Motivation, Organizational Identification, and Experiences of the Quality Examiner

JENNIFER K. LEHR, FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY
RONALD E. RICE, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

This article analyzes factors that influence a person's decision to become a quality examiner. Basic motivational needs, organizational identification, and demographic measures were the primary conceptual factors used in this study. Survey responses from examiners of Johnson & Johnson's Signature of Quality process and other employees showed that 1) personal motivations for becoming an examiner were predominately self-actualization and belongingness, with some pragmatic emphasis on improving quality in one's organization or unit, 2) people underestimated the amount of time and energy required, and the value, and comprehensiveness of the experience, 3) the best aspects of training included hands-on experience, excellence criteria, case study, and learning from other examiners, and 4) the best aspects of the examiner process were interactions with other examiners and the applicant company employees. The only aspects significantly associated with higher organizational identification were more years working with the organization and a greater perception of the usefulness of the process for improving businesses. This article suggests implications for recruiting and training examiners, and the underlying causal role of organizational identification.

Key words: motivation, organizational identification, quality examiner, quality recruiting and training

INTRODUCTION

Much has been written about the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) and its use as a national assessment tool. Little attention has been paid, however, to organizations that have adopted and adapted the MBNQA criteria for their own use. Thus, little is known about the role that examiners—organizational volunteers—play in the success of such internal assessment and award programs, especially considering how arduous and time-consuming this activity is. This research provides insight into that issue by exploring the motivations and influences, especially organizational identification, behind one's decision to become an examiner as part of the internal quality process at an international corporation. It also describes some of the examiners' experiences in this challenging role.

NATIONAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT

In 1987, the MBQNA was established to promote awareness of quality excellence, to recognize quality achievements of U. S. companies, and to publicize successful quality strategies (Bell and Keys 1998; NIST 2001; Vokurka, Stading, and Brazeal 2000). Named for the late secretary of commerce, Malcolm Baldrige, the award has come to symbolize the quest for quality in American business. It is firmly grounded in the total quality management (TQM) movement. Since its inception, the MBNQA has been awarded to 41 U. S. companies in the areas of manufacturing, service, and small business. Beginning in 1999, education and health care organizations also became eligible to apply

for the award. To be considered for the award, organizations are assessed against a stringent set of criteria in seven categories: 1) leadership, 2) strategic planning, 3) customer and market focus, 4) information and analysis, 5) human resource focus, 6) process management, and 7) business results.

Winners have included such high-profile organizations as Xerox Corporation, Cadillac, Federal Express, Ames Rubber, Merrill Lynch, the Ritz-Carlton Hotel Company, and others. Much has been written about the MBNQA (Blazey 2000; Brown 2000; Conference Board 1992; 1994; DeCarlo and Sterett 1990; Fisher 1994; Garvin 1991; George 1992; Marconi 1993; Reimann 1991; *USA Today* 1997; Vokurka, Stading, and Brazeal 2000). Of equal importance are the growing number of U. S. organizations that make use of the MBNQA criteria without ever submitting an application. Nearly two million copies of the Baldrige Award criteria have been distributed since the award's humble beginnings (NIST 2000; *USA Today* 1997). Add to this the growing number of organizations, institutions, and states that have adapted the award criteria for their own use, and it becomes clear that the MBNQA has had a significant impact on American business. Baldrige Award winners continue to outperform the Standard & Poor's 500 (NIST 2000; Tai and Przasnyski 2000), in keeping with TQM research, which shows a significant correlation between more extensive TQM implementations and positive financial performance (Douglas and Judge 2001).

Yet the organizational landscape is also littered with considerable failures, incomplete implementation, and outright rejections of TQM. An Arthur D. Little & Co. report, cited in Port et al. (1992), noted that only 36 percent of companies surveyed believe TQM increased their competitiveness, and benchmarking may be effective only for companies that already have a TQM program. An Ernst & Young and American Quality Foundation (1992) study found that having a quality strategy doesn't always lead to effective implementation of a quality-oriented culture. So clearly there are areas of quality implementation and management that require greater understanding.

One area that has received little attention is the important role of the quality examiner. Essential to internal assessment programs and the MBNQA in particular is the process whereby individuals volunteer or are nominated to participate as examiners in the assessment. Several of the major elements of TQM are reflected in involving employees in internal quality assessments: placing quality as a top priority, instituting leadership practices oriented toward TQM values and vision, developing a quality culture, involvement of organizational members in cooperative efforts to achieve quality improvement, and the strong role of quality departments to guide quality efforts (Waldman and Gopalakrishnan 1996; Hradesky 1995; Jablonski 1994; Stamatis 1996). The role of the examiner can be an arduous one. He or she is the individual who reads and scores the applications and visits the sites of the candidate organizations. Given the demands on their time and energy, it seems remarkable that individuals agree to become quality examiners.

Thus, the first focus of this study are the influences on volunteering for such a task: motivations, organizational identification, and demographic variables. The second focus of the study, in line with TQM's emphasis on ongoing learning through feedback, is to briefly describe the examiners' recommendations for improving their experience. Brief reviews of the literature on motivation and organizational identification follow. If research can isolate factors that motivate an employee to become an examiner, then one can possibly involve an even broader range of employees in quality assessment and support in the future. Results from this study could also be useful for learning more about the examiner's perceptions of his or her role in the quality assessment process, and how this role carries over to other areas of employee responsibility.

MOTIVATION

The concept of motivation has always been appealing to researchers, and since the 1960s, many theoretical frameworks have been developed to address motivation and the workplace (Alderfer 1972; Bolles 1975; Herzberg 1966; Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman 1967; Locke and Latham 1984; Maslow 1970; McClelland and Winter 1970; Pinder 1984; Vroom

1964; Wahba and Bridwell 1976). The concept of motivation is wide-ranging, but Daft (1997) offers a broad definition that is useful for the authors' purpose: "Motivation refers to the forces either within or external to a person that arouse enthusiasm and persistence to pursue a certain course of action." But, as Landy and Becker (1990) point out, different theorists are often interested in only one aspect of motivation. For example, Chadwick-Jones, Nicholson, and Brown (1982) were only interested in that piece of motivation theory that helped them to explain employee absenteeism.

Therefore, the first challenge is to identify the aspect of motivation that is relevant. Here, the authors are concerned with explaining and exploring factors that lead to a certain type of behavior—that is, wanting to become an examiner. They are looking for a motivating force that would lead to a specific behavioral response. Consequently, Maslow's (1970; 1998) approach to human motivation seems an appropriate framework in which to explore elements that lead individuals to become examiners.

Perhaps one of the most famous theories of motivation (Daft 1997, 529), Maslow's theory, suggests that individuals are driven by five categories of needs: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs. Table 1 suggests what each of these needs might be for both "on-the-job" and "off-the-job" applications. Originally, Maslow suggested that these needs exist in a hierarchical order, where lower-order needs (that is, physiological and safety) must be satisfied before higher-order needs can be fulfilled. He later realized the limitations of his stair-step approach, however, and conceded that "human needs are multiple and they often occur simultaneously in modern society" (Ivancevich, Lorenzi, and Skinner 1997, 319). Individuals do not always fulfill lower-order needs before aspiring to fulfill higher-order needs, as Alderfer (1972) also argued in his existence, relations, and growth (ERG) theory of motivation. Current downsizing trends provide ample evidence of how employees, no longer situated within a secure work environment, will still strive to fulfill higher-order needs such as esteem and belongingness.

Maslow's approach is useful here because it helps explain why individuals engage in certain behaviors in the workplace that extend beyond the fulfillment of basic physiological and safety needs. Daft (1997, 531) offers the example of the "Lend a Helping Hand" program sponsored by GMAC's Albany Quality Council, where employees are judged for their helpfulness to other employees. Contest winners are publicly recognized and given gift certificates for their efforts. Daft believes that Maslow would view such forms of public recognition in the workplace as fulfilling individual belonging and esteem needs.

This framework provides a concise conceptual typology for talking about the kinds of needs that drive individuals to volunteer. One might hypothesize that individuals volunteer to be examiners to achieve the type of

Table 1 Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

Need	Fulfillment off the job	Fulfillment on the job
Physiological	food, water, sex	heat, air, base salary
Safety	freedom from war, pollution, violence	safe work, fringe benefits, guaranteed employment
Belongingness	family, friends, community group	work groups, clients, coworkers, supervisors, profession
Esteem	approval of family, friends, community	recognition, high status, increased responsibilities, promotion, awards
Self-Actualization	education, religion, hobbies, personal growth	opportunities for growth, training, advancement, creativity; participation in work decisions

Sources: Daft (1997); Ivancevich, Lorenzi, and Skinner (1997); Maslow (1970).

recognition noted previously (a fulfillment of an esteem need), but one could also hypothesize that individuals volunteer because they are seeking growth opportunities (a type of self-actualization need), and perhaps even because organizational members already working in quality or process improvement areas think they should volunteer in order to fulfill latent employment and professional expectations (safety or belongingness).

A general motivation influencing, and resulting from, participation as a quality examiner may be a sense of empowerment, an intrinsic task motivation (Leonard, Beauvais, and Scholl 1995; Spreitzer 1995). This increased perception of empowerment in turn increases perceptions of service quality that employees are able to deliver, according to a study of customer service representatives by Goodale, Koerner, and Roney (1997). In particular, especially powerful aspects of empowerment in that study included competence, impact, and intrinsic rewards for quality service, while extrinsic rewards provided little or no influence.

The researchers concluded that "individuals who felt that providing a good quality service was intrinsically rewarding were more likely to have positive perceptions of their ability to perform dependably and accurately, more likely to have a perception that the facilities and equipment used in the department were consistent with providing quality service, and more likely to perceive that they were able to help customers and provide prompt service" (Goodale, Koerner, and Roney 1997, 208).

ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION

Organizational identification is defined as the "perceived oneness" and alignment that employees have with their organization, and the extent to which they "experience the organization's successes and failures as their own" (Mael and Ashforth 1992, 103). Organizational identification stems from the larger concept of social identification, "the perception of belongingness to a group classification" (Mael and Ashforth 1992, 104). Organizational identification then becomes "a specific form of social identification where the individual defines him or herself in terms of his or her membership in a particular organization" (Mael and Ashforth, 105; Ashforth and Mael 1996; Mael 1988; Mael and Tetrick 1992; Scott 1995; 1997). For Cheney and Tomkpins (1987, 3), organizational identification provides both descriptive and action-related information. Peoples' identification with a certain organization not only reveals something about who they are, but it also reveals something about how they will act, and in some cases, how others should act toward them.

Often explored alongside organizational commitment (Barge and Schlueter 1988; Russo 1998; Scott 1995), organizational identification typically functions as an antecedent to commitment. A strong degree of organizational identification will lead to employee commitment. Or, as Cheney and Tomkpins (1987, 9) suggest, identification is the "substance" of action, while commitment is the "form." Gonzalez (1996, 15-16) adds: "Individuals who identify with an organization are more likely to believe in and accept the organization goals and values, exert effort on behalf of the organization, and desire to maintain membership in it, behaviors that constitute organizational commitment." In other words, if individuals feel they belong to the organization they will be more committed to that organization (Ashforth and Mael 1989; Mowday, Steers, and Porter 1979; 1982) and in turn, make decisions that are in the best interest of the organization (Tompkins and Cheney 1983). For example, individuals who demonstrate strong organizational identification have been shown to be less prone to absenteeism and other types of withdrawal from the company (Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly 1992).

Aside from these potential positive outcomes, Cheney and Tomkpins (1987, 8) point out that "one may be somewhat identified with an organization and still not committed to it." Likewise, one may be committed to an organization and not identify with all of the values asserted by the organization (Mael and Ashforth 1992). In some cases "identification with an organization can result in feelings of shame, disgrace, or embarrassment" (Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail 1994, 242). Such was the case for Firestone executives in the months following the revelations concerning the

Firestone/Ford Explorer tire crisis.

Organizational identification has a variety of implications for the organization. Several researchers (Barker and Tompkins 1994; Bullis and Tompkins 1989; Tompkins and Cheney 1985) have sought to examine the power associated with identification, and it can be argued that managing identification may be wise for some organizations, especially in light of current down-sizing and restructuring trends.

Organizational identification may also play a role in the success or failure of quality initiatives such as the MBNQA. For example, "employees resist total quality because their beliefs about the organization's identity constrain understanding and create cognitive opposition to radical change" (Reger, Gustafson, DeMarie, and Mullane 1994, 565). In this sense, organizational identification fosters cognitive inertia against changing existing schemas for sense-making and interpreting action. So potential quality participants must identify with the sponsoring organization, but the organization must have, or develop over time, an identity that supports the kinds of changes and values that TQM implies. Stone and Eddy (1996) propose that such matching of organizational values with individual values and needs is a critical component of a successful TQM implementation. This match improves individual outcomes such as satisfaction, improvement of processes, and learning, which in turn lead to more positive perceptions of customer service quality, and eventually, organizational performance.

Organizational identification would seem to have direct relevance to the role of the quality examiner. One might hypothesize that those who have stronger identification with the organization will be more likely to volunteer to become examiners, seeing the opportunity as yet another way of becoming a closer member of the organization, and, through social learning and role modeling with other organizational representatives, have a greater knowledge of the quality management process.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Acknowledging the importance of the examiner's role in the intraorganizational competitiveness assessment and recognition process leads to the following three basic questions:

- What influences an individual to decide to become a quality examiner, and what expectations does he or she have? Better understanding the motivations and expectations examiners have might make it easier to encourage others to participate, and to articulate the rewards that participants obtain.
- How do the examiners evaluate their experience? Assessing past experiences, such as assessing an organization's application for an MBNQA, can provide directions for improving future experiences.
- How is organizational identification associated with being a quality examiner? Knowing how one's identification with his or her organization is related to the examiner process might be used in designing nomination materials and understanding nonparticipants' motivations.

METHOD

Site

Johnson & Johnson (J&J) recognized the benefits of the MBNQA process early on. In 1993, J&J chief executive officer Ralph Larsen requested that all of J&J operating companies worldwide (168 at that time) complete a self-assessment using their Baldrige-based, Signature of Quality (SOQ) competitiveness assessment guide before the end of 1994, and biennially thereafter. Managed by the J&J Quality Institute, this tool and process have come to be ingrained in the culture of all J&J companies. Based on the self-assessment, companies may also submit applications for the J&J SOQ Competitive Assessment and Recognition process. Those J&J companies that reach certain levels of quality are recognized as bronze, silver, and gold award winners. The J&J Quality Institute generously provided the researchers access to its SOQ examiners in all J&J companies around the world.

In the early years of the SOQ process, potential examiners were most often recommended by managers and directors, who also needed to have a clear understanding of the time commitment involved. Individuals

who were able to complete the rigorous and labor-intensive training (25 to 30 hours of "prework" followed by two to three days of face-to-face training) were generally asked to serve as examiners. More recently, individuals have also been given the opportunity to volunteer as long as they have the support of their manager and/or director. But training is only the first phase of their involvement. Once individuals have completed the training, have been accepted to serve as examiners, and have agreed to do so, then the actual assessment process begins.

Examiners must once again complete 25 to 40 hours of prework during which time each member of the examiner team reviews and scores a particular J&J company's self-assessment (or competitive assessment) application. This individual work is followed by team conference calls through which members strive to reach consensus regarding scoring as well as strengths and areas for improvement. During this intervening time period, the team also begins detailing points that will become site-visit issues. In other words, certain points made in the company's application may be unclear, or team members may wish to see a particular process in action. These are referred to as "site-visit issues"—matters that will be clarified and discussed once the team is at the site. Several weeks later the team will meet at the J&J location for a five-day site visit during which time they will verify points made in the application and clear up any questions or concerns. Following the site visit, team members must prepare a final feedback report. It soon becomes clear that the contributions required of examiners are great; nearly one month out of the year is dedicated to examiner-related activities.

Pilot Survey

A pilot questionnaire consisting of open-ended questions was constructed that addressed the three phases in the "life" of an examiner. Part I (Before Involvement) included questions addressing how one becomes an examiner, why one chooses to become an examiner, and the expectations of the examiner. Part II (During Involvement) included questions addressing the training and certification process for becoming an examiner, and how their expectations are met. Part III (After Involvement) included questions addressing the results of the experience, and the perceived value/benefit of the experience. Nine senior examiners, selected by the J&J Quality Institute, were asked to complete and comment on these questions.

Full Survey and Samples

Using the responses from the pilot questionnaire and additional input from members of the J&J Quality Institute, the questionnaire was revised. Most questions were reformatted as close-ended (but including the opportunity to add new categories not identified from the pilot survey). This combined the advantages of the open-ended questions of the pilot survey that allowed the J&J respondents to generate possible categories in their own language, with the advantages of structured, close-ended questions. In this way, even though the survey used primarily close-ended questions, the content and wording was generated by internal members of the relevant organizational population, rather than imposed *a priori* by the external researchers. Some questions asked respondents to rank their top three choices. Respondents might choose a particular item, but consider it of lesser importance than the other two items. Therefore, each choice was weighted by the reverse of its rank (first = 3, second = 2, third = 1). This was done instead of presenting the items as Likert-style scales, because of the length of the survey and because the authors wanted to present the list of items as possible motivations, expectations, evaluations, benefits, and so on, that individual respondents could select from according to their own experiences, instead of a set of attributes that each respondent had to complete.

To address the research question concerning organizational identification, nine questions from the work of Mael (1988) and Mael and Tetrick (1992) were included in the full survey. In Mael's pilot study of 161 undergraduates regarding identification with their university, 10 items emerged as "the essence of the construct" of identity with a psychological group. The overall reliability was satisfactory (alpha = .76), but principal components analysis yielded two compo-

nents. A six-item component represented *shared experience*, the perception that one shares the experiences, successes, and failures of the focal organization. A four-item component represented *shared characteristics*, the perception that one shares the attributes and characteristics of prototypical group members. The alpha reliability of the two dimensions were .81 and .66, respectively. Mael and Tetrick's (1992) study of business and psychology students at two Midwestern universities reinforced Mael's findings. Because of the low factor loading of the 10th item in their study, the authors used only the first nine of their items (see Table 2).

Included with the full survey in the mailing to J&J examiners were two copies of a short survey that included only the organizational identification questions and a few other basic demographic questions. The examiners were then instructed to give one of the short surveys to a person who had been with the organization for about as long as they had, and the other to a person who had only been with the organization for a short time. This allowed the authors to compare organizational identification levels between examiners and nonexaminers to see if organizational tenure influenced those differences and to insure variance in organizational tenure among the nonexaminers.

Survey packages (which included one revised examiner survey and two short nonexaminer surveys) were mailed to all 154 J&J examiners around the world. The sending and return address was the researchers' university, not J&J, to emphasize that this was an external research project, not an internal evaluation. Eighty-three examiner surveys (54 percent) and 150 nonexaminer surveys (49 percent) were returned. This is a high response rate for a mailed survey, considering that the nonexaminer surveys were not addressed to specific people, and surveys were distributed to a variety of international locations.

Thus, the full survey included the following sets of questions for examiners:

- Source of learning about SOQ
- Reasons for becoming an examiner
- Importance of SOQ
- Difference between expectations and experiences

Table 2 Wording of organizational identification items.

Organizational/experience aspects:
When someone criticizes (this organization), it feels like a personal insult.
I'm very interested in what others say about (this organization).
When I talk about this organization, I usually say "we" rather than "they."
This organization's successes are my successes.
When someone praises this organization, it feels like a personal compliment.
I act like (name of organization) person to a great extent.
Group/characteristics aspects:
If a story in the media criticized the organization, I would feel embarrassed.
I don't act like a typical (name of organization) person.
[score reversed for analysis to maintain similar direction of meaning]
I have a number of qualities typical of (name of organization) people.
The limitation associated with (name of organization) people apply to me also.
[not used in current study because of low factor loading]

Source: Mael and Tetrick (1992).

- Value of training
- Training goals
- How well training met those goals
- Strengths of training
- Training areas needing improvement
- Most important examiner topics learned at training
- Importance of SOQ for improving business
- Topics discovered as an examiner that training had not prepared them for
- Most valuable SOQ examiner experience
- Influence of SOQ on other activities
- Personal benefits from the experience
- Encouraging others to become an examiner
- Type and level of participation in SOQ over the years

The surveys for both examiners and nonexaminers asked several demographic questions (gender, age, organizational tenure, education, position, function) and the nine organizational identification items. Finally, the nonexaminer survey also asked about the level and source of familiarity with SOQ.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics and Organizational Identity Scale

Table 3 provides item stems, descriptive statistics, and mean frequency for each question. In the summaries, items are listed in order of weighted ranking, but the unweighted ranking by simple frequency can be identified by the item means. For example, the reason for becoming an examiner "I was nominated" was mentioned first seven times, second twice, and third four times, for a total weight of 29, while "personal development" was mentioned first only four times, second 11 times, and third 16 times, for a total weight of 50, nearly twice as much.

Table 4 shows the factor loadings, dimensionality, and reliability of the overall organizational identity scale and two subscales (shared organizational experience and shared personal characteristics). These results are nearly identical to Mael and Tetrick's (1992), except that the "person" question here loads on the characteristics/personal dimension and the "media" question loads on the organizational/experience dimension (both of which make more sense). The two subscales were highly correlated with the overall scale ($r=.94$ for organizational/experience, $r=.84$ for group/characteristics), and the two subscales were significantly correlated with each other ($r=.61$). Reliability for the two subscales was .82 and .72, respectively, and .85 for the overall scale. The authors emphasize results for the *overall scale* but note results for the separate subscales when appropriate, and the organizational/experience subscale for the final correlational analyses.

Respondents

The respondents come from a variety of countries (29), mostly from a range of 25 cities within the United States, but also noticeably from Brazil, the Philippines, South Africa, Taiwan, Scotland, Mexico, India, and Japan.

Concerning demographics, 59 percent of respondents were male (higher for examiners), the average age was 43.6 years (higher for examiners), and they had been working with J&J for 10.5 years (higher for examiners). Concerning educational levels, overall (examiners and nonexaminers) 38 percent of respondents had college degrees, nearly 45 percent had some graduate school or a master's degree, and 4.7 percent had a doctorate. Examiners were slightly more likely to have a master's degree or doctorate.

Considering organizational position, 44.3 percent were managers, 7.2 percent were supervisors (all nonexaminers), 20.9 percent were directors (largely, but not all, examiners), 2.1 percent were vice presidents (all examiners), 8.9 percent were professional (mostly nonexaminers), and 16.6 percent had other job positions (mostly nonexaminers). Concerning organizational function, 3.8 percent were general management (more examiners), 19.1 percent were marketing or sales (more nonexaminers), 10.2 percent were finance

Table 3 Descriptive statistics and frequencies from quality assessor surveys, from examiners only, both groups, and nonexaminers only.

Short Question Description		Examiners Mean	Examiners s.d.
How Did You First Learn of SOQ?			
Company management		.65	.48
Quality institute rep		.18	.39
Colleagues		.08	.28
JJ corporate publicity		.05	.22
Other		.02	.15
JJ corporate management		.01	.11
Why Did You Decide to Become SOQ Examiner?			
Professional development	1	.87	.34
Beneficial to company	2	.81	.40
Personal development	3	.72	.45
Learn more about other companies	4	.59	.49
Encouragement from company management	5	.41	.49
I was nominated	6	.33	.47
Opportunity to work JJ people	7	.42	.50
Improve visibility in company	8	.37	.49
Beneficial to dept	9	.33	.47
Opportunity to use quality training	10	.35	.48
Opportunity meet other JJ people	11	.29	.46
Opportunity to travel	12	.06	.24
Value of PREWORK for Your Overall Training?			
(1 little - 5 great value)		3.87	1.09

Table 3 Continued

What Did You Perceive Goals of Training to Be?			
Understand SOQ criteria	1	.93	.26
Understand SOQ process	2	.86	.35
Understand scoring	3	.82	.39
Calibrate examiner scoring	4	.51	.50
Learn standards best pract	5	.48	.50
Learn conduct as examiner	6	.75	.44
Learn work w/team examiners	7	.80	.41
Other	8	.04	.19
Examiners How Well did Training Meet Goals Noted Above?			
(1 not at all - 5 very well)		4.25	.64
What Were Areas of Strength in Training?			
Hands-on assessment learning	1	.71	.46
Learn excellence criteria	2	.45	.50
Learn evaluate applicants	3	.64	.48
Use case study	4	.67	.47
Working in teams	5	.76	.43
Learning from examiners	6	.59	.49
Interacting w/examiners	7	.71	.46
Facilitators trainers	8	.43	.50
Learn provide feedback	9	.61	.49
The prework	10	.39	.49
Use of practice sessions	11	.40	.49
Interacting QI people	12	.57	.50
Use appl already scored	13	.28	.45
Other	14	.01	.11

Table 3 Continued

Areas of Training that Could Be Improved?			
Use best-in-class examples	1	.82	.39
More emphasis site visit	2	.66	.48
JJ case study	3	.34	.48
Reduce train exp examiners	4	.23	.42
Other	5	.17	.38
Extend training	6	.19	.40
Nothing needs improved	7	.04	.19

Most Important Examiner Things Learned at Training?			
Need to focus on criteria	1	.81	.40
How to score application	2	.76	.43
Consensus-building	3	.71	.46
Need to read complete application	4	.54	.50
Language feedback comment	5	.59	.49
How work with others	6	.34	.48
Need to write complete sentences	7	.36	.48
Ethics of examiners	8	.28	.45
Examiners' conduct code	9	.31	.47
Other	10	.06	.24

How Useful Is SOQ Process for Improving a Business?			
(1 not at all - 5 very useful)		4.64	.55

Table 3 Continued

Discover Things as Examiner Training Didn't Prepare for?			
Consider differing views	1	.37	.49
Time needed for feedback	2	.30	.46
Deal differing examiners	3	.28	.45
Consider differing companies	4	.28	.45
Assure balance examination	5	.2	.41
Nothing not prepared	6	.20	.41
Other		.18	.39
Handle site visit	8	.17	.38
Interact with applicants	9	.17	.38
Time needed for site visit	10	.08	.28

Before Getting Involved, How Important Did You Think SOQ Process Was?			
(1 not so important - 5 very important)		3.53	.99

Differences Between Expected and Experienced SOQ Process?			
More demanding		.76	.43
More valuable		.66	.48
More comprehensive		.58	.50
Applicable to our business		.57	.50
More interesting		.46	.50
More dynamic		.37	.49
Less prescriptive		.10	.30
More prescriptive		.07	.26
Other exp-actual differences		.06	.24
Less interesting		.05	.22
Less demanding		.04	.19
Less dynamic		.02	.15
Less comprehensive		.02	.15
Less valuable		.02	.15
Not applicable to our business		.01	.11

Table 3 Continued

What One Experience as SOQ Examiner Stands Out?		
Interactions of examiners	.22	.41
Reaction of co. nonexaminers	.14	.35
Other	.12	.33
Interaction w/ examiners	.11	.31
Management techniques of co.	.10	.30
Management teams of applicant co.	.10	.30
Operating processes	.10	.30
Examiner training session	.07	.26
Impact of cultural diff.	.05	.22

SOQ Involvement Lead You to Engage in Other New Activities?		
Process improvement	.67	.47
On team prepare SOQ application	.66	.48
Consulting internally	.47	.50
Benchmarking	.42	.50
Training instructing JJ	.34	.48
Part in other quality acts.	.33	.47
Training instructing ext.	.14	.35
Consulting externally	.13	.34
Advancement/promotion JJ	.12	.33
Additional education	.07	.26
Other	.06	.24
No new activities	.04	.19

Table 3 Continued

What Personal Benefits Related to Participation in SOQ?			
Learn quality principles	1	.66	.48
Broadened view of quality	2	.76	.43
Deeper commitment quality	3	.65	.48
Valuable expertise	4	.64	.48
More global perspective JJ	5	.58	.50
Deeper commitment company	6	.45	.50
Network other J&J people	7	.59	.49
Understanding of company	8	.47	.50
Work w/international groups	9	.58	.50
Meet new people	10	.63	.49
No personal benefits	11	.01	.11
Other	12	.04	.19

Why or Why Not Encourage Others?			
Would encourage others	1	1.0	0
Opportunity learn from others	2	.90	.30
Professional development	3	.88	.33
Personal development	4	.71	.46
Excellent training	5	.70	.46
Networking	6	.52	.50
Helping other companies	7	.31	.47
Other positive reasons	8	.10	.30
Would not encourage	9	.02	.15
Too time-consuming	10	.02	.15

Level of Familiarity with SOQ Process?					Nonexaminers N	Nonexaminers s.d.
(1 not at all - 5 very familiar)	--	--	--	--	3.22	1.19

Table 3 Continued

How Became Familiar with SOQ Process?					N	Pct
Helped dept unit company application	--	--	--	--	22	14.5
Training meetings workshops	--	--	--	--	20	13.2
Participation in self-assessment	--	--	--	--	15	9.9
Informal discussion word mouth coworker	--	--	--	--	11	7.2
Boss supervisor higher-ups	--	--	--	--	6	3.9
Printed materials brochures literature	--	--	--	--	6	3.9
Part involvement w/teams from proc	--	--	--	--	6	3.9
Company received award	--	--	--	--	4	2.6
Individual specific person	--	--	--	--	4	2.6
Human resources	--	--	--	--	3	2.0
Adopting the process	--	--	--	--	3	2.0
This survey	--	--	--	--	2	1.3
Individual is examiner	--	--	--	--	1	.7
Integration programs JJ	--	--	--	--	1	.7
Interview with manager who is exam	--	--	--	--	1	.7
JJ participation	--	--	--	--	1	.7
Company orientation	--	--	--	--	1	.7
Through qip process	--	--	--	--	1	.7
Translated the guidelines	--	--	--	--	1	.7
Involved in gmp (?)	--	--	--	--	1	.7

Table 3 Continued

	Examiners		Both		Nonexaminers	
Demographics	**Mean**	**s.d.**	**Mean**	**s.d.**	**Mean**	**s.d.**
Female 1 male 2	1.7	.5	1.6	.5	1.5	.5
Age (22-59)	43.6	7.2	39.2	8.8	37.2	8.8
Years with JJ (<1-36)	14.4	8.3	10.5	8.7	8.4	8.2
Years as SOQ examiner	2.4	1.4	--	--	--	--
Participated 1993A	.1	.3	--	--	--	--
Participated 1993	.1	.4	--	--	--	--
Participated 1994	.3	.5	--	--	--	--
Participated 1995	.8	.4	--	--	--	--
Participated 1996	.6	.5	--	--	--	--
Participated 1997	.3	.5	--	--	--	--
No. of exams completed (1-6)	2.0	1.3	--	--	--	--
Exam team leader 1y 2n	1.6	.5	--	--	--	--
Education	**N**	**Pct**	**N**	**Pct**	**N**	**Pct**
Sec high school	5	6.0	12	5.1	7	4.6
Some college	2	2.4	18	7.7	16	10.5
College	35	42.2	89	37.9	54	35.5
Some graduate school	6	7.2	31	13.2	25	16.4
Masters	29	34.9	74	31.5	45	29.6
PhD	6	7.2	11	4.7	5	3.3
Position						
Manager	40	48.2	104	44.3	64	42.1
Supervisor	0	.0	17	7.2	17	11.2
Director	32	38.6	49	20.9	17	11.2
Vice president	5	6.0	5	2.1	0	0
President	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professional	3	3.6	21	8.9	18	11.8
Other - 19 named	3	3.6	39	16.6	36	23.7

Table 3 Continued

Function	N	Pct	N	Pct	N	Pct
General management	6	7.2	9	3.8	3	2.0
Marketing sales	13	15.7	45	19.1	32	21.1
Finance accounting	8	9.6	24	10.2	16	10.5
Research development	5	6.0	16	6.8	11	7.2
Manufacturing/logistics	14	16.9	40	17.0	26	17.1
Quality assurance	6	7.2	16	6.8	10	6.6
Quality management	17	20.5	24	10.2	7	4.6
Human resources	5	6.0	19	8.1	14	9.2
Other - 20 named	9	10.8	42	17.9	33	21.7

	Examiners		Both		Nonexaminers	
Organizational Identification (1 strongly disagree - 5 strongly agree)						
Critisizing JJ is a personal insult	* 4.22	.81	4.07	.85	3.99	.86
Interested what others think JJ	4.36	.69	4.32	.72	4.30	.74
Use "we" not "they"	4.60	.60	4.54	.64	4.51	.66
Organization's successes mine	* 4.42	.72	4.25	.79	4.16	.81
JJ praise personal compliment	* 4.31	.83	4.14	.81	4.05	.79
Act like JJ person	* 4.33	.80	4.07	.87	3.93	.88
Media crit embarrass me	* 4.18	.80	4.01	.89	3.92	.92
Rev-not act typical JJ person	3.84	1.05	3.79	1.04	3.76	1.03
I have qualities typical JJ pers	* 4.07	.75	3.90	.81	3.81	.82
Organizational Ident. Scale	* 4.26	.55	4.13	.56	4.05	.55
Subscales:						
Organizational/experience	* 4.35	.55	4.23	.57	4.16	.57
Group/characteristics	* 4.08	.68	3.92	.72	3.83	.73

Note: Examiners N=83; Nonexaminers N=150
Ranking of items for some questions are based on weighted frequencies (see text)
* p<.05, comparing examiners to nonexaminers

Table 4 Factor analyses of organizational identification variables—for all items, organizational/experience items, and group/characteristics items.

	Organizational Identification Scales		
Variables	**All**	**Organizational/ experience**	**Group/ characteristics**
insult	.76	.80	--
think	.68	.73	--
talk	.62	.66	--
success	.69	.72	--
praise	.78	.79	--
person	.83	--	.86
media	.59	.65	--
typical n	.52	--	.74
typical y	.63	--	.81
Eigenvalue	4.2	3.2	1.9
%. variance	46.7	52.9	64.4
Reliability	.85	.82	.72

Note: Only factor loadings > .60 are shown for the two subscales.

or accounting, 6.8 percent were research and development, 17 percent were manufacturing or logistics, 6.8 percent were quality assurance, 10.2 percent were quality management (five times more for examiners than nonexaminers), 8.1 percent were human resources, and 17.9 percent named a variety of other functions (twice more for nonexaminers than examiners).

Examiners had been involved as SOQ examiners for an average of 2.4 years, completed nearly two examinations, participated more frequently in 1995 (81 percent) than 1996 (55 percent), 1994 (33 percent), or 1997 (33 percent), with 29 percent being team leaders. These changes in participation levels may be a result of other organizational initiatives that required the attention and expertise of experienced SOQ examiners, or it may be a reflection of changes in the SOQ cycle times that did not make it possible for experienced examiners to participate several years in a row.

What Influences an Individual to Become an SOQ Examiner?

Sources Two-thirds of the examiners first learned of SOQ through their own company management, 18 percent through a J&J Quality Institute representative, and 8 percent through colleagues. The most common ways nonexaminers became familiar with the SOQ competitive assessment and recognition process included helping with the department/unit/company application, training/meetings/workshops, participation in the company's self-assessment, and informal discussion, and word-of-mouth with coworkers and peers. Overall, nonexaminers were moderately familiar with the SOQ process (3.2 on the 1 to 5 scale). Note, however, that nonexaminers were given their surveys by examiners, so they are likely more familiar with SOQ than the general nonexaminer.

Reasons The highest ranked (weighted) reasons for becoming an SOQ examiner included professional development, benefits to the company, and personal development. Other highly ranked reasons included learning more about other companies, encouragement from company management, being nominated, opportunity to work with J&J people, improve one's visibility in the company, beneficial to the department, and opportunity to use quality training. Motivations for becoming an SOQ examiner include belongingness (working with others, benefits to department or organization), esteem (visibility, encouragement), and self-actualization (development, learning, training).

How Do Examiners Evaluate Their Experience?

Training Before training, examiners receive materials that provide an overview of the SOQ process and training. Generally, these prework materials were seen as relatively valuable (3.9 out of 5). The highest ranked perceived goals of the training itself were to understand the SOQ criteria, understand the SOQ process, and understand the assessment scoring. Less frequently mentioned goals were to calibrate examiner scoring, learn the best-practice standards, learn appropriate conduct as an examiner, and learn to work with a team of examiners. The highest ranked ways that training met those goals included hands-on assessment learning, learn excellence criteria, learn how to evaluate applicants, use of a case study, working in teams, learning from examiners, and interacting with examiners. The highest ranked areas of training that could be improved included use of best-in-class examples, more emphasis on the site visit, and use of a J&J case study.

The highest ranked areas about the examiner process learned during training included the need to focus on the criteria more, how to score the application, and consensus-building. The next highest included the need to read the complete application, and what language to use to provide feedback comments. The highest ranked areas that the training did *not* prepare the examiners for included considering differing perspectives, the time needed for feedback, dealing with differing examiners, considering differing companies, and assuring a balanced examination.

Expectations and Experiences

The greatest differences between what the examiners expected from the SOQ process and what they experienced included more demanding, move valuable, and more comprehensive, followed by applicable to J&J's business, more interesting, and more dynamic. In spite of the moderately high importance respondents had assigned to the SOQ process before getting involved (3.5 out of 5), it seems that the experience was more positive and useful than expected, implying that the benefits of being an examiner are not well advertised or understood beforehand, thus generating fewer volunteers than are possible.

Experience During and After SOQ Process

The highest ranked experiences as a SOQ examiner included interactions of examiners, the reaction of company nonexaminers, and interaction with other examiners. Note that the top categories have to do with belongingness. The most frequently mentioned other new activities that SOQ involvement stimulated included process improvement, being on the team to prepare a SOQ application, consulting internally, and benchmarking. Thus, involvement as an examiner also generates subsequent organizational benefits in quality improvement areas.

The highest ranked personal benefits related to SOQ participation included learn quality principles, broadened view of quality, deeper commitment to quality, developing valuable expertise, a more global perspective of J&J, and a deeper commitment to J&J. While the self-actualization motivation is apparent here (learning, expertise), there is also a strong belongingness aspect (global perspective and deeper commitment to the company).

Almost all respondents would encourage others to participate in the SOQ process. Their reasons included the opportunity to learn from others, professional development, personal development, excellent training, and networking. Again, motivations included belongingness (networking) and self-actualization (learning, development, training).

Overall, while examiners felt that the SOQ process was of only moderate importance for J&J (3.5 out of 5), they felt that it was very useful for improving a business in general (4.6). This may be because J&J already emphasized quality management and implemented ongoing assessments.

How is Organizational Identification Associated with Being an SOQ Examiner?

Levels of and differences in organizational identification

Overall, respondents generally identified with J&J, as indicated by the average organizational identity scale value of 4.1 (from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Examiners had a stronger overall identification with J&J than did nonexaminers (4.3 to 4.1), with a greater difference related to the group/characteristics subscale (4.1 to 3.8) than to the organizational/experiences subscale (4.3 to 4.2) (all these differences were statistically significant, $p<.05$).

Relations among Demographics and Perceptions with Organizational Identification, Overall, and by Examiners or Nonexaminers

Table 5 shows correlations between organizational identification variables, examiner questions, and demographic measures, for the full sample, examiners, and nonexaminers. For *examiners*, the only summary item even weakly associated with overall organizational identification was examiners' evaluation that the SOQ process was useful for improving a business. That is, the more they identified with J&J overall, the more they felt the SOQ process would be useful for improving businesses. Prior perceived importance of the SOQ process, years as an examiner, number of examinations completed, and serving as a SOQ team leader were not associated with organizational identification. Because organizational identity is higher for examiners than for nonexaminers, but the extent of SOQ participation by examiners (years, examinations, team leadership) was not associated with organizational identity, it seems likely that initial identification with the organization slightly contributed to the reasons for becoming an examiner, rather than the assessment experience increasing examiners' organizational identification. Of the demographic variables, increased age for examiners, and increased age and organizational tenure for *nonexaminers* were slightly but significantly associated with the overall organizational identification scale. For *both groups* combined, increased age and increased years with J&J were both slightly associated with the organizational/experience subscale. Gender and education were not associated with organizational identification.

Finally, to take into account that age, years with J&J, and being an examiner vs. a nonexaminer were somewhat interrelated, the authors conducted a summary regression for the two groups overall predicting the organizational/experience identity subscale by age, years with J&J, and membership in either grouping. They also conducted an analysis for examiners only including the usefulness for business measure. Table 6 summarizes the results.

For both groups together, after controlling for examiner or nonexaminer membership, only years with J&J remained as a predictor of the organizational/experience identification subscale (explaining only about 8 percent of the variance). For examiners only, both years with J&J and perception of the extent of usefulness of SOQ process for businesses were significant predictors of the organizational/experience identification subscale (jointly explaining 11 percent of the variance).

Table 5 Correlations of organization identification scales with evaluation measures, and demographic variables, for both groups, J&J examiners, and nonexaminers.

Both (N=207)	Education	Gender	Age	Years
education	--			
gender (f=1, m=2)	.13	--		
age	.03	.32**	--	
years w/co	.04	.30**	.74**	--
org identity	.05	.15	.20*	.25**
		Organizational identification scales		
	All	Org	Group	
Examiners (N=67)				
Nonexaminers (N=135)				
gender	-.08	-.03	-.15	
	.12	.17	.02	
age	.21	.29*	.04	
	.15	.11	.16	
education	.05	-.01	.15	
	-.04	.02	-.13	
years w/comapny	.17	.20	.08	
	.23*	.23*	.16	
Examiners (N=73)				
		Organizational identification scales		
	All	Org	Group	
Before getting involved, how important did you think SOQ process was for J&J?	.07	.10	.01	
How useful is SOQ process for improving a business?	.29*	.29	.24	
How many years have you served as a SOQ examiner?	.15	.16	.09	
How many examinations have you completed?	.10	.08	.10	
Have you served as an examination team leader?	-.05	-.05	-.04	

* p<.01 ** p<.001

Table 6 Regression and covariance analyses, both groups and examiners only, predicting organization/experience identification subscale.

Both groups, controlling for examiner/nonexaminer (covariance analysis)	
Predictors:	
Age	not significant
Years with J&J	beta=.27*
Examiner/Nonexaminer	not significant
Adjusted R2	.08
$F_{(2,1,203)}$	4.9**
Examiners only	
Predictors:	
SOQ useful for improving business	beta = .27*
Years with J&J	beta = .27*
Adjusted R^2	.11
$F_{(2,204)}$	4.9**
* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001	

The authors expected that organizational identification would have been associated with being an examiner, possibly because high identification inspired people to volunteer. The simple t-test between the groups showing higher identification for examiners, and the lack of significant correlations of levels of examiner experience with organizational identification, both implied this was the case. Because examiners were older and had been with J&J longer, however, the t-test results were overestimates of the true difference between the groups. The best single influence on greater organization/experience identification was more years with J&J. This is not particularly revealing. It simply indicates that organizational socializing processes, especially within a company that fosters a strong mission and identity, are operating well.

For examiners, higher organizational identification was also associated with feeling that the SOQ process improved business in general. This indicates that those who are more socialized into the J&J identity and mission are more likely to feel that quality improvement approaches are good for business.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was stimulated by the diffusion of both national and intraorganizational quality assessment programs, and the work and effort required by quality application examiners. In particular, the authors were interested in understanding the motivations of these examiners for participating in the assessments, whether this was a function of their identification with the sponsoring organization, and some of the expectations and experiences of these examiners. Here, the authors studied examiners for the worldwide J&J Signature of Quality initiative and comparable nonexaminers.

Summary of Results

Personal motivations for participating as an examiner were predominately self-actualization and belongingness, with some pragmatic emphasis on improving quality in one's own organization or unit (safety and belongingness). With respect to training, the best

aspects of training included hands-on experience, excellence criteria, case study, and learning from other examiners. The most important focus was on excellence criteria and application scoring. Suggested improvements in training included best-in-class examples and site visits; better coverage of differences in perspectives, examiners, and other companies; and the time needed to prepare feedback. With respect to *expectations compared to experiences*, people underestimated the amount of time and energy required, but more important, with respect to possible communication strategies for encouraging organizational members to volunteer to be an examiner, the value, applicability, nature, and comprehensiveness of the SOQ experience. With respect to the *experience* in general, the best aspects were interactions with other examiners and the applicant company nonexaminers, the SOQ process was perceived as highly valuable for improving businesses, participation led to more individual activity in process improvement and being on SOQ application teams, and personal benefits involved learning and valuing quality principles.

The only variables significantly associated with higher organizational identification were, for all respondents, more years with J&J, and for the examiners, a greater perception of the usefulness of the SOQ process for improving businesses. These results raise the question of whether being an examiner *per se*, either through selection or experience, is related to organizational identification. The simplest explanation seems to be that people who have been with J&J longer are more likely to identify with the organization and are more likely to become examiners, possibly because of ongoing socialization within this organization's strong culture. Although this finding is supported by other researchers (Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail 1994; Gonzalez 1996; Kramer 1991) who have asserted that higher degrees of contact with the organization (more years of employment), and thus with aspects of its identity, leads to higher levels of internalization on the part of organizational members, it does little to connect examiner participation directly with organizational identification per se.

The second finding, that for examiners, greater perceived usefulness of the SOQ process for improving businesses is associated with higher levels of organizational identification, might have more significance, especially when coupled with the findings that participation as an examiner helped one see the value of SOQ for improving a business, and that most examiners perceive greater personal and organizational benefits from the experience than they had expected. These relationships might be useful in developing more persuasive explanations of the role and value of organizational self-assessments in particular, and general TQM processes, such as the MBNQA—that is, that these activities, even when requiring considerable volunteer effort, as useful for business in general, and not just for symbolic or promotional purposes within J&J.

There are several theoretical and practical implications to be drawn from this research. In the area of motivation, it is useful because it brings Maslow's (1970) framework back to the arena of motivation research. True, some (Landy and Becker 1990; Pinder 1984) consider it to be a (too) universal theory of work motivation. In other words, Maslow's theory has been applied (perhaps mistakenly so) to explain all work behavior, ranging from decision-making to quality and quantity of work. In describing Pinder's proposition for middle-range theories of motivation, Landy and Becker state:

"Instead of developing new theories to deal with all behaviors, we should concentrate on developing less-ambitious theories that deal with a limited range of behavioral phenomena...current motivation theories are expected to do too much, to predict too wide a range of dependent variables."

However, note that only two of the many reasons sources for becoming an examiner were externally generated—being nominated and encouragement from company management—while all the others were internally generated and easily grouped into Maslow's motivation categories. By highlighting the personal values and benefits, as well as the formal organizational benefits, of becoming an examiner, those that manage the SOQ process might be able to develop more focused materials and encourage greater participation.

In the area of organizational identification, this study extends the literature by demonstrating that cer-

tain activities that might be thought to increase organizational identification (participation as an examiner) do not appear to have the expected outcome (higher levels of identification), nor does identification seem to be a mechanism of unobtrusive control (Barker and Tompkins 1994; Bullis and Tompkins 1989; Tomkpins and Cheney 1985) by fostering increased SOQ participation, once organizational tenure is controlled. It may be that identification controls some work behavior, but it clearly does not govern all choices. It also may be the case that organizational identification is not a highly manageable construct. Here, organizations may have little success trying to justify internal assessment participation on the basis of organizational goals, identity, and commitment.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

The examiners of the Johnson & Johnson SOQ process were the sole focus of this study. This can be construed as limiting the generalizability of these findings to other organizations. Organizational factors may well differentially influence the extent and form of quality motivations. For example, Sitkin, Sutcliffe, and Schroeder (1994) argue that TQM involves two essentially different goals, learning and control, and that managers must achieve a balance between these two orientations to match their organization's situational uncertainty. Carson and Stewart (1996) refer to these two as the sociotechnical approach and the traditional approach. The control component of quality involves minimizing variance, achieving consistent product and service quality, and meeting customer needs. These goals imply standardization, routineness, and moderate certainty, which would also work to suppress experimentation and radical innovation. Under this orientation, individual workers would be encouraged to monitor and provide feedback about their activities but not to take excessive initiative. Thus, they would be less motivated to take on peripheral activities and less rewarded by intrinsic job satisfactions.

The learning component would emphasize independent thinking, learning feedback, autonomy, incentives for invention, and so on. It may well be that motivations for quality participants would be different, or at least differently supported, in total quality control implementations vs. total quality learning implementations. At the time of this study, however, J&J had 168 *separate* operating companies around the world. But the level of organizational identification for both examiners (M=4.05 to 4.26) and nonexaminers (M=3.8 to 4.1) across the responding organizations was relatively high. Given the highly decentralized nature of J&J, it is interesting to see that there is still a strong sense of what it means to be a J&J employee that extends beyond the borders of country and culture, and thus presumably specific organizational culture or work environment.

Given that several organizations (AT&T, Intel, Hewlett-Packard, and others) have shifted to an internal, Baldrige-based approach for self-assessment that makes use of employees as examiners (also called reviewers, auditors, and consultants), this research has increased relevance. First, such research at least highlights the experiences and outcomes for the employees who are charged with a large part of the completion and success of such programs, and provides some suggestions for improving internal communication and training. Second, it offers a way to begin evaluating and comparing employee perceptions regarding the viability of such a framework, the value of the training, and so on. As more and more companies make use of the Baldrige Award criteria or Baldrige-based instruments, this becomes a more timely endeavor.

It is also recognized that several limitations are presented by using a survey to tap into the complex constructs of motivation and identification. This was especially challenging for exploring motivation. The survey was designed to uncover factors that would motivate an individual to become an SOQ examiner, but by trying to develop an *exploratory* survey for understanding employee motivation while also trying to preserve the language and phrasing uncovered during the pilot test of the survey, the authors may have sacrificed some of the construct validity. That is, self-actualization and

belongingness statements may have been oversampled and thus overrepresented on the full survey. However, these were the terms generated and selected by the two groups of respondents. In the future, it would be wise to reassess the questions prior to administration and to consider using another pretested instrument to assure concurrent validity. It would also be valuable to conduct interviews or focus groups to augment the survey findings, and perhaps conduct some participant observations of how members discuss, or encourage, SOQ participation. Alternatively, even with a survey methodology, respondents could provide open-ended textual explanations. These could be analyzed to identify the intraorganizational issues, communication processes, clusters of meanings that examiners associate with their role, and accounts justifying taking on the examiner role or dealing with the challenges of the role (Tompkins and Cheney 1983).

The second construct measured through the survey, organizational identification, posed fewer challenges since several instruments are available for measuring both organizational identification and commitment. It was decided that Mael and Ashforth's (1989) instrument was more manageable and appeared to have the greatest conceptual clarity. It would be interesting and valuable, however, to see if Cheney's (1983) Organizational Identification Questionnaire (OIQ), which has high reliability (Barge and Schlueter 1988), would yield similar results. Of course, it is also worth noting that the Cheney instrument has been subjected to considerable criticism over the years (Miller, Allen, Casey, and Johnson 2000; Miller, Johnson, and Grau 1994; Sass and Canary 1991) for the negligible distinction it provides compared to the Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) organizational commitment instrument. As such, the Mael and Ashforth instrument may have been the better choice.

Another recommendation might be to follow the steps of Scott (1995; Kleinfeld 1996) to determine if identification levels differ across targets. In other words, although examiners and nonexaminers identify strongly with J&J as a whole (though slightly higher for examiners), they may show different levels of identification with their respective companies. This might, in turn, have implications for the recruitment, training, and management of examiners within specific companies.

A final limitation of the present study involves the sampling technique used. There is little question that the process used to select the nonexaminer cohort may have led to some bias in the cohort group. Examiners may have selected others who shared their orientation toward SOQ and quality in general. In terms of practicality, however, there would have been no other way to include this nonexaminer group in this study, and asking for explicit differences in organizational tenure among the nonexaminers was one way to increase possible variability in respondents.

A final recommendation for further study would be to conduct a similar study on a national level, to assess motivation and identification for MBNQA examiners. Although the general role is the same, several aspects are different. For J&J examiners, participation is absorbed into their role as a J&J employee. For examiners on the national level, participation is in addition to regular work expectations and hours. There are financial implications as well. On the national level, examiners must cover the costs of their trip to and from Gaithersburg, M. D., for examiner training. Given some of these factors, it would be interesting to see if individuals were motivated by the same needs, and derive the same personal and organizational benefits, as those who function within the safety and constraints of a single organization.

In summary, this research begins to pave the way for exploring what is becoming a key organizational role: the internal assessment examiner. As potential "change agents" (Hutton 1994) for the organization, and as a sound way for involving employees in corporate quality efforts (Riordan and Gatewood 1996), examiner actions and behaviors have significant implications. Finally, as more and more organizations continue to use Baldrige-based instruments and criteria for internal assessment, it will become increasingly important to understand all of the facets of participation in such a program, from the standpoint of the individual as well as the organization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors appreciate the support of The Johnson & Johnson Quality Institute, directed by William Quinn, and The Rutgers University Center for Organizational Development and Leadership, directed by Brent D. Ruben, http://www.cdl.rutgers.edu.

REFERENCES

Alderfer, C. P. 1972. *Existence, relatedness, and growth.* New York: The Free Press.

Ashforth, B. E., and F. A. Mael. 1989. Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review* 14, no. 1: 20-39.

Ashforth, B. E., and F. A. Mael. 1996. Organizational identity and strategy as a context for the individual. *Advances in Strategic Management* 13: 19-64.

Barge, J. K., and D. W. Schlueter. 1988. A critical evaluation of organizational commitment and identification. *Management Communication Quarterly* 2, no.1: 116-133.

Barker, J. R., and P. K. Tompkins. 1994. Identification in the self-managing organization: Issues and implications. *Human Communication Research* 21, no. 2: 223-240.

Bell, R., and B. Keys. 1998. A conversation with Curt W. Reimann on the background and future of the Baldrige Award. *Organizational Dynamics* 26, no. 4: 51-61.

Blazey, M. L. 2000. *Insights to performance excellence 2000: An inside look at the 2000 Baldrige Award criteria.* Milwaukee, Wis.: ASQ Quality Press.

Bolles, R. C. 1975. *Theory of motivation.* 2nd edition. New York: Harper & Row.

Brown, M. G. 2000. *Baldrige award winning quality: How to interpret the Baldrige criteria for performance excellence.* 10th edition. Portland, Ore.: Productivity Inc.

Bullis, C., and P. K. Tompkins. 1989. The forest ranger revisited: A study of control practices and identification. *Communication Monographs* 56: 287-306.

Carson, K., and G. Stewart. 1996. Job analysis and the sociotechnical approach to quality: A critical examination. *Journal of Quality Management* 1, no. 1: 49-65.

Chadwick-Jones, J. K., N. Nicholson, and C. Brown. 1982. *The social psychology of absenteeism.* New York: Pager.

Cheney, G. 1983. On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: Field study of organizational identification. *Communication Monographs* 50: 342-362.

Cheney, G., and P. K. Tompkins. 1987. Coming to terms with organizational identification and commitment. *Central States Speech Journal* 38, no. 1: 1-15.

Conference Board. 1992. *Baldrige winners on world-class quality.* Report no. 992. New York: The Conference Board.

Conference Board. 1994. *Lessons taught by Baldrige winners.* Report no. 1061. New York: The Conference Board.

Costin, H. I., ed. 1994. *Readings in total quality management.* Fort Worth, Texas: Harcourt Brace.

Daft, R. L. 1997. *Management.* 4th edition. New York: Dryden Press.

DeCarlo, N. J., and W. K. Sterett. 1990. History of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. *Quality Progress* 23, no. 3: 21-27.

Douglas, T., and W. Judge Jr. 2001. Total quality management implementation and competitive advantage: The role of structural control and exploration. *The Academy of Management Journal* 44, no. 1: 158-169.

Dutton, J. E., J. M. Dukerich, and C. V. Harquail. 1994. Organization images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39: 239-263.

Ernst & Young and American Quality Foundation. 1992. *International quality study: Top line findings.* New York: Ernst & Young and AQF.

Fisher, D. C. 1994. *Measuring up to the Baldrige: A quick & easy self-assessment guide for organizations of all sizes.* New York: AMACOM.

Garvin, D. A. 1991. How the Baldrige Award really works. *Harvard Business Review* 71: 80-95.

George, S. 1992. *The Baldrige quality system: The do-it-yourself way to transform your business.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gonzalez, J. A. Jr. 1996. *Organizational identification: An approach based on social identity.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Goodale, J., M. Koerner, and J. Roney. 1997. Analyzing the impact of service provider empowerment on perceptions of service quality inside an organization. *Journal of Quality Management* 2, no. 2: 191-215.

Herzberg, F. 1966. *Work and the nature of man.* Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishers.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, and B. B. Snyderman. 1967. *The motivation to work.* 2nd edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hradesky, J. 1995. *Total quality management handbook.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Hutton, D. W. 1994. *The change agents' handbook: A survival guide for quality improvement champions.* Milwaukee, Wis: ASQC Quality Press.

Ivancevich, J. M., P. Lorenzi, and S. J. Skinner. 1997. *Management: Quality and competitiveness.* 2nd edition. Chicago: Irwin.

Jablonski, J. R. 1994. *Implementing TQM: Competing in the nineties through total quality management.* 2nd edition. Albuquerque, N. M.: Technical Management Consortium, Inc.

Kramer, R. M. 1991. Intergroup relations and organizational dilemmas: The role of categorization processes. In *Research in organizational behavior,* edited by L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Landy, F. J., and W. S. Becker. 1990. Motivation theory reconsidered. In *Work in organizations,* edited by B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press Inc.

Leonard, N., L. Beauvais, and R. Scholl. 1995. A self-concept based model on work motivation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, August.

Locke, E. A., and G. P. Latham. 1984. *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works!* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Mael, F. 1988. *Organizational identification: Construct redefinition and a field application with organizational alumni.* Ph.D. diss., Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.

Mael, F., and B. E. Ashforth. 1992. Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13: 103-123.

Mael, F., and L. E. Tetrick. 1992. Identifying organizational identification. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 52: 813-824.

Marconi, J. 1993. *The Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award self-assessment workbook.* Methuen, Mass.: GOAL/QPC.

Maslow, A. H. 1970. *Motivation and personality.* 2nd edition. New York: Harper Row.

Maslow, A. H. 1998. *Maslow on Management.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

McClelland, D. C., and D. G. Winter. 1970. *Motivating economic achievement.* New York: The Free Press.

Miller, V. D., M. Allen, M. K. Casey, and J. R. Johnson. 2000. Reconsidering the organizational identification questionnaire. *Management Communication Quarterly* 13, no. 4: 626-658.

Miller, V. D., J. R. Johnson, and J. Grau. 1994. Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 22: 59-80.

Mowday, R., R. Steers, and L. W. Porter. 1979. The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 14: 224-247.

Mowday, R., R. Steers, and L. W. Porter. 1982. *Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.* New York: Academic Press.

National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). 2001. See URL http://www.quality.nist.gov/public_affairs/factsheet-baldfacts.htm.

Pinder, C. C. 1984. *Work motivation.* Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman.

Port, O., J. Carey, K. Kelly, and S. Forest. 1992. Quality: Small and midsize companies seize the challenge—not a moment too soon. *Business Week,* Nov. 30: 67-74.

Reger, R., L. Gustafson, S. DeMarie, and J. Mullane. 1994. Reframing the organization: Why implementing total quality is easier said than done. *Academy of Management Review* 19, no. 3: 565-584.

Reimann, C. W. 1991. The Baldrige criteria speak for themselves. *Quality Progress* 24: 43-44.

Riordan, C. M., and R. D. Gatewood. 1996. Putting the "E" (employee) into quality efforts: A process model of organizational practices, quality principles, and employee reactions. In *Advances in the management of organizational quality, volume 1,* edited by D. B. Fedor and S. Ghosh. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Russo, T. C. 1998. Organizational and professional identification: A case of newspaper journalists. *Management Communication Quarterly* 12, no. 1: 72-111.

Sass, J. S., and J. D. Canary. 1991. Organizational commitment and identification: An examination of conceptual and operational convergence. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 55: 275-293.

Scott, C. R. 1995. *Self-reports and expressions of identification among organizational teams using a group decision support system.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, Texas.

Scott, C. R. 1997. Identification with multiple targets in a geographically dispersed organization. *Management Communication Quarterly* 11, no. 4: 491-522.

Sitkin, S., K. Sutcliffe, and R. Schroeder. 1994. Distinguishing control from learning in total quality management: A contingency perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 19, no. 3: 537-564.

Spreitzer, G. 1995. Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal* 38, no. 5: 1442-1465.

Stamatis, D. H. 1996. *Total quality service: Principles, practices, and implementation.* Del Rat Beach, Fla.: St. Lucie Press.

Stone, D., and E. Eddy. 1996. A model of individual and organizational factors affecting quality-related outcomes. *Journal of Quality Management* 1, no. 1: 21-48.

Tai, L. S., and Z. H. Przasnyski. 2000. Baldrige Awards winners beat the S&P 500. *Quality Progress* 33, no. 4: 45-51.

Tompkins, P. K., and G. Cheney. 1983. Account analysis of organizing: Decision making and identification. In

Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach, edited by L. L. Putnam and M. E. Pacanowsky. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Tompkins, P. K., and G. Cheney. 1985. Communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. In *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions*, edited by R. D. McPhee and P. K. Tompkins. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Tsui, A. S., T. D. Egan, and C. A. O'Reilly. 1992. Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37: 549-579.

USA Today. 1997. There's more to winning than winning. *USA Today*, October 9.

Vokurka, R. J., G. L. Stading, and J. Brazeal 2000. A comparative analysis of national and regional quality awards. *Quality Progress* 33, no. 8: 41-49.

Vroom, V. 1994. *Work and motivation*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wahba, M. A., and L. G. Bridwell. 1976. Maslow reconsidered: A review of the research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 15: 212-240.

Waldman, D., and M. Gopalakrishnan. 1996. Operational, organizational, and human resource factors predictive of customer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Quality Management* 1, no. 1: 91-107.

BIOGRAPHIES

Jennifer Lehr is assistant professor of communication studies, Department of English, Communication, and Philosophy, at Fairleigh Dickinson University in Madison, N. J. She is the coauthor of *Excellence in Higher Education: A Guide to Organizational Self-Assessment, Strategic Planning and Improvement* with Dr. Brent Ruben (Kendall-Hunt, 1997). She has presented numerous conference papers to local, national, and international communication and management association audiences. Lehr's dissertation research considers the role that measurement plays as a form of communication within the organization. Other research interests include: total quality management, organizational learning, and the role of communication in customer service. She has served as an examiner for the New Jersey Quality Achievement Award (now called the Governor's Award for Performance Excellence) and is first vice-president of the New Jersey Communication Association.

Lehr has a doctorate from Rutgers University. She can be reached at Farleigh Dickinson University, 285 Madison Ave., M-MS3-01, Madison, N. J. 07940, or by e-mail at Jennifer@fdu.edu.

Ronald E. Rice is professor and chair, Department of Communication, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, at Rutgers University. He has coauthored or co-edited *The Internet and Health Communication* (2001); *Social Consequences of Internet Use: Access, Involvement, and Interaction* (2001); *Public Communication Campaigns* (1st ed: 1981; 2nd ed: 1989; 3rd ed: 2001); *The New Media: Communication, Research and Technology* (1984); *Managing Organizational Innovation* (1987); and *Research Methods and the New Media* (1988). He has conducted research and published widely in communication science, public communication campaigns, computer-mediated communication systems, methodology, organizational and management theory, information systems, information science and bibliometrics, and social networks.

Rice has a doctorate from Stanford University. He can be reached at rrice@scils.rutgers.edu .