Enthusiastic employees outproduce and outperform employees who are not motivated to perform. They step up to do the impossible. They rally each other in tough times. Most people are enthusiastic when they're hired: hopeful, ready to work hard and eager to contribute. What happens to dampen their enthusiasm? Management, that’s what.

In this summary, three employee management experts from Sirota Consulting offer 30 years of research and experience to show readers exactly what managers are doing wrong — and what they should do instead.

Drawing on detailed case studies and employee attitude surveys from hundreds of companies, the authors offer research-proven solutions — not fads, nostrums or phony shortcuts. Along the way, they describe a dollars-and-cents business case for high employee morale, explain exactly what employee morale means, and present the specific management practices that offer the greatest positive performance impact.

What You’ll Learn In This Summary

- Techniques that are shown to increase employee performance 30 to 40 percent — and also increase stock performance.
- Proven solutions and real data that are based on research with more than 2,500,000 employees in 237 companies.
- How to deliver the three core elements of a healthy workplace: fairness, achievement and camaraderie.
- Ways to stop your organization’s managers from demotivating your employees.
- How to build a real partnership culture for the long term.
THE ENTHUSIASTIC EMPLOYEE
by David Sirota, Louis A. Mischkind and Michael Irwin Meltzer

— THE COMPLETE SUMMARY

Worker Motivation, Morale And Performance

The impact shook everything for blocks. Fire sucked so much oxygen out of the air around the impact zone that windows in nearby buildings blew out as the towers of the World Trade Center began to wither and then collapse. On the 32nd floor of the World Financial Center, the editorial and business offices of Barron’s Magazine had been almost instantaneously decimated. Yet, on Sept. 11, 2001, Barron’s employees had already turned their attention to publishing the next magazine on time. The idea of not publishing never even came up.

Most organizations would love to have employees who display that level of enthusiasm for their jobs, their companies and their co-workers.

Difficult Employees

Managers spend too much time dealing with difficult employees. Some of them think that the problem of dealing with troublesome employees is a drain on human resources. But the reality is even worse, because the biggest problem is the vast number of workers who aren’t openly troublesome but who have become indifferent to the organization and its goals. At least the openly troublesome workers can be dealt with, whereas the “walking indifferent” are silent killers. They give a mere fraction of what they are capable of contributing.

The economic cost of this underutilization to the affected business is enormous.

How does a company tackle this kind of problem? It can operate in one of two ways: It can pressure employees to do more or it can treat its workers to a series of rah-rah events, speakers and programs. Neither approach will do much good — in fact, the former will likely exacerbate the problem. We need to get to the root of employee indifference and we need to address it. The real challenge is to turn indifferent workers into enthusiastic workers. First, we must understand what workers want. Then, we must give it to them.

This might sound absurd to some, a sure way to insolven. On the contrary, it is a powerful path to business success. Here’s why:

1. Many years of research have established that there is little conflict between the goals of management and those of employees. The key question is not how to motivate workers, but how to sustain — and prevent management from destroying — the motivation that employees naturally bring to their jobs.

2. Workers have basic needs that management can and should address. When companies can meet their employees’ needs, the result isn’t just satisfied employees but enthusiastic employees. Every successful company has to address three crucial factors: equity, achievement and camaraderie.

3. Employee enthusiasm results in enormous competitive advantages for those companies with the strength of leadership to manage for real long-term results.

These points are proven by numerous cases from more than 30 years of survey research into the effect of employee attitudes on organizational effectiveness.

Is Loyalty Dead?

The “loyalty is dead” crowd suggests that new economic conditions have made untenable the previous paternalistic pattern of lifetime careers at caring companies. There will never be a return to old-fashioned paternalistic employment, and paternalism does not need to
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be replaced with a neutral “transactional system” — where workers are nothing more than a paycheck and can be removed at a moment’s notice.

The gains from a transactional relationship are usually temporary, in part because such organizations receive from most of their workers little beyond what is absolutely required and monitored. For example, can a company expect its employees to treat customers with individual care and concern — the care and concern that creates loyal customers — where the employees are treated as invisible, interchangeable and expendable parts? A transactional relationship is therefore often a prescription for short-term success and long-term mediocrity.

Neither a paternalistic nor a transactional relationship is the most effective way to create high levels of long-term organizational performance. The policies and practices in this summary represent a third alternative: partnership. The loyalty in a partnership relationship is not the kind that parents and children have toward each other. Instead, it involves the bonds that develop among adults working collaboratively toward common, long-term goals and having a genuine concern for each other’s interests and needs. ■

What Workers Want:
The Big Picture

The effectiveness of critical business policies depends on the extent to which our assumptions about human motivation are accurate. If they are not accurate, they either have no impact at all, or worse, they boomerang and damage the organization. Accuracy depends not only on wisdom and experience, but on systematic research. The problem with many theories in this field is not that they have nothing to say, but rather that they focus on one aspiration as the central motivator, claim that most people are frustrated with the achievement of that aspiration, and typically assert that what the theorist has uncovered is a “new generation” of workers.

What People Actually Say About Work

For reasons that are misguided, popular theories of what employees want change continually, and the change is often couched in terms of new generations of workers whose needs and expectations somehow magically differ from their predecessors. Some say there are differences between the “Baby Boomers” and “Gen X.”

Contrary to the variety of unsupported theories about worker attitudes, such as the Gen X and job-enrichment fads, we find that the overall satisfaction of workers with the type of work that they do is strong and constant over a wide variety of industries and occupations. There is also no evidence that younger workers are more (or less) disenchanted than their elders.

The Three Factor Theory of Human Motivation in the Workplace

There are three primary sets of goals of people at work: equity, achievement and camaraderie. This Three Factor Theory of Human Motivation in the Workplace maintains that:

1. These three sets of goals are what the overwhelming majority of workers want.
2. No other goals are nearly as important for the vast majority of workers.
3. These goals haven’t changed over time and cut across cultures.
4. When your organization works to achieve these goals, the result will be high work-force morale and firm performance.

How the Three Factors Work in Combination

The three factors interact with each other in an interesting way. The Three Factor Theory asserts that employees seek to satisfy three needs — equity, achievement and camaraderie — in any employment situation. It further asserts that, when all three needs are met, this results in enthusiasm directed toward accomplishing organizational goals. A great company for employees is one that largely meets all of those three needs. The moral of this story is that it can be difficult to get employees excited about a company that, for example, gives them challenging work to do when they have a basic sense of inequality as to how they are treated.

Human Motivation

The Three Factor Theory provides a positive view of the nature of work. The essentials of human motivation have changed very little over time, but management is acting in a different way and is reaping the consequences. As an example, if you treat workers like disposable commodities, which began to happen with the downsizings of the late ’80s and the ’90s, you should not be surprised that workers are no longer “loyal.” Why should they be? It would be irrational for people to be loyal to organizations that show no interest in them other than as, essentially, temporary “hands” to get the work done.

Nothing is very complicated about this perspective. The performance improvement methods contained in this summary are the “blocking and tackling” of an enlightened management: enlightened in its understanding that what the overwhelming majority of people seek from work doesn’t conflict with management’s objectives and, in fact, usually strongly supports them. If these methods are implemented, the results will be outstanding. ■
The Enthusiastic Employee — SUMMARY

Tell Us in Your Own Words

Here’s how enthusiastic employees respond when asked to give written comments:

✓ “We are totally committed to our customers. This is the passion of this company from the executive suite to my colleagues on the front line. I know from first-hand experience that customers believe they are the primary focus of our business and greatly appreciate the level of service and attention we provide them.”

✓ “The bottom line isn’t everything here; employees count, too.”

✓ “I mean it. I feel like I’ve died and gone to heaven here. If things stay this way, I’d like to spend the rest of my working life for this company. You feel like a real person, not just a number.”

Employee Enthusiasm and Business Success

What does employee enthusiasm have to do with business success? Many companies have enjoyed long-term success — ranging from Barron’s Magazine to the Mayo Clinic to Starbucks — and although there is no common industry, geographical area or business model, they share one thing: The morale of their workers, as measured in surveys, is much higher than most other companies. This is one of the key characteristics of almost every company that has experienced long-term success. The high morale of their workers is a result of specific policies and practices that engender enthusiasm in their employees about their jobs and their companies. And, on average, organizations with enthusiastic employees are much higher performing organizations than the rest.

A Few Leading Organizations

For about 20 years, Intuit has led a burgeoning industry of software development and sales in the important area of business and financial management of small organizations, the accounting professions and consumers. Employee enthusiasm is not just a feeling or an attitude: It is a motivated state, impelling people to action. Intuit gives its workers something to achieve, and it is dedicated to fulfilling its promises to employees by tracking how they are doing.

Enthusiastic employees routinely produce significantly more than the job requires, often working all kinds of hours to get things done right; search for ways to improve things rather than just reacting to management’s requests; encourage co-workers to high levels of performance; and welcome rather than resist change.

About 16.4 percent of the business units surveyed can be characterized as having highly discontented and perhaps, hostile, work forces. Hostility differs from enthusiasm, but they are both highly motivated states that impel people into action. Anger is primarily a product of a sense of injustice. Where the motivation of an enthusiastic employee is to do more and go beyond what is called for, the motivation of a hostile employee is to do less and somehow harm the organization.

The People Performance Model

There is a very large and impressive body of work proving that employee enthusiasm translates into stronger business performance. Jeffrey Pfeffer, in his comprehensive review of the research, concludes that companies with enthusiastic employees are 30 to 40 percent more productive. Research shows that companies with high morale performed consistently better than their industry comparison group, according to the stock market.

The best research and thinking in this area developed a model called the People Performance Model, which encompasses all the key variables and the way these variables relate to each other. The research and simple logic suggest that the relationship between morale and performance is reciprocal: Each is both a cause and an effect of the other. It is a system of interlocking, mutually reinforcing factors — a virtuous circle or a vicious circle (if the direction is negative).

Here are the key points of the People Performance Model:

● People and their morale matter tremendously for business success, including customer satisfaction.

● Employee morale is a function of the way an organization is led.

● Success breeds success. The better the individual and organization perform, the greater the employee morale is, which in turn boosts performance.

● The management practices that matter most boost an employee’s sense of equity, achievement and camaraderie.

Motivated by Fair Treatment

The policies and practices that facilitate employee enthusiasm begin with the concept of equity — the degree to which people believe their employer treats them with fundamental fairness. When focusing on the treatment of large groups, equity refers to the collective treatment of workers relative to fundamental and generally accepted societal standards. These standards include a “living wage,” adequate nonwage benefits such as medical coverage, sensitivity in handling layoffs, safe working conditions, a reasonable workload and equality of employment opportunity.

Although lifetime employment guarantees are about impossible for just about any organization, if an organization seeks to have enthusiastic workers, it must under-
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stand that those employees are not fungible objects. Workers often experience layoffs not as prudent business stewardship but rather as base inequitable treatment. Where does this attitude come from? The answer has two parts: the sense of substantive equity (whether the thing itself is fair) and the sense of procedural equity (whether what is done is done fairly). Alan Sloan captured the spirit of a new era in a 1996 Newsweek article:

“Firing people has gotten to be trendy in corporate America, in the same way that building new plants and being considered a good corporate citizen gave you bragging rights 25 years ago. Now you fire workers — especially white-collar workers — to make your corporate bones … Wall Street and Big Business have been in perfect harmony about how in-your-face capitalism is making America great.”

The new management attitude includes ordering layoffs when a company is doing well. In the early 1990s, several large corporations downsized despite being profitable. What message does management convey by these and similar actions? It might be an encouraging message to the investment community, but to workers it is simply this: “Forget all that talk about you being an asset to the company; You are really a cost and a disposable commodity. And we will keep our costs down!”

Loss of Security

People react strongly to loss of security and the lost sense of fair treatment that comes with it in circumstances such as these. The need for people to feel that they are being treated fairly is basic, and nothing is more basic for most people than job security. The impact of people feeling that they are not being treated equitably in this respect can be strongly negative on the organization.

The way many American companies now seem to operate, by essentially using downsizing as a strategic maneuver rather than as a last resort compelled by economic necessity, is largely misguided and self-defeating. It violates a fundamental need of workers and, in doing so, severely damages the sense of equity that’s necessary for effective organizations.

It is equally momentous when a company makes a decision not to downsize when other companies in the industry take that path. Such companies exist. The alternative philosophy was articulated by Rubbermaid CEO Wolfgang Schmitt when the growth of his company slowed:

“Sure, we could take out a lot of our people. But we could give up our future. One, we’d demotivate the people who remained. Two, they surely wouldn’t have the loyalty they have now. Three, if there were any good people left, they wouldn’t be here long. They’d be look-

ing around. And uncertainty reduces risk taking.”

The policy represented in that view isn’t just humanitarian — it’s the policy that’s best for the business.

Layoffs are not good for a company in the ordinary course. Although a layoff often results in a short-term spike in a company’s stock price, the impact on the long term can be quite different. A mountain of evidence casts doubt on the efficacy of downsizing for many companies as a cost-reduction strategy. Research done in the mid ’90s found that downsizing companies outperformed the S&P only slightly during the six months following news of a restructuring, then lagged badly, netting a negative 24 percent by the end of three years. In most companies, downsizing the work force is frequently a short-term solution with little or no long-term benefits.

Lester Thurow of MIT writes, “Layoffs are painful and costly. There are innumerable reasons they should be avoided if possible: Severance payments must be made. Higher training costs lie ahead. The skilled members of the team whom a firm has laid off will not be there to be rehired when times get better. Morale suffers among the remaining workers, and fewer will be willing to make personal sacrifices to help the company while it needs it most.”

Best Policies and Practices

The companies that are genuinely committed to providing their employees with stable employment follow these specific practices:

1. Exhaust all possible alternatives before laying off people.
2. When layoffs cannot be avoided, first ask for volunteers.
3. When layoffs cannot be avoided and there are no more volunteers, act generously and decently. From an organizational standpoint, you’re not doing it just for those who are let go, but for those who will stay.
4. Communicate honestly, fully and regularly throughout the entire process.
5. Recognize the impact of what you’re doing on the survivors, and take steps to minimize the negative impact.

Do not confuse providing employment stability with tolerance for unsatisfactory employee performance. Organizations must distinguish between conditions over which employees have no control — such as a market downturn or the introduction of labor-saving technology — and those where an individual simply chooses not to perform.

Compensation

Although job security is a critical concern of workers, it is also true that compensation is extraordinarily important for worker morale and performance. Don’t
Motivated by Fair Treatment
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believe anyone who tells you that money is “way down on the list” of worker goals — that what they really want is “appreciation” (or whatever) and they clamor for money only when those other things are lacking.

There are conditions that distinguish enthusiastic employees from unenthusiastic employees. Pay is vital in that respect, both substantively — it provides the material wherewithal for life — and symbolically — it is a measure of respect, achievement and the equitable distribution of the financial returns of the enterprise.

Research evidence points to four explanations for the relationship between wages and productivity: worker reciprocity and morale, lower turnover, decrease in “shirking,” and a superior pool of job applicants.

Respect

Equality is at the heart of respect — the treatment of each individual as important and unique without regard to any other characteristics, such as gender, race, income or even perceived performance or contribution to the organization.

The core issue is how people with more power or income treat those who have less. Management should do its best to eliminate humiliation and indifference to employees. Respect also includes providing safe working conditions. Companies should, as much as possible, work to minimize status distinctions in the organization as well. Finally, companies should do as much as possible to make sure communication is as open as possible within the company.

Motivated by Achievement

A critical condition for employee enthusiasm is a clear, credible and inspiring organizational purpose that translates for workers into a “reason for being there.” This might seem odd when talking about for-profit enterprises — isn’t the idea simply to make a buck and don’t employees, in turn, understand that and simply want to be paid well? Well, in fact, no. People are not that simple — not in what we want and not in what we expect from the organizations to which we belong and to which we are asked to give our talent and loyalty.

Pride and Satisfaction

Research shows a strong correlation between pride in the organization and the overall satisfaction of workers with that organization. (See sidebar on right.)

People want to work for an organization that does well but also does good. Considerable evidence shows that companies that “do good” show superior long-term performance. The most impressive study done in this area was by Collins and Porras, summarized in their book *Built to Last.* The authors sought to determine the factors that distinguished the best companies from the merely satisfactory. They referred to the best as “visionary” because among the key distinguishing features of those companies was emphasis on a vision that was “more than profits”:

“Contrary to business school doctrine, we did not find ‘maximizing shareholder wealth’ or ‘profit maximization’ as the dominant driving force or primary objective through the history of most of the visionary companies. They have tended to pursue a cluster of objectives, of which making money is only one — and not necessarily the primary one. Indeed, for many of the visionary companies, business has historically been more than an economic activity, more than just a way to make money.”

Unethical Behavior

At the negative end of the corporate citizenship continuum are companies that engage in clearly unethical behavior. A wealth of evidence shows that behaving in socially irresponsible ways is detrimental to shareholder value. In 1997, one study investigated 27 incidents of unethical or illegal corporate behavior and concluded that such behavior resulted in significant losses of shareholder wealth.

Research shows that business profitability is not simply about making money in the short term, but it is also about building positive and trusting relationships with all major constituencies that promote and sustain long-term profitability. A company should want customers who are willing to go the extra mile to purchase its services, employees who give their all for the organization, suppliers who feel (continued on page 7)
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themselves as genuine “partners” with the organization and therefore seek to deliver their best work to the company and in a timely manner, and a community that vigorously supports the company’s legitimate business interests.

People have a strong need to do something that matters and to do it well. At the end of the day, people want to feel that something was accomplished by virtue of their efforts. Workers feel frustrated when they spend their days struggling with faulty equipment or endless meetings. ■

For additional information on moral components in corporate ideologies, go to: http://my.summary.com

A Management Style That Works

Autocratic management involves domination of employees, inflexibility and a belief that discipline and punishment are the most effective means to get most workers to work. Laissez faire managers are divorced from their employees and uninvolved in what they do. Both management styles are different, but they are equally effective in demotivating the overwhelming majority of workers. Both place severe obstacles in the way of getting employees’ jobs done.

Research shows that participative management is the best way to go. Participative leadership is an active style that stimulates involvement. In an effective, participative organization, no one is in doubt as to who is in charge. But that person expects employees to think, to exercise creative judgment, and not just do. That is the environment in which impediments can be removed and in which employee enthusiasm can flourish.

Performance

Research demonstrates the superiority of participative management for performance. And decades of evidence show that the value of participative management is not limited to societies with a long history of democratic institutions.

Central to a discussion of participative management is the matter of “steep” or “flat” organizations. Organizations that workers feel to be excessively bureaucratic are typically steep. There are many layers in the management hierarchy. A flat organization is the opposite — fewer layers exist in the management hierarchy and, generally, a larger number of employees report to each level.

Companies with records of outstanding long-term performance frequently have extraordinarily flat structures. For example, Nucor Corp. has four management layers (foreman, department head, general manager, chairman) and The Dana Corp., which once had 15 management layers — and was barely profitable — went to five layers and much greater profitability. The process is circular: Organizations with committed and enthusiastic work forces require fewer controls and the fewer those controls, the greater the commitment and enthusiasm.

Perhaps a major reason companies with enthusiastic work forces are more successful is simply that it is so much less costly to manage them.

The Benefits of Self-Managed Teams

A goal of every organization should be to flatten its structure as much as possible, probably to somewhere between five and seven levels for the total organization, and just three levels in any facility. Flat organizations lend themselves to decentralized decision making. The decentralization that allows for effective flattening of an organization — not just head chopping — is best accomplished by establishing self-managed teams (SMTs). The ideal of the SMT is that it can produce the “whole thing” for an identified customer, has clear goals for which it is accountable, contains within it all the skills needed to get the job done, has access to the information and resources it needs to get the job done, and it receives rewards based on team performance.

A major issue for employees is the degree to which their organizations are committed to promoting from within. Companies give several reasons for not promoting from within to higher-paying jobs. However, research overwhelmingly supports the proposition that, on average, organizations that adhere to a promote-from-within policy perform much better than those that do not.

For example, in Built to Last, Collins and Porras conclude from their research on higher- versus lower-performing companies that the former “… develop, promote and carefully select managerial talent from inside the company to a greater degree than … [lower-performing] companies.” In fact, the CEOs of the higher-performing companies were six times more likely to be insiders promoted from within.

It is imperative that the company first seeks all possible internal candidates for an opening. To be effective, programs that identify organizational talent obviously must accompany this policy. ■

Motivated by Camaraderie

People don’t want to come to work to fight. It is important to understand employees’ fundamental desire to work collaboratively — a fundamental goodwill — because it is the basis on which teamwork is built after the layers of suspicion and resentment are removed.

Although employees derive pleasure from associating with others, such as during breaks, their greatest satisfaction comes from interacting as a team on the job in the service of common performance goals. This is a
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tremendous source of morale for employees.

Teamwork and Conflict

Teamwork is needed for just about every job at every level. Cooperation — not job descriptions, not organization charts, not formal procedures — is the glue that binds the parts of the organization.

Conflicts differ in how real or psychologically based they are. Approaches to reduce conflict must take this into account. There are two basic strategies:

● **Conflict management.** The parties agree not to fight and to establish mechanisms to help avoid and settle disagreement.

● **Partnership building.** The parties agree to actively collaborate in the achievement of mutual goals.

Conflict management is most appropriate when the conflict stems from a real divergence of interests. Partnership building is appropriate when the root cause is misperceptions. Unless misperceptions are clearly identified and acknowledged, the parties have no chance of becoming allies in a sustained way. The foundation for success is both parties trusting that they share a common goal.

The Total Organization Culture and How to Change It

The essence of the system and culture described in this summary is a “partnership” relationship. A partnership has both psychological and economic components — for example, employees’ confidence that they make significant contributions to the organization’s success and that they also share in the financial gains for that contribution. It is a high-involvement model: involvement in what the workers give to an organization and in what they receive from it.

A partnership culture is the surest path to a high-performance organization. Partnership works because it harnesses the natural motivation and enthusiasm that is characteristic of the overwhelming majority of workers. Other management modes dampen — even destroy — that motivation and enthusiasm. A partnership organization works because it assumes that the great majority of workers are motivated.

It Starts at the Top

Many partnership organizations didn’t have to change to that form; They started that way with a visionary founder and CEO who strongly believed that is the way people should be managed. Frederick Smith of Federal Express and Herb Kelleher of Southwest Airlines are good examples of this. But other organizations that have long operated with an entirely different management mode have consciously and deliberately undergone profound culture change to a partnership pattern. Good examples include Gordon Bethune’s changes at Continental Airlines and F. Kenneth Iverson’s highly successful efforts at Nucor.

A major lesson from these examples is that **action must begin with, and be sustained by, senior management.**

It is ironic that among the most satisfying aspects of organization life — as of life in general — are those that can be achieved only by hard work. This is especially true of attempts to change relationships: how people treat one another in their pursuit of earning a living. The overwhelming majority of people in organizations act in simple pursuit of equitable treatment, a sense of achievement, and camaraderie.

**Appearances**

They don’t want to do either the organization or their colleagues harm, but it often appears that way or, at the very least, that they don’t care whether the organization or their colleagues succeed or the organization improves. That occurs because of what happens to people when they join organizations, a combination of the daily on-the-job frustrations that cause people to act in ways not in their better nature; the way management treats them as sources of problems, costs and resistance rather than as assets; and the behavior of the tiny, often highly visible minority of employees who really don’t care and reinforce management’s pessimistic view of the workplace.

Partnership organizations emerge when senior leadership — in most cases it has been the CEO — has the foresight to see what can be and not just what is. This requires not only insight into human nature (especially that people want to do good for a good organization) and not just eloquence in communicating the partnership philosophy, but also perseverance and hard work over a period of years to translate the philosophy into specific and daily management policies. It requires seeing and treating employees as genuine allies in achieving change.

For additional information on partnership principles, go to: [http://my.summary.com](http://my.summary.com)