behaviour, co-worker shirking and power-orientation. I called the facets of discretionary work effort discretionary work time, discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed effort (which had two measures – taking charge and helping). This study built upon the previous two studies by empirically confirming which perks and irks were actually related to self-reported levels of discretionary work effort. More importantly, this study showed that perks, irks and monetary reward are differentially related to the different facets of discretionary work effort. In so doing, the research illustrated the conceptual meaningfulness and empirical utility of investigating the determinants of each of the facets of discretionary work effort separately (Briggs & Cheek, 1986). The details of this study and its key findings can be found in Chapter 6.
It is commonly accepted in the OB literature (Barnard, 1938; Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Organ et al., 2006) and in the economics literature (Akerlof, 1984; Jevons, 1871 [1970]; Leibenstein, 1966; 1979) that organisations need employees who are willing to supply discretionary work effort as this is important in enhancing organisational effectiveness and performance. The combination of methodologies used in my research program enabled me to thoroughly assess employee perceptions of perks and irks and to test their impact on discretionary work effort. From this I was able to identify the possible mechanisms through which perks, irks and monetary reward affect discretionary work effort. Thus, my research makes a substantial theoretical contribution to our knowledge and understanding of discretionary work effort and has important practical implications. I now turn to consider what substantive contributions my program of research makes to the discretionary work effort literature. Here I outline what was different about my research, what new information and insights emerge from the findings and how these advance the extant literature.

7.3 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Theoretically, my research makes several significant contributions to advance the literature on discretionary work effort. Firstly, it identifies a more comprehensive set of non-monetary work environment characteristics that are perceived as perks and irks and provides valid and reliable measures of these constructs. Secondly, it provides greater definitional and construct clarity for discretionary work effort by developing a concise theory-based definition and a more complete conceptualisation of this important construct. Thirdly, through a new application of the ideas contained in Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework my research empirically tests a new motivational model. This model provides a framework for understanding the association between different types of non-monetary work environment factors and the facets of discretionary work effort. Fourthly, it illustrates the conceptual meaningfulness and empirical utility of investigating the facets of discretionary work effort separately by showing that these facets have a differential pattern of relationships with perks, irks and monetary rewards. Finally, it advances the public sector work motivation literature by extending our understanding of how public sector employees perceive discretionary work effort and how perks, irks and monetary rewards relate to the level of discretionary work effort of public sector employees. Each of these contributions shall now be considered in greater detail.

7.3.1 Defining and Measuring Perks and Irks

The first of my research questions explored what employees perceive as perks and irks. Douglas and Shepherd (2000) are amongst the few, if not the only, researchers who have used these
terms in the academic literature. These authors, however, provided limited insight to what constitutes perks and irks as this was not the focus of their research. They identified autonomy as a perk, and risk and work effort demands as irks and lumped everything else as “other” working conditions. Furthermore, as they used conjoint analysis in their study, they did not need to develop measures of perks and irks. Thus, the gaps that this prior work left in the literature was the need to unpack what might comprise those “other” working conditions and the need to develop measures of perks and irks. My research extended the work by Douglas and Shepherd by addressing these gaps.

In addressing my first research question, my program of research identified those non-monetary work environment characteristics perceived to relate positively (perks) and negatively (irks) to discretionary work effort. Therefore, it provides insight to the nature and functioning of the perks and irks constructs. This research question was examined using a combination of qualitative methods in Study 1 and quantitative methods in Study 2. Overall the findings were reasonably consistent across these two studies. Together, these studies confirmed that employees commonly perceive challenging work, team-oriented leadership, co-worker support, support for flexible work arrangements and recognition for good performance as perks. They also confirmed that employees commonly perceive autocratic leader behaviour, co-worker shirking and power-orientation as irks. However, these studies failed to confirm enriched job design as a perk and workload pressures and resource constraints, and bureaucracy as irks. These results were augmented by Study 3 which verified that all five of the perks and two of the three irks were actually related to discretionary work effort. Whilst the first two studies identified what employees believed were the most important drivers of their discretionary work effort, this third study importantly verified whether or not these variables met this criteria for being included in the perks and irks domain for my research. That is, do they actually relate to discretionary work effort. These empirical results showed that co-worker shirking was only marginally related to discretionary work effort and therefore failed to qualify as an irk. These results also provided detailed information about how the perks and irks are related to discretionary work effort. This aspect of the research will be elaborated upon in the next section where research question two will be discussed.

Conceptually, the perks and irks constructs resemble other constructs in the literature, most notably, psychological climate (James & James, 1989; James & Jones, 1974). Climate refers to the meaning employees develop about their work environment. This provides a reference against which they determine what is appropriate work behaviour within that setting. The work climate literature is similarly concerned with the relationship between employee evaluations of work environment characteristics and their work behaviours. The similarities
between the perks and irks constructs and psychological climate lie in the fact that they each use a perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach (James & Jones, 1974) and they are multi-dimensional constructs. The key points of difference between the work climate construct and the perks and irks constructs developed as part of my research lies in their conceptual definition and content.

Researchers have previously investigated work climate as a holistic measure (Brown & Leigh, 1996; James & James, 1989) and as specific climate types. Schneider called these specific climates “climates for something” (Schneider, 1975). Perks and irks are analogous to specific climate types like a “climate for innovation” (Scott & Bruce, 1994), “climate for creativity” (Amabile et al., 1996), and a “service climate” (Schneider & Bowen, 1985). James and Jones (1974) emphasised that the climate construct should be clearly defined and that the conceptual definition should guide its measurement and operationalisation. The perks and irks constructs in my research were defined in terms of non-monetary work environment characteristics that were related, either positively or negatively, with discretionary work effort. Thus, while perks and irks are linked to the climate concept in that they assess a “climate for discretionary work effort”, they are conceptually different from other climate constructs found in the literature. To be part of the perks and irks domain, the non-monetary work environment characteristics can be either positive or negative and they need to either increase or decrease discretionary work effort. Therefore, my research on perks and irks adds to the climate literature by identifying the type of work climate that promotes (or hampers) discretionary work effort.

In addition to the definitional distinction of perks and irks from other specific work climate types, the set of perks and irks developed differed from work climate in terms of their content. My research established that while some work environment characteristics commonly identified as part of psychological climate are the same, there are others that were not. James and James (1989) identified four higher-order psychological climate factors from 17 first-order factors to assess psychological climate. These were leader support and facilitation, role stress and lack of harmony, job challenge and autonomy, and work group co-operation, warmth and friendliness. Brown and Leigh (1996) extended these factors to include freedom of expression and recognition from the organisation. The factors that form the psychological climate domain are mostly, though not exclusively, positive work environment characteristics. My research revealed that of the 19 factors identified as belonging to the psychological climate domain, only four represented perks and irks. These were challenging work, team-oriented leadership (i.e. leader support), co-worker support (i.e. work group cooperation) and recognition for good
performance. Furthermore, my research determined that some psychological climate factors are not part of the perks and irks domain. These factors are worthy of further discussion as they provide insight to how the perks and irks constructs differ from psychological climate.

The first point of difference related to the work environment characteristic of enriched job design. James and James (1989) identified job autonomy, job importance (i.e. meaningfulness) and job challenge and variety as dimensions of the higher order psychological climate factor job challenge and autonomy. The literature review also suggested that these positive job characteristics should be related to discretionary work effort. However, in my research job challenge was supported as a perk while enriched job design (i.e. autonomy, variety and meaningfulness) was not. This finding was most unexpected. The qualitative data in my research suggested that enriched job design is perceived as a strong perk by employees and this was further supported by parts of the quantitative analysis. Nonetheless the overall empirical results did not confirm it as a perk. While this outcome may have potentially been a measurement issue, it seemed that it could reflect how employees perceive challenging work and enriched job design as potential perks. It has been suggested in the literature on job design that the intrinsic job characteristics commonly associated with enriched job design may actually form a uni-dimensional construct (Dunham, 1976; Harvey et al., 1985). My research suggested that the boundary between challenging work and enriched job design may not be clear. In the empirical analyses many of the items measuring enriched job design factored with challenging work. Also, the content of the challenging work perk reflected autonomy, variety and meaningfulness. Supplementary analyses of autonomy as a separate measure from challenging work showed that autonomy was related to discretionary work effort. Thus, my research suggests that in their evaluations of the job, employees may form a more global view of the positive characteristics of the job in perceiving it as a perk.

The second point of difference between the content of my perks and irks constructs and psychological climate related to the work environment characteristic of workload pressures and resource constraints. Role overload is a psychological climate factor (James & James, 1989) that is conceptually similar to the workload pressures and resource constraints variable investigated in my research. However, my empirical results did not confirm workload pressures and resource constraints to be an irk. It seems that employee perceptions of workload pressures and resource constraints as an irk may depend on the level at which this work environment characteristic is present. The qualitative data from Study 1, together with the literature (Amabile, 1996; Ohly et al., 2006), suggests that at low and very high levels, workload pressures and resource constraints
are likely to be perceived as an irk. However, at moderate levels this factor appears to be perceived as a perk as it can add to the perceived importance and meaningfulness of the job. Furthermore, there was evidence in the first two studies of my research suggesting that workload pressures and resource constraints may be an idiosyncratic irk rather than a common irk. While some participants talked about feeling motivated when “the pressure is really on” and then “feeling a bit flat when all of a sudden that’s taken away and you’re back to normal”, others said they found that “the pressure of just meeting deadlines gets demotivating”. Therefore, it seems that while this work environment characteristic forms part of the psychological climate, employee perceptions of this factor as a potential irk is quite complex and is likely to be affected by the level at which it occurs as well as individual differences.

A third point of difference between the content of the perks and irks constructs and psychological climate relates to the identification of additional negative work environment characteristics that have not previously been identified as psychological climate factors. These were autocratic leader behaviour, power-orientation and co-worker shirking (although my empirical results did not confirm co-worker shirking as an irk). Sub-unit conflict is a psychological climate factor that contributes to a lack of harmony in an organisation. This construct is at a different level to my construct of power-orientation which is an organisational characteristic that involves the use of political, self-serving and manipulative actions that can cause destructive internal competition, political problems and a fear of challenging the views of others. Also, power-orientation need not involve conflict. Similarly, autocratic leader behaviour involves negative behaviours by the leader. Autocratic leader behaviour can be differentiated from the leader support and facilitation factor in psychological climate since it has been contended that negative leader behaviour is not the same as a low level of positive leader behaviour and that positive and negative leader behaviours may have quite different effects on employee work behaviours and attitudes (Amabile et al., 2004; Gould-Williams, 2007). My research revealed that both power-orientation and autocratic leader behaviour constitute irks.

In contrast, co-worker shirking was not confirmed as an irk even though the literature review mostly suggested that this factor should be perceived as an irk. This factor is also likely to negatively affect employee perceptions of work group cooperation, warmth and friendliness as a factor of psychological climate. Even though the qualitative data from my research indicated that employees felt “demotivated”, “frustrated”, “disillusioned” and “resentful” when they had co-workers that shirked, the quantitative empirical results showed that generally this did not translate into lower discretionary work effort. Rather, in the qualitative study a very
idiosyncratic response by employees was apparent with some participants reporting that they either lowered or raised their level of work effort while others maintained the same level of discretionary work effort.

These results support the contention that the response of employees to co-worker shirking is affected by two opposing forces, one an effort lowering response called a “sucker effect” (Kerr, 1983; Mulvey & Klein, 1998; Schnake, 1991) and the other an effort increasing response called a “social compensation effect” (Williams & Karau, 1991). Thus, unless it is known which of these two effects dominates, co-worker shirking has an unpredictable effect on employee discretionary work effort. My research results suggest that individual characteristics may impact on which effect dominates for a group of employees. An analysis of the qualitative data in my research suggested that the employee’s own work ethic may be important in affecting how he/she responds to shirking co-workers. In addition, females perceived co-worker shirking (along with all irks) as a stronger irk. This was further supported in the quantitative results which showed that gender may be important in affecting employee responses to co-worker shirking.

Johns (2006) argued that the inclusion of control variables in analysis may attenuate relationships. He contended that gender can be a very “potent if subtle contextual variable” and that “the frequent practice of controlling for the who variable in much organizational behaviour research simply washes out salient contextual influence” (Johns, 2006, p.391). He argued that men and women often face different work contexts and so the distribution of gender in the workplace can be important. When I excluded the control variables (which included gender) from my analysis, co-worker shirking had a significant negative relationship with the direction facet of discretionary work effort. In the light of my research having a higher percentage of males in the samples, these individual differences may have affected employee perceptions of perks and irks. Therefore, these variables might moderate the effect of co-worker shirking on discretionary work effort. Thus, rather than being a common irk which was the focus of my research, co-worker shirking may be an idiosyncratic irk. This is an idea that needs to be investigated in future research.

A final point worthy of note relates to the nature of the perks and irks revealed by my research program. The non-monetary work environment characteristics identified as perks and irks tended to be psychological/emotional (i.e. they primarily have affective or attitudinal effects) in nature rather than functional/instrumental (i.e. they primarily affect the employee’s ability to accomplish tasks). This suggests that cognitive evaluations of work environments that
are conducive to higher discretionary work effort are more strongly determined by psychological factors than by instrumental factors. This contrasts with psychological climate where several factors are functional in nature.

In summary, my research confirmed five important perks and two important irks. Even though the perks and irks constructs resemble the concept of psychological climate, they differ in at least two respects. Firstly, perks and irks are more narrowly and specifically defined. They are designed to assess a specific type of work climate, namely a climate for discretionary work effort. Secondly, the factors identified as part of the perks and irks domain differ from those in the psychological climate domain. Thus, my research advances the work climate literature by providing some new insights to what work environment characteristics are perceived as perks or irks, the nature of these factors and what affects whether or not a work environment characteristic is perceived as a perk or irk. In addition, it extends the prior work by Douglas and Shepherd (2000) in the entrepreneurship literature by identifying a more comprehensive set of perks and irks and developing measures for these constructs.

### 7.3.2 Redefining and Reconceptualising Discretionary Work Effort

The literature review revealed that the frequently cited definition of discretionary work effort developed by Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983) described potential discretionary work effort rather than actual discretionary work effort. My research, therefore, addressed this problem by developing a more concise theory-based definition of this important construct. In addition, by bringing together the economics and OB literatures on discretionary work effort a reconceptualisation of this construct was suggested. By merging these two perspectives, my research broadened the current conceptualisations of discretionary work effort in these separate disciplines to include the three facets of time, intensity and direction. This provides a more complete conceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct that is consistent with the theoretical conceptualisation of the work effort construct of which discretionary work effort is a sub-component (Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983). This reconceptualisation addressed concerns raised by some scholars (Bowles et al., 1984; Dubinsky & Skinner, 2002; Entwistle, 2001; Leibenstein, 1979; Morrison & Phelps, 1999) about existing conceptualisations of discretionary work effort being too narrowly defined. Thus, the redefinition and reconceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct advances the literature by providing greater definitional clarity and a more complete conceptualisation of this construct.
The utility of the reconceptualisation of discretionary work effort used in my research is demonstrated by the fact that there was a differential pattern of relationships between the predictor variables and the different facets of discretionary work effort. This reconceptualisation was empirically supported across the three studies comprising my program of research. In the Study 1 qualitative interviews, three overarching themes representing these three facets of discretionary work effort emerged from the analysis of how the study participants talked about discretionary work effort. In addition, the factor analyses of the discretionary work effort measures in both Study 2 and Study 3 supported a three factor structure (time, intensity and direction). Importantly, I was able to differentiate the facets of discretionary work effort in samples where there were some constraints on discretionary work effort that would lead to range restriction on some of my measures. This attests to the robustness of these facets of discretionary work effort as discrete concepts. In addition, the findings of the Study 3 analyses showed that the three facets of discretionary work effort have different correlates.

The findings from this aspect of my research advance the literature in a number of ways. In demonstrating the convergent and discriminant validities of the time, intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort I extend prior works on the discretionary work effort construct. For example, Brown and Leigh (1996) previously established the convergent and discriminant validities of the time and intensity dimensions. Also, Morrison and Phelps (1999) previously demonstrated that the two measures of the direction facet of discretionary work effort used in my research (taking charge and helping) can be empirically discriminated. However, no prior research has investigated all three facets discretionary work effort together to ascertain their convergent and discriminant validities. My findings revealed that these three facets of discretionary work effort are empirically distinct. Thus, my research provides a more complete conceptualisation, operationalisation and understanding of the discretionary work effort construct.

Furthermore, by disaggregating discretionary work effort into time, intensity and direction and examining whether these facets displayed unique patterns of relationships with work environment factors, my research provides a more detailed understanding of this construct. It provides new insights to the nature of these facets and the mechanisms through which work environment characteristics may affect discretionary work effort. Thus, from my research we can gain a truer picture of how employers and managers can increase organisational performance through greater discretionary work effort.
Amongst the new insights that my research revealed is that the time facet of discretionary work effort displayed a lower average but greater variability than the intensity and direction facets. This suggests that for a large group of employees, discretionary work time may be constrained or not perceived as discretionary as these other facets. The amount of discretion employees actually have over work time has been previously questioned (Clarkberg & Moen, 2001; Kahn & Lang, 1991; 1992; Maume & Bellas, 2001; Shank, 1986). This prior research focussed on the divergence between actual and preferred hours of work and constraints on hours worked by employers. Low discretion on time has been attributed to time constraints imposed by employers (especially for employees on lower wages) that restrict the ability of employees to contribute discretionary work time. These time constraints include employment contracts that prescribe hours of work and overtime bans. It has also been attributed to external non-work demands that create a time-squeeze on employees (Clarkberg & Moen, 2001) that reduce their willingness to supply discretionary work time. My research suggests both possibilities. The qualitative data indicated that considerably fewer employees perceive time related work behaviour as an indicator of discretionary work effort than intensity and direction related work behaviours, and the quantitative data suggested the willingness of employees to supply discretionary work time in response to higher monetary reward is low. In contrast, employees showed a greater responsiveness in supplying greater intensity of effort or to direct effort into discretionary activities. Perks and irks appear to be the primary mechanisms through which employees can be motivated to increase discretionary work effort and discretionary directed effort. No prior research appears to have looked at the extent to which employees exercise discretion in their work effort through the different facets of work effort.

My research also provides insight to the nature and functioning of the facets of discretionary work effort that makes a potential contribution to the workaholism literature. Workaholism research examines the work behaviour patterns of people who invest high levels of discretionary work effort. In this literature, workaholism has been defined in terms of attitudinal characteristics based on a workaholism triad consisting of ‘feeling driven’, ‘work enjoyment’ and ‘work involvement’ (Spence & Robbins, 1992). Workaholism has also been defined in behavioural terms including a high investment of discretionary work time, thinking about work when not at work, and working beyond organisational or economic requirements (Scott et al., 1997). Scott et al. (1997) suggested that different workaholic behaviour patterns defined by these behavioural criteria may have different determinants. Furthermore, Galperin and Burke (2006) recently brought together the workaholism triad characteristics and forms of the direction facet of discretionary work effort (discretionary functional and dysfunctional work
behaviours) to further develop our understanding of workaholic behaviour patterns. This prior research defines workaholic behaviour patterns in terms of discretionary work time and discretionary directed effort. My research indicates that a further defining element might be a high investment of discretionary work intensity. Given that my research shows that these three facets of discretionary work effort have different determinants, this additional defining element of workaholic behaviour suggests additional antecedents of workaholic behaviour patterns.

7.3.3 Testing a New Motivational Model of Discretionary Work Effort

The second of my research questions was about how perks, irks and monetary reward relate to the level of discretionary work effort. To address this research question I linked Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework of individual behaviour from the economics literature with my perks and irks constructs to develop an organising structure through which we can better understand the nature of the relationships between these work environment characteristics (including monetary reward) and the different facets of discretionary work effort. This approach was a distinguishing feature of my research as it involved a new application of Ash’s rational sociality framework to work motivation concepts and it formed the first known empirical testing of Ash’s conceptual ideas.

To recap, Ash (2000) maintained that people are both rational and social. The rational self aims to maximise personal self-interest and forms relationships for their instrumental benefits. The social self aims to maximise social self-interest by maintaining relationships that promote one’s sense of self. Individual behaviour involves a mix of rational and social self relationship decisions. Through their interactions with others, people simultaneously produce and consume relational goods. Relational goods are intangible, non-monetary outcomes that arise from interpersonal relationships and include feelings of trust, respect, acceptance and so forth. The relational goods inherent in relationships can be positive or negative and can have intrinsic and/or instrumental value (Ash, 2000; Gui, 1996). These relational goods define the characteristics of the relationship. A person can only enjoy these relational goods whilst a participant in the relationship. Also, the more a participant invests in the relationship the more relational goods he/she obtains. Therefore, in work-related relationships that are characterised by positive relational goods that are important to employees, employees will be motivated to invest more discretionary work effort to maximise the benefits from these relationships. Due to the nature of relationships, however, relational goods cannot be contracted. Rather, they are underpinned by norms of reciprocity (Gui, 2000; Mosca et al., 2007).
Ash (2000) maintained that people may form either primary or secondary relationships. Primary relationships are formed because they are perceived to have intrinsic value (i.e. they are a valued end in themselves). He contended that this type of relationship directly enters a person’s utility function and so should have a stronger influence on a person’s behaviour as the motivators are more proximal. In this type of relationship the social self is likely to be dominant in affecting behaviour. In contrast, secondary relationships are formed for the instrumental benefits that can be derived from them (i.e. they are a means of attaining other valued ends). The benefits of a secondary relationship enter a person’s utility function indirectly and so should have a weaker effect on a person’s behaviour as the motivators are more distal. In this type of relationship the rational self is likely to be dominant in affecting behaviour.

Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework provided an organising structure for positioning perks, irks and monetary reward to inform my hypotheses about how these different types of work environment characteristics will relate to the different facets of discretionary work effort. This enabled me to develop and test a more refined set of hypotheses underpinning my motivational model of discretionary work effort. Even though some of the perks and irks identified in my research do not directly involve interpersonal relationships with specific others, I drew on Rhoades and Eisenberger’s (2002) assertion that employees assign humanlike characteristics to organisations to argue that job and organisational characteristics are likely to be perceived by employees as an extension of their relationships with the organisation and/or its members (see Chapter 6). I used the distinction between relational and instrumental outcomes as a way of classifying perks, irks and monetary reward. I also linked this framework with economic and OB theories on discretionary work effort to determine how the facets of discretionary work effort might be positioned within Ash’s relational-instrumental structure. The cross-fertilisation of concepts and ideas contained in these frameworks from these different disciplines enabled me to identify which perks should relate to which facets of discretionary work effort and similarly which irks should relate to which facets of discretionary work effort. It also allowed me to determine where monetary reward should fit into Ash’s framework. The classification of perks, irks and monetary reward within this framework was important because if the perks and irks concepts are to have utility, then I needed an organising structure for understanding their effects on discretionary work effort.

Within Ash’s (2000) framework I classified perks as “intrinsic relational” work environment characteristics. I argued that perks foster relationships with supervisors, co-workers and the organisation. Within these relationships employees experience relational goods which
are intrinsically motivating. The idea of perks like perceived support from co-workers, leaders and the organisation producing relational goods like feelings of trust, concern, acceptance and so forth is well established in the OB literature (see Chapter 2). Similarly, I classified irks as “instrumental relational” work environment characteristics. I argued that irks produce negative relational goods like distrust, frustration, humiliation and disrespect. In the absence of any inherent positive relational goods employees who choose (or need) to remain with the organisation will most likely form secondary relationships with those specific others who are participants in the interactions associated with these irks for their instrumental benefits. Finally, I classified monetary rewards as “instrumental financial” work environment characteristics based on the financial and contractible nature of this relationship with the organisation. Additionally, I classified the time facet of discretionary work effort as “instrumentally-oriented” and the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort as “relationally-oriented” according to what existing economics and OB theories and research suggest are the types of factors most likely to influence each of these facets (see Chapter 6). The relational classes of work environment characteristics (i.e. perks and irks) were then hypothesised to be most strongly related to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort. The instrumental financial class of work environment characteristics (i.e. monetary reward) was expected to be most strongly related to the time facet of discretionary work effort. Also, the intrinsic relational class of work environment characteristics (i.e. perks) was hypothesised to be more strongly related to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort than the instrumental relational class of work environment characteristics (i.e. irks).

Thus, in linking Ash’s (2000) rational sociality framework with my perks and irks constructs and economics and OB theories on discretionary work effort, I envisaged the mechanisms through which perks, irks and monetary reward will relate to the different facets of discretionary work effort. These are depicted in Figure 7.1. My research only tested for direct relationships between perks, irks and monetary reward and the facets of discretionary work effort. Ash’s propositions provided the theoretical framework for identifying how, and how strongly perks, irks and monetary reward should relate to the facets of discretionary work effort. Testing the mechanisms through which these relationships occur was beyond the scope of my research and so needs to be confirmed through future research.
Implications of Ash’s Rational Sociality Framework

My research showed that perks, irks and monetary reward all play a role in affecting discretionary work effort. It also showed that perks (as compared with irks) are a dominant motivator of discretionary work effort. In addition, it revealed that perks relate most strongly to the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort, irks relate most strongly to the intensity facet of discretionary work effort, and monetary reward relates most strongly to the time facet of discretionary work effort. The pattern of relationships revealed by the application of Ash’s rational sociality framework to perks, irks, monetary rewards and the discretionary work effort constructs revealed a number of new insights that advance our understanding of what motivates discretionary work effort. These new insights are discussed below.
The dominant effect of perks was reflected in both the qualitative and the quantitative data. In the Study 1 qualitative interviews perks (compared with irks) attracted more comments and these comments came from a greater number of participants. The Q-sort-type procedure and the factor analysis in Study 2 also confirmed that there were more perks than irks. Study 3 then augmented these findings by showing that perks had stronger correlations, larger effect-size correlations and explained more variance in discretionary work effort than the irks. In addition, my analysis of the qualitative data suggested that perks foster relational goods which is compatible with what is suggested by Ash’s proposition that relational goods that have intrinsic value are inherent in primary relationships. In talking about perks, participants in Study 1 referred to feelings of ‘being valued’, ‘being respected’, ‘recognition’, ‘belonging’, ‘camaraderie’ and so forth. Also, the content of the perks measures developed in Study 2 suggested features of employee interactions with the leader, co-workers and organisation through which these types of relational goods might be fostered. Team-oriented leader behaviour, for example, related to things like the leader recognising the employee for good performance and treating the employee with respect and integrity. Similarly, co-worker support related to things like there being trust, cooperation and support amongst work group members. The fact that perks were strongly related to both the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort attests to the importance of fostering primary relationships in association with all of the interactions employees have with an organisation and its members.

In contrast to perks, when talking about irks participants spoke about negative relational goods like feelings of ‘humiliation’, ‘distrust’, ‘disrespect’, ‘not belonging’, ‘frustration’ and ‘disillusionment’. Similarly, the content of the irks measures reflected behaviours that would produce these types of negative relational goods. Autocratic leader behaviour, for example, related to things like focussing on mistakes, engaging in public ridicule of subordinates and taking over and interfering with the employee’s work. Similarly, power-orientation related to members of the organisation being critical of others’ ideas and playing political power games. Within Ash’s (2000) framework, these types of relational goods have no intrinsic value and so these interactions do not foster the development of primary relationships. Thus if the employee chooses to remain in the organisation and continues to experience these types of interactions, they are likely to form secondary relationships with the participants who are party to these interactions. My analysis of the Study 1 qualitative data, provided some evidence of this type of response by employees. For example, one participant who was experiencing a high level of irks (all of those investigated in my research) expressed feelings of frustration and unhappiness about his experiences at work. However, he felt that for economic and personal reasons he was tied to his current job. He was unable to find alternative employment with “the same pay” and didn’t want to move as he loved living in the area.
and had just bought a house. As a result he was doing what he believed that he was expected to do to stay in the job. This participant’s response indicates that he had chosen to form a secondary relationship with the leader and the organisation because it was instrumental in enabling him to remain living in the town and in keeping his house. Another participant who related a similar experience indicated that while at first he had ‘dropped his bundle’ because of the way his leader and the organisation were treating him, he then decided that he needed to raise his level of effort back to around what it had been until he could retire in a couple of years. This suggests that the instrumental benefit of maintaining the current relationships with the organisation and his leader was his primary motivator. Thus, this participant had similarly decided to form secondary relationships. While a small number of the Study 1 participants indicated that their level of discretionary work effort had declined substantially as a result of the irks they experienced, the more common response was to leave the organisation or, if unable to do so, to try to do what was needed to keep their job. Overall, these findings support Ash’s notion of instrumental considerations leading to the formation of secondary relationships that will have a weaker effect on employee behaviour.

While I hypothesised that perks and irks would both be related to the intensity and direction (i.e. the relationally-oriented) facets of discretionary work effort, my research showed that irks only affect the intensity facet. This outcome is consistent with an employee acting in rational self-interest as proposed by Ash’s framework. It seems plausible that because some work behaviours (i.e. the helping and taking charge measures of directed effort) are more observable by managers, employees acting in rational self-interest may be reluctant to vary this facet of discretionary work effort. Instead, they will decrease the intensity of their discretionary work effort as this action is more subtle and less detectable. Thus, this variation in discretionary work effort would be potentially less harmful to their performance evaluations by their leader and to their personal reputation.

Finally, my research showed that monetary reward distinguishes the time facet of discretionary work effort from the intensity and direction facets as it was the only work environment characteristic with a significant effect on the time facet. This outcome supports the idea that monetary reward is instrumental and so drives the instrumentally-oriented facet of discretionary work effort (i.e. time). Furthermore, the relatively small amount of variance in discretionary work effort explained by monetary reward supports the idea that this factor involves a secondary relationship between the employee and the organisation that will affect employee behaviour indirectly, and so has a weaker effect on employee work behaviour. Also, the fact that monetary reward relates differently to the facets of discretionary work effort than irks which also involve secondary relationships, supports the need to classify monetary reward as a different type of work.
environment characteristic. This research suggests that employee’s view their decision about how to allocate their time between work and non-work activities is based more on economic considerations (that are more easily contracted) than on relational considerations (that cannot be contracted).

Taken together my research results generally support the propositions posed in the rational sociality framework. There were just a few findings identified in Study 3 which were not consistent with this framework. These minor inconsistencies, however, appeared to reflect a contextual factor (i.e. managerial level). While this factor perhaps should have been controlled for in my research, I chose not to include it as a control variable. This decision was out of concern that by controlling for this variable potentially important relationships between monetary reward and discretionary work effort may have been attenuated (Johns, 2006) since in local government management level is strongly correlated with monetary reward. Nevertheless, these small inconsistencies need to be checked through further research. This should perhaps be done in research contexts where there is greater variability in both the quantity and types of monetary rewards and where this variable is less strongly correlated with management level.

The pattern of effects found in my research appears to support the idea that secondary relationships are less powerful than primary relationships in their effects on discretionary work effort. However, in order to validate the utility of Ash’s (2000) framework as an organising structure for predicting the effects of different types of work environment characteristics on the different facets of discretionary work effort there is a need to discount competing explanations for the observed relationships. Thus, I now turn to consider whether or not some other theoretical frameworks commonly used to investigate the determinants of discretionary work effort might better explain the relationships observed in my research.

Much of the prior research in the OB literature has been conducted within a social exchange theory framework in which the principles of reciprocity and fairness affect employee work behaviours. Similarly, in the economics literature principal agent and gift exchange models of discretionary work effort (Akerlof, 1982, 1984; Akerlof & Yellen, 1990; Alchian & Demsetz, 1972; Shapiro & Stiglitz, 1984) have dominated. These current economic models also incorporate social exchange theory and the principles of reciprocity and fairness.

While the social exchange theory framework appears to provide good predictions on the effect of positive relationships on discretionary work effort (Gould-Williams, 2007; Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 1996a), this framework has been less successful at reconciling observations of weak or no association between negative relationships and discretionary work effort. Even though
the notion of negative norms (i.e. where negative actions are reciprocated with negative responses) are theoretically plausible (Gouldner, 1960), there has been limited empirical support for negative behaviours by an organisation and/or its members being reciprocated with adverse responses like lower discretionary work effort, non-cooperation, disrespect and so forth by employees. It has been argued that employees may be reluctant to respond negatively out of concern that further undesirable outcomes like loss of reputation, lower job performance, reduced opportunities for advancement and adverse effects on future employability may result (Gould-Williams, 2007; Organ et al., 2006; Tepper, 2000; Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2003). This idea, however, has not yet been fully explored (Gould-Williams, 2007). Organ (2006) contended that when a participant is in a negative relationship, an employee will tend to adopt a self-interest focus instead of acting in the mutual interest of the relationship participants. As a result, the employee will respond in a way that is personally beneficial. While not explicitly stated, each of these arguments infer that the employee weighs up the costs and benefits of alternative responses to negative experiences at work and will choose to behave in the way that is most personally beneficial (Kahneman et al., 1997; Vroom, 1964). This suggests that the mechanisms through which irks affect discretionary work effort are the employee’s expectancy evaluations of the outcomes of alternative responses.

The suggestion that employees will adopt a self-interest focus instead of acting in the mutual interest of the relationship participants is a point that these frameworks have in common with Ash’s framework. A self-interest focus aligns with Ash’s notion that the rational self will dominate in situations where the relationship is not perceived by the employee as having intrinsic value and so chooses to form a secondary relationship for its instrumental benefits. The social exchange theory and principles of reciprocity and fairness frameworks, however, do not extend to explain the effect of monetary reward on discretionary work effort. A relationship formed with an organisation principally for monetary reward is a positive relationship and so might be expected to have similar effects on discretionary work effort as perks. It has been suggested, however, that monetary reward can undermine the intrinsic motivation of employees (Deci, 1975; Frey, 1997) which may partially explain the relatively weak effect of monetary reward on discretionary work effort. According to this view, however, all extrinsic motivators (i.e. leader support, co-worker support and so forth) are less motivating than intrinsic motivators (i.e. intrinsically satisfying job characteristics). Thus, this framework is at odds with the pattern of effects found in my research. While economists have noted the significant though relatively weak effect of monetary reward on discretionary work time (Idson & Robins, 1991), according to the agency theory and gift-exchange models, monetary reward should also be related to discretionary work intensity. My research, however, found this not to be the case.
Perhaps another alternative hypothesis for the weaker or non-relationship between irks and discretionary work effort that needs be considered is the individual’s own work ethic. This individual difference characteristic may prevent employees from lowering their level of discretionary work effort when experiencing irks. The qualitative data in my research suggested this possibility in relation to employee responses to co-worker shirking, however it seemed less evident in discussions about irks associated with the leader and organisation overall. Also, there is evidence in the literature suggesting that the work ethic of employees has declined (Entwistle, 2001; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Yankelovich & Immerwahr, 1983). If this is the case, then work ethic is less likely to influence employee responses to irks. Therefore, this hypothesis seems a less plausible explanation of the weaker effect of irks on discretionary work effort than Ash’s framework. Individually, none of these alternative frameworks appear to provide an adequate explanation either for why employees are less responsive to irks than perks, or why perks might have a more pervasive effect on discretionary work effort than either irks or monetary reward. Therefore, Ash’s model appears to fill a theoretical gap by distinguishing between intrinsic and instrumental considerations in the formation of relationships. Thus, it seems to provide a more complete framework for understanding the pattern of effects that emerged in my research than these alternative hypotheses. Also, none of these alternative frameworks appear to offer a structure for explaining the differential pattern of effects on the different facets of discretionary work effort.

Overall, my research advances our understanding of the determinants of discretionary work effort by providing greater detail about how perks, irks and monetary rewards are related to the different facets of discretionary work effort. By revealing that the different facets of discretionary work effort have different correlates, it demonstrates the conceptual meaningfulness and empirical utility of distinguishing the three facets of discretionary work effort (Briggs & Cheek, 1986). While the ERB literature provides evidence that discretionary directed effort in the forms of affiliative and challenging ERBs have a positive impact on organisational performance, particularly organisational effectiveness, further research will be needed to assess if the three facets of discretionary work effort also display a differential pattern of consequences. This would reinforce the utility of differentiating these facets. In addition to the theoretical significance of the findings of my research, there are important implications for developing strategies through which managers might influence the level of discretionary work effort of their employees (see Section 7.4).

My research tested Ash’s (2000) framework as an organising structure for understanding discretionary work effort rather than as a utility maximising decision-making model. This test appears to be the first empirical research using the rational sociality framework
as I found no evidence in the literature of any prior empirical studies using this framework. In addition, in his rational sociality theory Ash did not explicate what factors create an environment that fosters the formation of primary relationships. Therefore, there is an important complementarity between Ash’s rational sociality framework and my perks and irks constructs. Firstly, my research applied Ash’s framework to a workplace setting which was a new application for his propositions. Secondly, as my research generally supported Ash’s framework as an organising structure, it informs his framework about what types of work environment characteristics might foster the formation of primary relationships in organisations, and thereby increase the discretionary work effort of employees. Thus, it makes a useful contribution by showing that the propositions in Ash’s framework appear to hold up and by extending the model to identify contextual factors that may foster the formation of primary relationships.

Furthermore, Ash’s (2000) framework did not elucidate what might be the effect of a combination of primary and secondary relationships on a person’s overall behaviour. In complex settings like the workplace, it is plausible that employees may simultaneously experience a combination of perks and irks. In the OB literature, James and James (1989) argued that employees divide their cognitions pertaining to the job, leader, co-workers and the organisation into separate internal compartments. This suggests that the employee may form a mixture of different types of relationships within their work setting based on their evaluation of the interactions with others associated with these perks and irks.

Therefore, it seems feasible that an employee might have a primary relationship with his/her co-workers with whom he/she experiences a high level of support but simultaneously has a secondary relationship with his/her leader who displays a high level of autocratic leader behaviour. Our knowledge of the pattern of relationships that perks and irks have with discretionary work effort based on Ash’s (2000) organising structure, would lead us to predict that the primary relationship that the employee has with his/her co-workers will motivate him/her to increase the intensity with which he/she works as well as direct more of hi/her discretionary effort into helping co-workers and taking charge, other things being equal. However, the secondary relationship with the leader will lead us to predict that the employee will lower his/her level of discretionary work intensity, other things being equal. Taken together, however, there are two countervailing forces affecting the employees work effort decision. Ash’s rational sociality framework suggests that the stronger effect of the primary relationship will dominate and that the net effect is one of increased discretionary work effort. This outcome would be consistent with the observation that in practice employees do not appear to lower their
discretionary work effort when in negative relationships with specific others. Nevertheless, the level of discretionary work intensity is likely to be lower than a situation in which the employee has a primary relationship with both his/her co-workers (fostered by co-worker support) and his/her leader (fostered by team-oriented leadership). Thus, managers who fail to address the presence of irks like autocratic leader behaviour, even in the presence of co-worker support, will not be maximising the discretionary work effort of the employee.

At this stage, these propositions are purely speculative as investigating the effect of combinations of perks and irks on discretionary work effort was beyond the scope of my research. However, the qualitative data in my research may shed some light on the possibility of a counterbalancing effect when a mix of perks and irks are being experienced. In the qualitative interviews one employee described being in a situation where her leader displayed a very high level of autocratic leader behaviour but she also experienced a very high level of co-worker support and she perceived her level of discretionary work effort to be quite high. An analysis of her comments suggested that while she continued to supply a relatively high amount of discretionary time and intensity to her work, much of her effort was being directed into the demands of her leader rather than directing it towards constructive non-required tasks. She reported that prior to the negative relationship developing with her leader, she had directed much of her effort into introducing new initiatives in the organisation. This data suggests that the effect of the co-worker support counteracted, at least to some degree, the effect of the autocratic leader behaviour. Nonetheless, it seems that this person was not attaining a peak level of discretionary work effort as much of her effort was being diverted into non-discretionary activities that were unlikely to benefit the organisation. Similar experiences were also reported by a small number of other participants in Study 1. Interestingly, a common counterbalancing factor in the experiences described by these participants was co-worker support. This finding augments my quantitative research results that showed that co-worker support has a relatively strong effect on discretionary work effort and my qualitative research results which identified co-worker support as an important perk. To enhance our confidence in Ash’s framework and our ability to predict discretionary work effort using this framework as an organising structure, further research needs to be undertaken to investigate whether or not in situations where employees have a mix of perks and irks a “primary relationship effect” does dominate.

Generally, my research highlighted the importance of social and interpersonal relationships in influencing discretionary work effort. It also demonstrated that to gain a more complete understanding of employee discretionary work effort the differential roles of the job, interpersonal, organisational and monetary reward domains of the work environment need to be recognised.
Focussing on only one or a few of these variables provides an incomplete picture and is likely to prevent managers from maximising the potential of their human resources. These results suggest that although challenging work and co-worker support are dominant motivators of discretionary work effort, relationships with managers and the organisation are highly relevant for influencing specific facets of discretionary work effort. Similarly, monetary reward is important in motivating employees to invest voluntary time to work. The relationship between the employee and the leader is important in fostering a greater investment of discretionary work effort in the form of intensity. This influence can occur directly through the type of relationship the employee forms with the manager as well as indirectly through how the leader designs the employee’s job to provide greater challenge and responsibility. My research also demonstrates the important effect of organisational relationships with employees on the direction employees channel their discretionary work effort.

My research findings indicate that the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort are strongly relationally-oriented in that they are directly and more strongly influenced by aspects of the work environment that involve interpersonal interactions with the organisation and its members. In contrast, the time facet of discretionary work effort is generally insensitive to perks and irks. This reflects the instrumental-orientation of this work effort decision of employees and supports the economists’ view that monetary reward is a motivator of discretionary work time. Similar to prior research (Idson & Robins, 1991), however, my research revealed that monetary reward has a significant but quantitatively small effect on an employee’s supply of discretionary work effort.

Overall, my research differs from what has been previously examined in the literatures on work climate and discretionary work effort in that it investigated how both monetary and non-monetary work environment characteristics relate to discretionary work effort. It also developed an organising structure that incorporated both of these types of work environment characteristics to shed light on how these factors relate to discretionary work effort. This framework will help improve our predictions of discretionary work effort and provide insight to how managers can create work environments that will motivate their employees to supply higher levels of discretionary work effort.

7.3.4 Contributions to Public Sector Motivational Research

As previously noted (see Chapter 3), most research on work motivation and discretionary work effort has been conducted in private sector organisations. As a result, several scholars have highlighted how relatively little is known about public sector employee motivation (Frank &
Lewis, 2004; Gould-Williams, 2007; Perry, 1997; Perry & Wise, 1990; Wright, 2001). This was a gap in the literature that my research aimed to address.

As public sector organisations undergo reform and face increasing pressures to improve their service delivery, it is important to understand the extent to which those factors that are known to motivate private sector employees translate to public sector organisations. Thus, the need for more systematic empirical research to improve our understanding of how public managers can motivate employees to supply discretionary work effort has been identified. While there is a growing body of literature on the motivation of public sector employees, the research focus appears to be on the direction facet of discretionary work effort (i.e. ERB). Also, prior research on the determinants of discretionary work effort has mostly been limited to the effects of individual dispositional (especially public service motivation) and context-related attitudinal characteristics with less emphasis given to the effects of work environment characteristics. My research addresses some of these limitations of prior public sector research to advance our understanding of public sector motivation. My research addressed this gap in the literature by extending our understanding of how public sector employees perceive discretionary work effort, and how perks, irks and monetary rewards are related to the level of discretionary work effort of public sector employees. A distinguishing feature of my program of research was to evaluate what work behaviours public sector employees perceive as discretionary prior to testing their relationship monetary rewards, perks and irks. In addition, I assessed the validity of established measures of discretionary work effort that had been developed in a private sector setting to a public sector context.

While all of the discretionary work effort scales used in my research had been previously tested in private sector settings, I found no evidence in the literature of the time and intensity scales or the taking charge measure of discretionary directed effort being previously tested in public organisations. Thus, it was unknown how well my conceptualisation of discretionary work effort and the measures employed in research on discretionary work effort in private sector settings might translate to a public sector setting. As previously noted, while some forms of discretionary directed effort might be classified as discretionary in the private sector, in a public sector setting they may typically be what all employees must do and so are not perceived as discretionary (Kemery, Bedeian, & Zacur, 1996). If so, it is important to look at whether various work behaviours are perceived as discretionary. Thus, my research provides new information to advance our understanding of how public sector employees perceive discretionary work effort.
The similarities between my results and prior research results suggest that public sector employees perceive discretionary work effort in a manner that is generally consistent with my theoretical conceptualisation of this construct. That is, discretionary work effort is perceived to consist of three facets - time, intensity and direction. In addition, the time, intensity and direction scales used to measure discretionary work effort in private organisations appear to be equally suited to public organisations. Thus, my research demonstrates that the conceptualisation of discretionary work effort and the measures used in my research largely generalise across this broader range of work settings.

The qualitative results in my research, however, suggested that public sector employees may differ slightly in their perceptions of what constitutes discretionary directed effort and the relative importance of its different forms. Most of the broad forms of ERB established in the literature as discretionary behaviours (Organ et al., 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2000) were confirmed as forms of discretionary directed effort for public sector employees. Individual initiative and helping were the most widely recognised by employees in this industry sector, while other discretionary behaviours like civic virtue, organisational compliance, organisational loyalty and self-development (Organ et al., 2006) were recognised as discretionary to a much lesser degree. That is, a very broad cross-section of public sector employees view personal initiative to improve things within the organisation (individual initiative), and helping, supporting and cooperating with other employees on work-related matters (helping) as key ways in which they direct their discretionary work effort. In contrast, “sportsmanship”, which is a willingness to tolerate inconveniences and impositions without complaining (Podsakoff et al., 1990), did not appear to be viewed as a discretionary behaviour. This may be due to the nature of the public service where greater legal and statutory constraints commonly impose inconvenience and inflexibility, and so these may be perceived as the norm. My research, however, contrasts with a prior public sector study in Nigeria (Ehigie & Otukoya, 2005) in which perceptions of organisational support and fair treatment were reported to correlate with sportsmanship. This study, however, did not actually establish if this form of directed effort is perceived as discretionary in this organisational setting. It is also possible that cultural differences account for this different research outcome (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Furthermore, my research provides new insight to public employee motivation by identifying how a wider set of positive and negative work environment characteristics affect the level of discretionary work effort of public sector employees. Gould-Williams (2007), for example, found that while positive leader behaviour positively affected discretionary directed
effort (measured by helping), he concluded that although negative leader behaviour affects employee motivation it does not translate into reduced discretionary work effort. By using a more complete conceptualisation of discretionary work effort, my research revealed that negative leader behaviour (i.e. autocratic leader behaviour) negatively affects the intensity facet of discretionary work effort and that power-orientation has a similar effect. It also showed that positive leader behaviour (i.e. team-oriented leadership) affects both the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort. Thus, it is important for public sector managers to address both perks and irks to increase the discretionary work effort of their employees. In addition, challenging work and fostering healthy positive relationships amongst co-workers are important mechanisms through which discretionary work effort of public sector employees can be induced. Overall my research suggested that non-monetary work environment characteristics (i.e. perks and irks) generally have a stronger and more pervasive effect on discretionary work effort than monetary reward. This is likely to come as welcome news to public sector managers who are usually more constrained than their private sector counterparts in their ability to pay higher wages, offer other financial incentives and provide advancement opportunities to motivate employees (Frank & Lewis, 2004).

7.4 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

My research shows that there are three facets of discretionary work effort and that each of these have different predictors. This has important management, education and Human Resource (HR) implications. Firstly, while many organisations traditionally rely on monetary reward and benefits like tangible status or executive perks to attract, retain and motivate employees, my research draws attention to the importance of what are termed “soft perks” in the popular compensation literature (Budman, 1994) and “soft” HR practices (Delery, Gupta, Jenkins, & Walker, 1998; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997) in the academic management literature as motivators of discretionary work effort. My research can assist managers to better understand how different work environment characteristics that are under their control can be manipulated to influence discretionary work effort.

The conceptualisation of discretionary work effort in my research has important implications for HR departments and managers. In showing that discretionary work effort has three facets, it shows that each of these facets need to be addressed by HR systems, that is, training, rewards and so forth. While currently in its developmental phase, the rational sociality framework can provide managers with a practical tool for designing more motivating work environments. This framework suggests that perks (“intrinsic relational” work environment characteristics) are particularly important in motivating more discretionary work intensity and discretionary directed
effort by employees. It also shows the importance of monetary reward (“instrumental financial” work environment characteristics) in motivating discretionary work time. It has highlighted the important role of interpersonal relationships between employees and their managers and co-workers in influencing the intensity and direction facets of discretionary work effort. However, it also suggests that if managers really want to maximise the potential of their human resources, they need to address perks, irks and monetary reward as they each impact differently on the facets of discretionary work effort.

This research suggests strategies for managers influencing different facets of discretionary work effort. For example, managers wanting to motivate employees to work more intensively in the time they are at work should focus on designing challenging jobs, training managers in developing positive interpersonal relationships with subordinates, and fostering cooperation and support amongst work groups perhaps through a program of recognition and reward for good effort and performance. They might also address the level of autocratic leader behaviour and power-orientation in their department and/or organisation. Alternatively, to encourage employees to channel more discretionary effort into proactive change-oriented behaviour, managers should design challenging jobs for their employees and provide greater flexibility in work arrangements. Also, to encourage employees to direct their discretionary effort into helping others in the organisation, fostering cooperation and support amongst work groups would be an especially valuable strategy. Furthermore to induce employees to work longer discretionary hours, managers will need to look at monetary incentives, although they must also recognise that employees generally seem to be less inclined to supply discretionary work time.

The education and HR training implications of these findings point to the importance of training both managers and non-supervisory employees in interpersonal relationships. Management education and training needs to include how to design jobs so they are more challenging for individuals based on their skills and abilities, as well as how to cultivate healthy positive relationships with employees. The development of interpersonal skills in things like effective communication, team-building, and conflict management, and an understanding of emotional intelligence will be important for both managers and non-supervisory staff to build an environment that fosters trust and transparency so that primary relationships can develop (Ash, 2000).

In addition, this research has important practical implications for public sector managers. It is recognised that discretionary work effort is an important factor affecting organisational performance outcomes (Gould-Williams, 2007; Organ et al., 2006). This research can guide public sector managers on which perks and irks they need to manipulate to best motivate employees to
supply more intensity of effort and to direct their effort into discretionary activities that can enhance organisational performance. Practitioners in local government have indicated that this knowledge, along with training in this area, will be of particular importance for new managers who have been promoted from technical or professional roles into a supervisory role but have no formal training in management or an understanding of how to manage and motivate subordinates.

Finally, this research is also timely for policy makers in State government especially in Western Australia where the government is now strongly progressing a local government reform agenda. Policy makers will need to examine the capacity for public sector managers to cultivate organisational perks that will foster the formation of primary relationships with employees. They also need to look at promoting and supporting the training of local government managers in how to cultivate perks and to address irks in their organisations. In addition, they need to look at how local government managers can be given greater flexibility to reward employees for good performance through a range of monetary and non-monetary incentives. This requires a shift away from current practices of compensation being tied to a position and industry awards and standards determining monetary reward more than performance. This is especially the case for non-contracted employees who are primarily in lower management and non-supervisory roles and make up the majority of the local government workforce.

7.5 RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

As with all studies there is no single best research design and limitations exist. As noted in the preceding three chapters, each of the studies comprising my program of research had some limitations. This section focuses on the key limitations of my overall program of research.

The first limitation was the use of subjective, self-report measures for all of the variables in my research model. With the measures for both the predictor and criterion variable coming from the same source, common method variance was a potential issue. This problem could have been addressed by obtaining these measures from separate sources or at different times (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Gathering data from different sources in my research was problematic from a logistical perspective as well as for its cost implications. The logistical difficulties associated with linking data from separate sources for 12 different organisations, the compromising effect that this might have on respondent anonymity and the greater cost and time associated with this strategy made it impractical for my research. Gathering these measures at different times also presented difficulties. Because of the scope of my program of research, data collection was already occurring at three different times over approximately a year. A fourth round of data collection was likely to meet resistance from the
participating organisations. Therefore, I opted to use some of the procedural and statistical techniques proposed by Podsakoff et al. (2003) to help minimise the potential for these problems (see Section 3.3.3). Wherever possible, I also triangulated the findings from my quantitative studies with data collected from my qualitative study which was gathered at a different time using a different method. While the statistical techniques employed to test for common method bias suggested that there was no evidence of this being a problem with the data, future research aimed at validating the findings of this research, would benefit from collecting data for the predictor and criterion variables using different sources or having a temporal separation if self-reports are used.

A second limitation related to the cross-sectional research design employed. This method restricts the findings to the situation that existed at the time and the participants surveyed. As a result, no conclusions can be drawn on cause-effect relationships between the variables under investigation. This research, therefore, relied on theory to suggest the direction of the causal paths. A longitudinal research design would permit causal conclusions to be reached.

A third limitation relates to the external validity and generalisability of my research findings due to the context of my research. One issue relates to a possible omission of important perks and irks and another relates to a range restriction for the monetary reward variable. My research aimed to identify the most common perks and irks but my choice of industry sector may have introduced some bias. I was able to gather the data from a diverse group of organisations and employees in various occupations, but it was limited to one type of public sector organisation. By choosing the public sector rather than using a variety of organisations, some variable omission may have occurred. While some prior research on work-related needs, values and preferences has reported no differences between private and public sector employees for variables like recognition for contributions and interpersonal relationships, other studies have reported differences on other factors like job status, prestige, and opportunities for helping others (Frank & Lewis, 2004; Rainey, 1982; Wittmer, 1991). Also, it has been suggested that public sector jobs may provide different rewards to the private sector and that motivational differences between employees in different work contexts are likely if employees self-select jobs or become socialised or adapt to the culture of an organisation or industry sector (Wittmer, 1991). Therefore, given the potential for some important perks and irks having been omitted, the measurement scales developed in my research will need further validation and possibly further development using different samples.

In addition, the relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort may have been affected to some degree by conducting my research in the public sector. In this industry, there is a very limited range of financial incentives available. Wages and salaries are the principal
form of monetary incentive provided to employees. These are largely determined by industry awards and standards rather than employee performance. These factors are likely to constrain the variability of monetary reward amongst employees in this sector which can contribute to a range restriction problem that may conceal the extent of the true relationship between monetary reward and discretionary work effort. Nonetheless, a significant though modest relationship was found between monetary reward and discretionary work effort, attesting to the robustness of this relationship even with some evidence of range restriction for this variable.

Next, my research focussed on establishing if there is a direct relationship between perks, irks, monetary reward and discretionary work effort. Therefore, a fourth limitation was that it did not investigate if there are indirect mechanisms through which these relationships operate. There are likely to be factors (including employee characteristics and attitudes) that moderate or mediate at least some of the relationships between the predictor variables investigated in my research and the level of discretionary work effort that were not included in this research.

Finally, as participation in this research was voluntary, self-selection may have contributed to a response bias. Even though most employees had an opportunity to complete the interviews and/or questionnaires during work time or a time convenient to them, there were lower than desired response rates which may have accentuated a response bias. There was some evidence of self-selection in Study 1 which required additional strategies to be put in place to obtain volunteers with low levels of work motivation and discretionary work effort. However, an assessment of non-response bias in Study 3 using a modified form of the extrapolation method (Armstrong & Overton, 1977; Monson, 2005) suggested that this was unlikely to be an important source of error.

7.6 FURTHER RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

My program of research presents several opportunities for further research. One clear direction for further research is to replicate this research with different samples to demonstrate the validity of the perks and irks constructs and the generalisability of my research findings. The current study established that a five factor perks and three factor irks measurement model provided a good fit with the sample data for both perceived perks and irks and the level of perks and irks present in the workplace. The next steps in this research would be to: (i) validate the perks and irks measurement model with other samples of local government employees; and (ii) to test if these findings can be generalised by repeating the research with samples of employees from other public and private sector organisations. Replication with samples from different types of organisations would establish if there
are other common perks and irks that were not revealed in my research where the sample was limited to local government.

The current research findings were based on essentially cross-sectional studies that used subjective self-report measures of discretionary work effort. Therefore, future research needs to establish if the relationships revealed hold up under a longitudinal research design whereby the measures for the predictor variables are gathered prior to the measures of discretionary work effort. A longitudinal research design would enable the cause-effect relationships theorised in the current study to be confirmed. Also, the use of discretionary work effort measures that do not rely only on self-reports would alleviate concerns about common method bias associated with this form of data collection (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

Another issue, not within the scope of this research, involves the effect of individual differences on the relationship between perks and irks. In this research, I sought to identify those perks and irks that are common to most employees. However, individuals are likely to differ both in terms of what they perceive as perks and irks (Douglas & Shepherd, 2000; Frank & Lewis, 2004) as well as the “level” of perks or irks that they find most motivating (Parker et al., 2001). Differences in preferred levels of perks and irks were suggested as an explanation for workload pressures and resource constraints and bureaucracy failing to be confirmed as irks in my research. Thus, another direction for further research could be to examine idiosyncratic perks and irks and differences in preferred levels for perks and irks. This variability could be incorporated into the model of discretionary work effort as moderation variables by using a measure of their value, importance or preferred level to employees. This approach would enable an idiosyncratic perk like “public service” as well as differences in perceptions of irks like “workload pressures and resource constraints” or “bureaucracy” and preferred levels of some perks and irks like challenging work to be built into the model.

In addition, the current study focussed on direct relationships between perks, irks, monetary reward and discretionary work effort. A more complex model including the mechanisms through which perks and irks might affect discretionary work effort could be built. By examining mediation effects for these relationships we would develop a better understanding of the mechanisms through which perks and irks influence discretionary work effort. For example, according to social exchange theory and the principle of reciprocity, social relationships between organisational members (i.e. managers, subordinates and co-workers) influence discretionary work effort through the formation of trust, group identity and perceptions of fairness (Organ et al., 2006). These variables not only represent potential processes through which relationally-oriented perks and irks can influence the
level of discretionary work effort, but have also been identified as relational goods that motivate higher work effort (Ash, 2000; Gui, 1996; Mosca et al., 2007). Thus, these factors present possible mediator variables that could be investigated in future research. While some of these variables have previously been investigated for the direction facet of discretionary work effort in the ERB literature, their potential mediating role in affecting the intensity facet is yet to be examined.

Furthermore, the effect of irks compared with perks on discretionary work effort was consistent with Ash’s (2000) distinction between primary (intrinsic) and secondary (instrumental) relationships. Ash contended that while intrinsic relationships enter a person’s utility function directly, instrumental relationships enter it indirectly. That is, instrumental relationships should have a weaker direct effect on discretionary work effort but potentially influence it via instrumental outcomes expected from participation in a secondary relationship with the leader. If this is the case, irks should have significant indirect effects through these other variables. This research would provide an empirical test of the mechanisms of the secondary relationship propositions proposed by Ash’s framework.

In a similar vein, the weaker direct relationship between irks and discretionary work effort found in my research may be a product of these relationships being contingent on individual and/or contextual characteristics. Therefore, another potential direction for further research is to identify and test possible moderator variables. For example, while not directly relevant to my research questions, the findings from my analysis of the Study 1 interviews suggested that employee work ethic might be a potential moderator of the relationship between at least some irks and discretionary work effort. Some study participants stated that they continued to supply discretionary work effort despite what they perceived as irks in their work place. They attributed this to their own work standards or ethic. Also, the “social compensation effect” of co-worker shirking offers an explanation for this irk having a marginal effect on discretionary work effort. Thus, concern for one’s reputation and future employment prospects (Gould-Williams, 2007; Organ et al., 2006), and perceived exit opportunities (Williams & Karau, 1991) might moderate this relationship.

Beyond the focus on perks and irks and their relationship with discretionary work effort, there is a need to more fully investigate the effect of monetary incentives on discretionary work effort. Using total income in my research rather than overtime payments, bonuses and so forth to measure financial benefits provided a rather crude measure of monetary reward. Thus, to investigate the full extent of the monetary reward-discretionary work effort relationship there is a need to use a more sophisticated measure of financial benefits as well as a wider range of monetary incentives.
Further research is also needed to ascertain the value placed on particular non-monetary work environment characteristics by employees relative to the employer’s cost of provision. Managers might investigate the preferences and aversions of their current employees to better identify the cost-effectiveness of changing perks and irks present in their organisation. This would allow managers to optimise the mix of perks and irks, and to introduce effective negotiated employment agreements with each employee, or at least with groups of similar employees, rather than persist with a ‘one-size-fits-all’ employment agreement. Research may answer whether better leadership, and/or the development of a workplace culture that encourages and rewards particular discretionary work effort behaviours by individuals really do have cost effective impacts on discretionary work effort for relatively minor cost.

Finally, a further research direction might be to further refine and improve the psychometric properties of the three facet discretionary work effort measurement model as the alpha reliability for the manifest indicators was a little low although comparable to other similar research (see for example Brown & Leigh, 1996). This might be improved by developing additional items for the scales measuring the time and intensity facets of discretionary work effort and by including additional indicators of the direction facet of discretionary work effort. For example, the time facet scale employed in my analysis had three items which is the minimum number recommended (Kline, 1998). Additional items to improve the quality of this scale might include voluntarily working extra unpaid hours at work or at home, and staying back at work to finish off important tasks. These ideas were amongst the comments on discretionary work time in the Study 1 interviews. Also, spending time thinking about work when not at work is an indicator of high discretionary work effort used in the workaholism literature (Harpaz & Snir, 2003; Scott et al., 1997) that may be suitable. In relation to the intensity facet, the Study 1 qualitative interviews indicated that when employees talk about discretionary work intensity they compare how hard they work with other work group members. This suggests an item on work intensity relative to others may enhance the intensity scale. Finally, as my measure of the direction facet included only two exemplars, a wider range of non-required work activities into which employees may direct their effort should enhance the quality of this measure. Civic virtue, which involves responsibly participating in and being concerned about the organisation at a macro-level (Organ et al., 2006), is a form of discretionary directed effort that has been included in many prior ERB studies and displays a more macro focus than other discretionary behaviours, and so may be a suitable inclusion in this measure.
7.7 CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of my research was to discover what employees perceive as common perks and irks and to examine how these, together with monetary reward, relate to discretionary work effort. By drawing from various literatures that have addressed work motivation and discretionary work effort to undertake this investigation, my research extended the current body of literature on this issue. Notably, bringing together the OB and economics literatures was beneficial as it highlighted that researchers from these two fields have investigated discretionary work effort from different vantage points broadening our view of this important concept. This approach provided a more complete conceptualisation of the discretionary work effort construct that is consistent with the work effort construct of which discretionary work effort is a component. Also, it expanded the range of predictors beyond those covered by any individual literature to provide a more comprehensive view of perks and irks.

Evidence from my program of research indicated that perks and irks as well as monetary reward play a role in influencing the level of discretionary work effort of employees. This research not only expands our knowledge about the perks, irks and discretionary work effort constructs, but also improves our understanding of how perks and irks influence discretionary work effort. There appeared to be a nuanced relationship between different classes of work environment characteristics and the different facets of discretionary work effort. Perks seemed to have a stronger and more pervasive influence on discretionary work effort than either irks or monetary reward. The rational sociality framework taken from work by Ash (2000) in the economics literature, showed some promise for providing a useful system for classifying work environment characteristics to improve our predictions of discretionary work effort. The presence of a nuanced relationship between these variables, pointed to the empirical utility of investigating the facets of discretionary work effort separately (Briggs & Cheek, 1986).

In an environment where organisations are increasingly under pressure to improve performance to remain financially viable and competitive, it is critical for employers and managers to recognise the role they can play in influencing the discretionary work effort of their employees. Organisational leaders can shape the work environment to make it more motivating and induce employees to engage in work behaviours beyond what is minimally required and which have the potential to improve organisational effectiveness and performance. Job characteristics and interpersonal relationships, especially positive relationships, play an important role. This research enhances our understanding of how these work environment characteristics impact on the different facets of discretionary work effort. It seems that managers have a greater opportunity to influence
discretionary work effort by motivating employees to work more intensively and to channel their
effort into particular types of work behaviours and activities than to try to encourage them to supply
extra discretionary work time. Nonetheless, my research has shown that managers need to address
perks, irks and monetary reward to influence time, intensity and direction to ensure the most
effective utilisation of their human resources.

This research does not fit with any single academic discipline as it derives from and
contributes to a wide-ranging field of literature and research. Different disciplines have examined the
problem of work motivation and discretionary work effort from different perspectives based on
different assumptions and using different methods. This has created a disjunction among academic
fields, perhaps none more so than economics and psychology as they have sought to understand what
motivates discretionary work effort. Researchers in each discipline have often been reluctant to use
insights from neighbouring fields to enhance their own research. My research has endeavoured to
further close the gap between economics and psychology by drawing on literature and research from
these different disciplines to improve our understanding of what motivates discretionary work effort.
I have attempted to reconcile the different approaches and to harmonise the use of technical terms
describing essentially similar phenomena. It is hoped that this research will serve to provide a
platform for further such interdisciplinary research into human behaviour in the workplace.
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Study 1
Information Sheet for Personal Interviews and Focus Group Participants

Researcher:
Robyn Morris (Principal Researcher)
Brisbane Graduate School of Business
Faculty of Business
Queensland University of Technology

Contact Details:
Phone: (08) 9792 4090
Email: robyn@careconsulting.com.au

Project Description
This research is being conducted as part of my PhD studies at the Brisbane Graduate School of Business at Queensland University of Technology. The study aims to explore employees’ views on work effort, the things that affect job satisfaction and those things that motivate or demotivate them at work. Participation is completely voluntary and the researcher guarantees the confidentiality and anonymity of each person participating. As the researcher, only I will hear and see your individual responses and these will be reported in a way that ensures no single person can be identified. You have been invited to participate in this study of local government employees in Western Australia with the agreement of your CEO. No information provided by specific individuals however will be seen by or made available to anyone within your organization.

By volunteering to be part of this project, you have agreed to participate in either a personal interview of about one-hour in length or a two-hour focus group interview. I will choose interview and focus group participants from amongst the volunteers to ensure that I get a cross-section of employees in terms of gender, age, job level and type, and length of service. These are some of the things believed to affect work motivation and it is important that I get a wide range on views on these topics.

During the interview, you will be asked to talk about your views on work effort, your participation in voluntary tasks, activities and projects at work, and your views about your work environment and various types of rewards. The information gathered will be used to develop a survey questionnaire that will be distributed at a later time to all employees of the local governments participating in this project. The survey will allow these issues to be investigated across a wider group of people.

Expected Benefits
Your participation in this project is not likely to provide you with any immediate, direct personal benefits. There is, however, the possibility of a longer-term indirect benefit for you and the industry in which you are working. Managers can affect the environment in which you work. Improving our knowledge and understanding of what motivates you at work and the importance of different rewards to you will help managers to develop strategies for improving employee job satisfaction and performance. It will also allow managers to better design reward systems that are valued by its employees.
Approval by Participating Organisations

Including your own organisation, there will be approximately 15 regional and sub-regional local governments in Western Australia participating in this project. WALGA has also expressed an interest in the project and its general findings.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If at any time you feel you want to withdraw you are free to do so without having to explain why and without comment by the researcher.

Audio Recording

To assist with the accurate transcription of the individual and group interviews, these discussions will be tape-recorded. The audio recordings will only be used for the purpose of this project, will be kept in a secure location during the project and will be destroyed once the content has been transcribed.

Confidentiality

All the information that you provide is completely confidential. As the principal researcher only I will have access to the information that you personally provide and this will only be reported in combination with that provided by all other participants. No individual person will be identifiable in any of the published results.

Risks

This project involves collecting information about your views on work effort and work motivation through personal interviews, focus group interviews and/or an anonymous survey. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, no names will appear on any documents and all focus group participants will be asked to agree to the confidentiality of the content of the discussions in the consent form signed. Also, the audio recordings of all discussions will be destroyed after their content has been transcribed and all written records will be securely stored and only accessible to the researcher.

Questions and Further Information

If you would like any extra information or have any questions about this project, please contact Robyn Morris (contact details above).

Concerns or Complaints

If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of this project you should contact the Research Ethics Officer at Queensland University of Technology. The contact details are:
Postal: Office of Research   Telephone: 07 3864 2340
O Block Podium   Email: ethicscontact@qut.edu.au
QUT Gardens Point Campus
GPO Box 2434
Brisbane   QLD  4001

Feedback

The researcher will not provide feedback on the specific results or outcomes of the project to individual participants. A summary report of the main outcomes of interest to the local government sector will be provided to the participating local governments and to WALGA for further distribution.
APPENDIX 2
Study 1 Consent Form

Queensland University of Technology  Brisbane Australia

Project Title: Employee Work Motivation and Discretionary Work Effort

Research Team: Robyn Morris
PhD Student
Brisbane Graduate School of Business
Queensland University of Technology

Phone Contact: (08) 9792 4090
Email Contact: robyn@careconsulting.com.au

Statement of Consent

By signing below, you are indicating that:

• You have been given enough information about the project to be able to make an informed decision about your participation in it;
• You understand the information provided to you;
• You have had any questions about the project and your participation in it answered to your satisfaction;
• You understand that if you have any additional questions you can contact the research team at any time to provide further information;
• You understand that participation in this project is completely voluntary and that you are free to withdraw at any time without comment or penalty;
• If at any time you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project you can contact the Research Ethics Officer on (07) 3864 2340 or ethicscontact@qut.edu.au; and
• You agree to participate in this project and allow the research team to use the information provided by you for the purpose of this project.

Name: __________________________________________________________________________
Signature: _________________________________________________________________________
Date: ______________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 3

Study 2 Questionnaire and Cover Letter

EMPLOYEE WORK MOTIVATION AND DISCRETIONARY WORK EFFORT SURVEY

Researcher:
Robyn Morris (PhD Student)
Brisbane Graduate School of Business
Faculty of Business
Queensland University of Technology

Contact Details:
Phone: (08) 9792 4090
Email: robyn@careconsulting.com.au
Mail: PO Box 2130 Bunbury WA 6231

AN OPPORTUNITY TO HELP IMPROVE THE WORK ENVIRONMENT

WHY FILL IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE?
This is an opportunity for you to have your say to help improve the work environment. This questionnaire has been developed as part of my PhD studies and is an independent survey. Eleven other Councils are participating across WA and your involvement will ensure that I receive a good representation of employee views. Everyone’s responses will be combined and a summary report given to participating Councils and the WA Local Government Association to help improve your employer’s understanding of local government employee preferences and work motivation.

PARTICIPATION AND CONFIDENTIALITY
Your participation is completely voluntary and your responses are strictly confidential and anonymous. Under no circumstances will other employees or your organisation have access to these. By completing this questionnaire you are agreeing to have your responses used only for this research.

HOW TO FILL IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE
I am seeking your personal views. Please answer the questions by giving your own impressions and not those of other people. It is important that you answer the questions as frankly as possible. There are two parts to the questionnaire. Part 1 asks about your beliefs about work and the type of work environment you would like to have. The work environment is the day-to-day task, social and physical environment associated with a job. This information will help to identify how a more satisfying and rewarding work environment can be developed for your benefit. Part 2 asks about your present job.

Please answer ALL questions even if you are not completely certain of your response. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers or any trick questions. If some questions seem repetitive this is to ensure that I have accurately obtained your views. Please read the instructions at the start of each section carefully. This should take about 30 minutes but you may wish to take longer.

When you have completed the questionnaire please mail it to me in the postage paid envelope provided as soon as possible but no later than Friday 24th February.

If you prefer to complete the survey electronically please email me and I will send you a copy. If you have any questions about this study or the questionnaire please contact me by phone or email (see details above).

If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of this project you should contact the Research Ethics Officer at Queensland University of Technology. The contact details are:
Postal: Office of Research
O Block Podium
QUT Gardens Point Campus, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane QLD 4001
Telephone: 07 3864 2340
Email: ethicscontact@qut.edu.au

Thank you for taking the time to help with this study
QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this important research project. Your response is highly valued and will remain completely confidential and anonymous. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer each question as honestly as you can. **It is most important that you answer ALL questions.**

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This section asks about your personal details and present job situation and will be used to gain a better understanding of the preferences and views of different groups of workers.

Please place a **cross** or a **tick** in the appropriate box or write your answer in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Gender:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 20 yrs</td>
<td>40-49 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-29 yrs</td>
<td>50-59 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 yrs</td>
<td>60+yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. My present job is:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Casual/temporary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. I presently work for the Shire/Town/City of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The department/section that I work in is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Length of time working for this organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td>under 1 yr</td>
<td>1-2 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>11-15 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16+ yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. My job level is:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non- management</td>
<td>Lower management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>Senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. My immediate manager/supervisor is:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower management</td>
<td>Middle management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Please indicate at which <strong>level</strong> (eg 1-10) and <strong>step</strong> in that level (eg 1-4) you are currently employed (e.g. If your job is a 3.2 you would indicate this as Level 3 and Step 2).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level:</td>
<td>Step:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. My present job involves working:</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside or in the community</td>
<td>Inside an office environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 1

The following set of questions ask you about the type of work environment you would most like to have and your beliefs about work in general. When thinking about this focus on those things that you believe would cause you to become satisfied or dissatisfied with your work. This part is about your PREFERENCES and BELIEFS not your actual work environment.

MY PREFERRED WORK ENVIRONMENT

This section aims to get an accurate picture of what you see as the positive and the negative things associated with a job and work environment. The positives are those things that would give you personal satisfaction (i.e. a perk). The negatives would cause you personal dissatisfaction (i.e. an irk). These things may relate to the job itself, the organisation, the manager/supervisor or co-workers.

Listed below are things that could be part of any work environment. Please indicate how much of a positive (a perk) or a negative (an irk) you would find each work feature IF it was part of your job or work environment. For each statement use the 7-point scale provided to circle the one number (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7) that best reflects your preference.

The following explanations may assist you in clearly understanding some key terms that appear in the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>WORK AREA</th>
<th>MANAGER/SUPERVISOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The company or establishment for which you work.</td>
<td>The department, branch, division or group within which you do most of your work.</td>
<td>The person that you would directly report to for most of your work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-WORKERS</th>
<th>IRKS</th>
<th>PERKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The group of people with whom you would interact with or work closely with on a day-to-day basis.</td>
<td>The non-monetary things that you associate with a job that would provide you with personal psychic dissatisfaction (i.e. the negatives).</td>
<td>The non-monetary things that you associate with a job that would provide you with personal psychic satisfaction (i.e. the positives).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Thinking about the content of a job and how you would prefer to work, how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) would you personally find a job situation where:

1. It is clear how my job contributes to meeting the goals of the organisation. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. The workload is too heavy to have time for developing new ideas. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I am allowed to experiment and discover new things. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I often get taken off a task or project because there isn't enough money or resources to finish it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I can be involved in a project or job from start to finish. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I have the freedom to use my own judgment in deciding how I do my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I have very little time to think about wider organisational problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. I am required to take personal responsibility for the outcomes. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. The budget allocated for projects is never enough to do the job properly. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I often have trouble getting the right materials or equipment to do a job properly. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. I often have to respond to crises or tight deadlines. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. I feel personally challenged by the work but it is within my capabilities. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I can work on important tasks or projects. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. I am able to work completely independently of others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. It is difficult for me and my co-workers to find time for long-term planning or problem solving. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. The job allows me to make full use of my skills and abilities. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. I feel personally challenged by the work but it is within my capabilities. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. I can work on important tasks or projects. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. I am able to work completely independently of others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. The time I have to complete a task is not enough to do good quality work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. The workload is so heavy that I never have enough time to get everything done. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. I can do things that involve helping other people. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. I find the work personally interesting or I feel passionate about it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. I have to work really hard all the time. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. The work gives me opportunities to learn new things. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. The information I need to complete tasks is always hard to get. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. I always need to take work home to get it finished in time. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

b) Thinking about the kind of manager/supervisor you would prefer to work with, how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) would you personally find each of the following:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. One who treats me with respect and integrity. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. One who focuses on my mistakes rather than recognising any of the good things I do. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. One who shows no interest in any suggestions I make. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. One who frequently takes over or interferes in the work I am doing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. One who is someone that I can respect. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. One who has poor people skills. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. One who controls every piece of paper going into and out of the office. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. One who does not communicate information that affects me or my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. One who is open to new ideas. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. One who focuses only on short-term goals. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. One who controls everything I do and how I do it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. One who has ideas that force me to rethink things that I have never questioned before. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. One who dislikes having his/her views or decisions questioned or challenged. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. One who expects a high standard of work from me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. One who leads by example providing me with a good role model. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>One who encourages me to continuously improve on my performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>One who monitors and controls everyone closely even those who are good workers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>One who always gives me positive feedback when I perform well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>One who does not delegate any responsibilities to others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>One who shows confidence in my ability to meet what he/she expects of me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>One who inspires members of our work group with his/her plans for the future.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>One who encourages me to find new and better ways of doing things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>One who builds a team spirit and attitude amongst members in our work area.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>One who gives me a clear understanding of where we are going.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>One who gives me special recognition when my work is outstanding.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>One who willingly shares his/her knowledge &amp; expertise with me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>One who makes me feel like a valued member of the team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>One who acknowledges improvements in the quality of my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>On who only gives me negative feedback about my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>One who ridicules anyone who offers suggestions for improving things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>One who makes it clear to me what level of work performance is expected in terms of amount, quality and timeliness of output.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>One who gives my personal feelings and needs consideration before acting.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>One who encourages everyone in my work area to be a team player.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thinking about the kind of co-workers you would prefer to work with, how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) would you personally find each of the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>People who recognise and value the work I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>People who are committed to the work we are doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>People who have a good blend of skills and talents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>People who go out of their way to help each other out when needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>People who encourage me to look for new and better ways of doing things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>People who freely share information that helps me do my job better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>People who value the contributions I make to our work area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>People who work well together as a team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>People who take time to listen to my problems and worries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>People who are energetic and inspiring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>People who trust each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>People who give me constructive feedback about how well I am doing in my job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. People who constructively challenge my ideas and thinking.  
14. People who openly communicate with each other.  
15. People who are frequently absent or late for work.  
16. People who avoid taking personal responsibility for their job or actions.  
17. People who never volunteer for extra tasks not formally required of them.  
18. People who try to look busy but waste time on non-work activities (e.g. social chat, personal calls)  
19. People who show no interest or commitment to their job.  
20. People who take more breaks than they should.  
21. People who fail to report work related problems when they see them.  
22. People who do poor quality work.  
23. People who contribute less effort when others are around to do the work.  
24. People who give less than 100% effort to their job.  
25. People who put in less effort than other members of the work group.  
26. People who don’t meet deadlines or deliver on promises.  
27. People who just do the minimum work required of them.  
28. People who leave jobs unfinished for others to do.  
29. People who stand around watching other team members do the work.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about the kind of organisation you would prefer to work for, how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) would you personally find each of the following:

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. One that provides opportunities for advancement for good performance.
16. One that encourages people and different departments to compete rather than cooperate with each other.
17. One that provides allowances for work related expenses (e.g. clothing allowance, travel allowance).
18. One that has a lot of formal rules & procedures that must always be followed.
19. One where everyone is encouraged to be creative and innovative.
20. One that provides substantial work related benefits for managers (e.g. company vehicle, mobile phone, professional membership fees).
21. One that provides flexible work arrangements (e.g. rostered days off, summer hours of work, flexi-time & job-sharing).
22. One that punishes people for mistakes rather than rewards people for good outcomes.
23. One where people are critical of any new ideas.
24. One that expects high standards of performance from its employees.
25. One that recognises outstanding performance.
26. One that is quick to take advantage of new opportunities.
27. One that provides a substantial retirement benefit program for all employees (e.g. non-compulsory superannuation contributions).
28. One where all decisions are made by management without consulting staff.
29. One that uses ‘best practice’ procedures.
30. One that focuses on making work a place people like and enjoy.
31. One where people play political or power games.
32. One that provides a comprehensive wellness program (e.g. employee assistance program, weight/stress control programs, free or subsidised health club membership).
33. One where people with good ideas for improving things get time to develop them.
34. One that has a salary structure that clearly reflects differences in people’s qualifications, skills & performance.
35. One that invests in the development of its people (e.g. provides opportunities to go to conferences, seminars, training courses).
36. One that emphasises getting good results or outcomes more than how tasks are done.
37. One that is very conservative and traditional.
38. One that focuses on the quality of work more than the quantity of work done.
e) Thinking about your **preferences** in relation to having access to organisational resources for personal use, how positive (a perk) or negative (an irk) would you **personally** find each of the following:

1. Having the opportunity to hire the organisation’s resources (e.g. equipment, tools, small machinery) for short periods for personal use.  
2. Having free access to organisational resources (equipment, materials, small machinery, tools, work vehicle) for personal use as long as the privilege is not abused.  
3. Having access to flexible work arrangements that accommodate my needs to take care of personal matters during work time as long as I get my work done.  
4. Having the opportunity to do little things for myself during work time (e.g. personal calls, photocopying, email) as long as I don’t go overboard.  
5. Having the opportunity to trade-off some of my own time (e.g. lunch break) so I can do some personal things during work time (e.g. attend school functions, finish work early).  
6. Having access to study assistance opportunities for personal studies in a work related area (e.g. course fees paid, paid study leave, do some study activities in work time).  
7. Having the opportunity to work from home for personal reasons (e.g. to care for a family member) if needed rather than having to take a sick day or personal day off.  
8. Having access to office equipment for personal use at no cost (e.g computer, fax).  
9. Having the opportunity to have special social gatherings with workmates in work time (e.g. special morning teas).  
10. Having access to the work phone for important or urgent personal calls.  
11. Having access to a company vehicle for occasional personal use.  
12. Having access to the internet at work for personal use (e.g. email, research, bill payment).  
13. Having access to facilities at work for social gatherings with workmates outside work time.  
14. Having the opportunity to take my spouse/partner to work related functions at company expense (e.g work social functions, conferences/seminars etc).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MY BELIEFS ABOUT WORK</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(f) Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It is important to me to make lots of money.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I work hard I will succeed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If there is an opportunity to earn money, I usually pursue it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hard work is fulfilling in itself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I frequently think about what I could do to earn a great deal of money.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As long as I’m paid for my work, I don’t mind working while other work colleagues or friends are having fun.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The kind of work I like is the one that pays top pay for top performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If I work hard enough, I am likely to make a good life for myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. By working hard I can overcome most obstacles that life presents and make my own way in the world.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hard work makes me a better person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hard work is a good builder of character.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would be unwilling to work for a below average wage even if the job was pleasant.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The most important thing about a job is the pay.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOU ARE NOW FINISHED PART 1. YOU ARE MORE THAN HALF WAY THROUGH. WHY NOT TAKE A SHORT BREAK BEFORE CONTINUING WITH PART 2.
### ABOUT YOUR PRESENT JOB

The following set of questions asks you about your present job. In answering these questions think about how you work, the types of things you do at work and how you feel about your present job.

Use the 7-point scale provided and circle only one number (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7) for each item to indicate the response that best describes your view.

#### THINGS I DO AT WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Thinking about how you usually approach your current job, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I often try to introduce new structures, technologies or approaches to improve efficiencies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I perform the tasks that are expected of me as part of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I strive as hard as I can to be successful in my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I often try to eliminate redundant or unnecessary procedures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I make constructive suggestions to improve the overall functioning of my work group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I go out of my way to help new employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I usually start work early or leave late.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I continuously look for new ways to improve the effectiveness of my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I try to bring about improved procedures in my work area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When there’s a job to be done, I devote all my energy to getting it done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I adequately meet my responsibilities at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I encourage others to try new and more effective ways of doing their job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Few of my co-workers put in more hours each week than I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I often make constructive suggestions for improving how things could operate within the organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I often try to adopt improved procedures for doing my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I fulfil the responsibilities specified in my job description.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I often try to change organisational rules or policies that are non-productive or counterproductive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When I work, I do so with intensity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I put in more hours throughout the year than most of the people in my work area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. When I work, I really exert myself to the fullest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I often try to correct a faulty procedure or practice at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. I keep myself well-informed on matters where my opinion might benefit the organisation. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. I volunteer for things that are not required of me by my job description. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. I work at my full capacity in all of my job duties. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. I often try to implement solutions to pressing organisational problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. I take action to protect the organisation from potential problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. I try to change how my job is done in order to be more effective. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. Among my co-workers, I’m usually the first to arrive the last to leave work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. I spend long hours at work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. I meet my performance expectations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. I try to introduce new work methods that are more effective for the organisation. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

### MY JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Thinking of your present job, please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you feel overall with each of the following by circling the number that best reflects how you feel.</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My pay and benefits.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My promotion opportunities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The recognition I receive for a job well done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The amount of say I have in how my work is to be done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My immediate manager/supervisor.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My co-workers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MY WORK EFFORT

(c). The scale below represents the level of work effort that you could give to your job. Zero represents no effort and 100 represents your maximum effort. **Maximum effort** is the point where you would become completely **physically or emotionally exhausted**.

Please place three marks along the scale below to show:

1. Place a square [ ] at the point along this scale to show what you believe is your typical level of effort – the level that you actually work at most of the time in your present job.
2. Now place a cross [X] at the point along this scale that represents what you believe is the level of effort that your immediate manager/supervisor would prefer people in your work area to work at most of the time?
3. Now place a circle [O] at the point along this scale to show how low you believe that the work effort of anyone in your work area would need to go before he/she would be in danger of being fired.

- [ ] = my typical level of effort;
- [X] = level of effort my manager/supervisor would prefer;
- [O] = minimum effort before anyone would be in danger of getting fired

---

Maximum Effort
WEIGHING UP THE POSITIVES AND THE NEGATIVES

(d) Thinking about the job you are doing and the organisation for which you work right now, please indicate how accurate or inaccurate the following statements are for you personally by circling the number that best describes your view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Inaccurate</th>
<th>Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thinking about all the tasks I do as part of my job, the satisfaction I get from the positive bits is greater than the dissatisfaction that I get from the negative bits.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thinking about the way in which my manager/supervisor leads my work area overall, I feel more satisfied than I feel dissatisfied with his/her actions and decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thinking about my co-workers overall I get more satisfaction from the positive things they do than I get dissatisfaction from the negative things they do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thinking about my organisation overall I get a greater level of satisfaction from being part of this organisation than I get dissatisfaction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Thinking about the community in which I work the overall benefits of being part of this community are greater than the overall costs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Thinking about ALL the NON-MONETARY parts of my work environment, the combination of positive things gives me more satisfaction than the combination of negative things causes me dissatisfaction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) I will be following up this questionnaire with a second survey. I need you to provide me with a code that allows you to remain completely anonymous but will let me match your responses. In the first two boxes below please write in the date of the month of your mother's birthday (e.g. if it is 2nd May write in 02). If you don't know write in 00. Now in the last 2 boxes write in the first two letters of your mother's first name (e.g. if her name is Mary write in MA). If you are uncertain write in ZZ.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE
APPENDIX 4

Study 3 Questionnaire

BRISBANE
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
Queensland University of Technology

EMPLOYEE WORK MOTIVATION AND DISCRETIONARY WORK EFFORT

Researcher:
Robyn Morris (PhD Student)
Brisbane Graduate School of Business
Faculty of Business
Queensland University of Technology

Contact Details:
Phone: (08) 9792 4090
Email: robyn@careconsulting.com.au
Mail: PO Box 2130 Bunbury WA 6231

SURVEY 2: HOW GOOD IS YOUR WORK ENVIRONMENT?

WHY FILL IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE?

During January/February 2006 you were invited to take part in a study of employee work motivation involving 12 WA Councils. Thank you to everyone that took part and I look forward to your input to this follow-up survey. The first part of this research identified those things that most people find positive or negative in a work environment. This second survey asks you about your present work environment and I encourage everyone to participate in this important follow-up even if you did not return your first survey. This part of the study will identify how well local government provides the type of work environment that its employees find motivating.

Your participation is completely voluntary and your responses are completely confidential. You are not required to provide your name and under no circumstances will anyone in your organisation have access to your responses. By completing this questionnaire you are agreeing to have your responses used only for this research.

Please read all the instructions carefully and answer ALL questions. There are no right or wrong answers. Some questions are being tested again to be sure that I capture your views accurately. This should take about 20 minutes to fill in but you may wish to take longer. If you prefer an electronic copy please email me and I will send you a copy. If you have any questions about this study or the questionnaire email me at robyn@careconsulting.com.au. If you are taking part and would like a summary of the research findings later this year please phone or email me to register your interest.

Please mail your survey in the postage paid envelope provided as soon as possible but no later than FRIDAY 5th MAY.

If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of this project you should contact the Research Ethics Officer at Queensland University of Technology. The contact details are:
Postal: Office of Research
O Block Podium
QUT Gardens Point Campus, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane QLD 4001
Telephone: 07 3864 2340
Email: ethicscontact@qut.edu.au
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QUESTIONNAIRE 2

Thank you for taking the time to take part in this follow-up survey. Your response is highly valued and will remain completely confidential. Please answer each question as honestly as you can. It is most important that you answer ALL questions.

**MY PRESENT WORK ENVIRONMENT**

- This section aims to get an accurate picture of how you view your present work environment. Answer the following questions from the point of view of the job you are presently doing.

Please indicate how accurately or inaccurately each of the following statements describes your present work environment. For each statement please circle only ONE number on the 7-point scale (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7) to best reflect your view.

The following explanations may assist you in understanding some key terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>WORK AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council for which you work.</td>
<td>The department, branch, division or group within which you do most of your work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGER/SUPERVISOR</th>
<th>CO-WORKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person that you directly report to for most of your day-to-day work.</td>
<td>The group of people with whom you would interact with or work closely with on a day-to-day basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For your present work environment how accurate or inaccurate is each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Inaccurate</th>
<th>Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) In my present job:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I find the work personally interesting or I feel passionate about it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am allowed to experiment and discover new things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I can be involved in a project or job from start to finish.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have the freedom to use my own judgment in deciding how I do my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel personally challenged by the work but it is within my capabilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have opportunities to tackle new problems or do different things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel like I am my own boss and do not have to double check all of my decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The job allows me to make full use of my skills and abilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is basically my own responsibility to decide how my job gets done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The work stretches my abilities and brings out the best in me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have the opportunity to do my work in my own way.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is clear how my job contributes to meeting the goals of the organisation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I have the chance to be creative &amp; use my own initiative.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I can work on important tasks or projects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The work gives me opportunities to learn new things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I can do things that involve helping other people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) My immediate manager/supervisor:

1. Treats me with respect and integrity.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Always gives me positive feedback when I perform well.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Shows NO interest in any suggestions I make.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Frequently takes over or interferes in the work I am doing.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Encourages me to continuously improve on my performance.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Has poor people skills.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Does NOT communicate information that affects me or my job.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Is open to new ideas.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Controls everything I do and how I do it.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. Dislikes having his/her views or decisions questioned or challenged.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Encourages me to perform at a high standard.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. Leads by example providing me with a good role model.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. Is someone that I can respect.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Focuses on my mistakes rather than recognising any of the good things I do.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Shows confidence in my ability to meet what he/she expects of me.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. Inspires members of our work group with his/her plans for the future.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. Encourages me to find new and better ways of doing things.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. Builds a team spirit and attitude amongst members in our work area.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. Gives me a clear understanding of where we are going.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. Gives me special recognition when my work is outstanding.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. Willingly shares his/her knowledge & expertise with me.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Makes me feel like a valued member of the team.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Acknowledges improvements in the quality of my work.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. Only gives me negative feedback about my work.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. Encourages everyone in my work area to be a team player.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. Provides me with opportunities for developing my career when I perform well.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. Shows concern for the personal welfare of staff in my work group.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. Personally compliments me when I do a better than average job.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. Considers my needs and personal feelings before acting.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

344
c) **My co-workers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inaccurate</th>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Moderately Inaccurate</th>
<th>Slightly Inaccurate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Accurate</th>
<th>Moderately Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Are committed to the work we are doing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Avoid taking personal responsibility for their job or actions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Go out of their way to help each other out when needed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Never volunteer for extra tasks not formally required of them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Freely share information that helps me do my job better.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Value the contributions I make to our work area.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Show NO interest or commitment to their job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Put in less effort than other members of the work group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Trust each other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Give me constructive (helpful) feedback about how well I am doing in my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Openly communicate with each other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Stand around watching other team members do the work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Are frequently absent or late for work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Work well together as a team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Recognise and value the work I do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Try to look busy but waste time on non-work activities (e.g. social chat, personal calls)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Encourage me to look for new and better ways of doing things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Just do the minimum work required of them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Fail to report work related problems when they see them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Do poor quality work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Contribute less effort when others are around to do the work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Leave jobs unfinished for others to do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Don’t meet deadlines or deliver on promises.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Have a good blend of skills and talents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Take more breaks than they should.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Are energetic and inspiring.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) My organisation:

|   | 1. Has different departments that focus on protecting their territory. | 2. Has departments that are uncooperative or even obstructive. | 3. Has people who try to shift their responsibilities or blame onto others (pass the buck) | 4. Rewards people on the basis of how well they perform in their jobs. | 5. Emphasises cooperation and collaboration as everyone is part of the team. | 6. Has poor communication. | 7. Encourages and helps its people balance work, family and non-work responsibilities. | 8. Provides opportunities for advancement for good performance. | 9. Encourages people and different departments to compete rather than cooperate with each other. | 10. Provides allowances for work related expenses (e.g. clothing and travel allowances). | 11. Encourages everyone to be creative and innovative. | 12. Provides flexible work arrangements (e.g. rostered days off, summer hours of work, flexi-time & job-sharing). | 13. Punishes people for mistakes rather than rewards people for good outcomes. | 14. Has people that are critical of any new ideas. | 15. Invests in the development of its people (e.g. provides opportunities to go to conferences, seminars, training courses). | 16. Recognises outstanding performance. | 17. Is quick to take advantage of new opportunities. | 18. Provides a substantial retirement benefit program for all employees (e.g. non-compulsory superannuation contributions). | 19. Has all decisions made by management without consulting staff. | 20. Focuses on making work a place people like and enjoy. | 21. Has people who play political or power games. |
|   | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |

Inaccurate ➔ Accurate

1. Very Inaccurate
2. Moderately Inaccurate
3. Slightly Inaccurate
4. Slightly Accurate
5. Moderately Accurate
6. Very Accurate
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Provides a comprehensive wellness program (e.g. employee assistance program, weight/stress control programs, free or subsidised health club membership).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Gives people with good ideas for improving things time to develop them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Recognises staff who take the initiative to make improvements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Has people who are reluctant to try new ways of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Rewards staff for good quality work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Has a salary structure that clearly reflects differences in people’s qualifications, skills &amp; performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Considers all staff as a valued member of the organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Rewards people who develop good ideas for improving the organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Recognises that its employees have a life outside of work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Gives me access to flexible work arrangements that accommodate my needs to take care of personal matters during work time as long as I get my work done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Gives me access to the work phone for important or urgent personal calls.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Gives me the opportunity to trade-off some of my own time (e.g. lunch break) to do some personal things during work time (e.g. attend school functions, finish work early).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Gives me access to study assistance opportunities for personal studies in a work related area (e.g. course fees paid, paid study leave, study activities done in work time).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Gives me the opportunity to work from home for personal reasons (e.g. to care for a family member) if needed rather than having to take a sick day or personal day off.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MY PRESENT JOB

This section aims to get an accurate picture of how you approach and feel about your present job. In answering these questions think about how you work, the types of things you do at work and how you feel about your present job.

For each statement please circle only ONE number on the 7-point scale (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7) to best reflect your view.

### THINGS I DO AT WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e) Thinking about the things you usually do in your <strong>present job</strong>, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following:</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I help other staff who have been absent with their work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often try to introduce new structures, technologies or approaches to improve efficiencies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I attend work meetings that are not compulsory but are seen as important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I often try to eliminate unnecessary or redundant procedures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I help new employees settle into their job even though I don't have to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I try to bring about new procedures in my work area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I keep myself aware of changes in the organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am always prepared to give others around me a helping hand at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I meet the formal performance requirements expected for my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I attend functions that are not required but help improve the Council image.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I willingly help others who have work related problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I try to introduce new work methods that are more effective for the organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I read and keep up with Council announcements, memos etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I adequately complete my work responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I often try to take on improved procedures for doing my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I often make helpful suggestions for improving things that could operate within the organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I often try to change organisational rules or policies that are non-productive or counterproductive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I try to change how my job is done in order to be more effective.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I perform all the tasks that are expected of me as part of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. I often try to correct a faulty procedure or practice at work.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. I fulfil the responsibilities specified in my job description.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. I help others who have heavy workloads.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. I often try to implement solutions to pressing organisational problems.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. I often think about quitting my present job and finding a new one.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. I don’t think I will stay working for this organisation for a long time.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. If I had the chance I would leave my present job.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MY JOB SATISFACTION

(f) Thinking of your present job, please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you feel with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My pay and benefits.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My promotion opportunities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The recognition I receive for a job well done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The amount of say I have in how my work is to be done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My immediate manager/ supervisor.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My co-workers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONETARY REWARD

Please indicate your total yearly income (before tax) from your present job. Only count the actual money you get from your base pay, overtime pay, bonuses or allowances, any paid time off and other direct money payments. Do NOT include any indirect benefits that form part of your ‘package’ such as a company car, superannuation contributions, funding for conferences or training etc.

- Under $30,000
- $30,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$49,999
- $50,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$69,999
- $70,000-$79,999
- $80,000-$89,999
- $90,000-$99,999
- $100,000-$120,000
- Over $120,000
MY WORK EFFORT

(g) In your present job, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

1. I strive as hard as I can to be successful in my work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I usually start work early or leave late. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. When there's a job to be done, I devote all my energy to getting it done. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Few of my co-workers put in more hours working each week than I do. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. When I work, I do so with intensity. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I work at my full capacity in all of my job duties. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I spend long hours doing my work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. When I work, I really exert myself to the fullest. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Among my co-workers, I'm usually first to arrive or last to leave work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I put more hours into my job throughout the year than most people in my work area. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. This section aims to look at your views of different levels of work effort. The scales below represent a range of possible levels of work effort that you could put into your job. It goes from zero that represents no effort at all up to 100 that represents your maximum effort. **Maximum effort** is the point where you would become completely physically or emotionally exhausted.

   (a) On the scale below place a square [□] at the point that you believe is your typical level of effort – the level that you actually work at most of the time in your present job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Effort</td>
<td>Maximum Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (b) On the scale below place a cross [X] at the point that you believe is the level of effort that your immediate manager/supervisor would prefer or expects people in your work area to work at most of the time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Effort</td>
<td>Maximum Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (c) On the scale below place a solid circle [●] at the point that you believe anyone in your work area would be in danger of losing their job if their work effort dropped below it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Effort</td>
<td>Maximum Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Gender:</th>
<th>□ Male</th>
<th>□ Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Age:</td>
<td>□ Under 20 yrs</td>
<td>□ 20-29 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. My present job is:</td>
<td>□ Full-time</td>
<td>□ Permanent part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The Council I presently work for is:</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The department/section I work in is:</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. I have worked for this Council for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ under 1 yr</td>
<td>□ 1-2 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. In my present job I am:</td>
<td>□ Non-management (do not supervise any other staff)</td>
<td>□ Lower management (supervise/coordinate a team/unit in day-to-day activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. The management level of my immediate manager/supervisor is:</td>
<td>□ Lower</td>
<td>□ Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. What percentage of your present job involves working:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>_____% outdoors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>_____% within the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>_____% indoors or in an office environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Did you complete and return the first survey sent out in January/February this year?  
| □ No | □ Yes |

K. IF YES I need you to again provide me with the same code you gave for your last survey. Remember you needed to write in the date of whatever month your mother’s birthday is on in the first two boxes below (e.g. if it is 4th May you write in 04). If you didn’t know write in 00. Now in the last 2 boxes you write in the first two letters of your mother’s first name (e.g. if her name is Janice you write in JA). If you are uncertain write in ZZ.  

e.g. 0 4 J A  

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND VALUABLE INPUT
# Appendix 5

## Study 3 CFA Results - Correlated 5-factor Perks and 3-factor Irks Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Challenging Work</th>
<th>Team-oriented Leadership</th>
<th>Co-worker Support</th>
<th>Support for Flexible Work Arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my present job:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am allowed to experiment and discover new things.</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to tackle new problems and do different things.</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job allows me to make full use of my skills and abilities.</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the chance to be creative and use my own initiative.</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work gives me opportunities to learn new things.</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| My immediate manager/ supervisor: | | | | |
| Treats me with respect and integrity. | | .849 | | |
| Always gives me positive feedback when I perform well. | | .845 | | |
| Leads by example providing me with a good role model. | | .837 | | |
| Encourages me to find new and better ways of doing things. | | .801 | | |
| Gives me a clear understanding of where we are going. | | .865 | | |
| Willingly shares his/her knowledge and expertise with me. | | .843 | | |
| Encourages everyone in my work area to be a team player. | | .730 | | |

| My co-workers: | | | | |
| Go out of their way to help each other when needed. | | | .782 | |
| Freely share information that helps me do my job better. | | | .776 | |
| Value the contributions I make to our work area. | | | .757 | |
| Trust each other. | | | .724 | |
| Work well together as a team. | | | .735 | |
| Have a good blend of skills and talents. | | | .616 | |

| My organisation: | | | | |
| Gives me access to flexible work arrangements that accommodate my needs to take care of personal matters during work time as long as I get my work done. | | | .857 | |
| Gives me the opportunity to trade-off some of my time (e.g. lunch break) to do some personal things during work time (e.g. attend school functions, finish work early) | | | .710 | |
| Gives me the opportunity to work from home for personal reasons (e.g. to care for a family member) if needed rather than having to take a sick day or a personal day off. | | | .513 | |

| Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability | .888 | .937 | .873 | .714 |
| Composite Reliability | .892 | .937 | .874 | .743 |
| Average Variance Explained | 62.3% | 68.1% | 53.8% | 50.1% |
APPENDIX 5 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Recognition for Good Performance</th>
<th>Autocratic Leader Behaviour</th>
<th>Power-Orientation</th>
<th>Co-worker Shirking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>My organisation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognises outstanding performance.</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities for advancement for good performance.</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives people with good ideas for improving things time to develop them.</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invests in the development of its people (e.g. provides opportunities to go to conferences, seminar, training courses).</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My immediate manager/supervisor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on my mistakes rather than recognizing any of the good things I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridicules anyone who offers suggestions for improving things.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently takes over or interferes in the work I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not communicate information that affects me or my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls everything I do and how I do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My organisation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has people who try to shift their responsibilities onto others (i.e. pass the buck)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha poor communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha people who play political and power games.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has people who are critical of any new ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My co-workers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute less effort when others are around to do the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just do the minimum work required of them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t meet deadlines or deliver on promises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do poor quality work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to report work related problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to look busy but waste time on non-work activities (e.g. social chat, personal calls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand around watching other team members do the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct Reliability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Variance Explained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Model Goodness-of-Fit Indices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>1504.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>2.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Correlations, Squared Correlations and Average Variance Extracted for Perks and Irks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>CHW</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>CWS</th>
<th>FWA</th>
<th>RGP</th>
<th>ALB</th>
<th>POWOR</th>
<th>CWSH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>-.564</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>-.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>-.754</td>
<td>-.442</td>
<td>-.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>-.301</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWA</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>-.387</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGP</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.464</td>
<td>-.576</td>
<td>-.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALB</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWOR</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSH</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations above the diagonal and correlations squared below the diagonal.

CHW = Challenging work
TOL = Team-oriented leadership
CWS = Co-worker support
FWA = Support for flexible work arrangements
RGP = Recognition for good performance
ALB = Autocratic leader behaviour
POWOR = Power-orientation
CWSH = Co-worker shirking
AVE = Average variance extracted

Average variance extracted for ALB < Correlation squared between TOL and ALB
APPENDIX 6

Study 3 CFA Results - Correlated 3-factor Discretionary Work Effort Measurement Model

Discretionary Work Time \( (\alpha = .806) \)

DWT1 I put more hours into my job throughout the year than most people in my work area.
DWT2 Among my co-workers, I’m usually first to arrive or last to leave work.
DWT3 Few of my co-workers put in more hours working each week than I do.

Discretionary Work Intensity \( (\alpha = .842) \)

DWI1 I strive as hard as I can to be successful in my work.
DWI2 When there’s a job to be done, I devote all my energy to getting it done.
DWI3 When I work, I do so with intensity.
DWI4 I work at my full capacity in all of my job duties.

Discretionary Directed Effort \( (DDE: \alpha = .712; TC: \alpha = .806; H: \alpha = .763) \)

TC1 I often try to introduce new structures, technologies or approaches to improve efficiencies.
TC2 I often try to eliminate unnecessary or redundant procedures.
TC3 I try to bring about new procedures in my work area.
TC4 I try to introduce new work methods that are more effective for the organisation.
TC5 I often make helpful suggestions for improving how things could operate within the organisation.
TC6 I try to change how my job is done in order to be more effective.
H1 I help others who have heavy workloads.
H2 I willingly help others who have work related problems.
H3 I am always prepared to give others around me a helping hand at work.
H4 I help new employees settle into their job even though I don’t have to.
H5 I help other staff who have been absent with their work.

Discretionary Work Effort Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness-of-Fit Indices</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>343.337</td>
<td>Discretionary work time</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Discretionary work intensity</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>Discretionary directed effort</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>- Taking charge</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>- Helping</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations, Squared Correlations and Average Variance Extracted for the Facets of Discretionary Work Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DWT</th>
<th>DWI</th>
<th>DDE</th>
<th>TC*</th>
<th>H*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DWT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDE</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations above the diagonal and correlations squared below the diagonal.

* Implied correlations

DWT = Discretionary work time
DWI = Discretionary work intensity
DDE = Discretionary directed effort
TC = Taking charge
H = Helping
AVE = Average variance extracted

Average variance extracted for Helping < Correlation squared between TC and H
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