2012

A phenomenological study of selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms

Jennifer M. Darling

Pepperdine University

Graduate School of Education and Psychology

A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY OF SELECTED CALIFORNIA SMALL BUSINESS FOUNDERS' MOTIVATIONAL PARADIGMS

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Jennifer M. Darling

March, 2012

John McManus, Ph.D. – Dissertation Chairperson

This dissertation, written by

Jennifer M. Darling

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Doctoral Committee:

John McManus, Ph.D., Chairperson

June Schmieder-Ramirez, Ph.D.

Farzin Madjidi, Ed.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vii

DEDICATION viii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ix

VITA x

ABSTRACT xi

Chapter One: Introduction 1

Background 1
Purpose of the Study 7
Research Questions 9
Importance of the Study 9
Assumptions 11
Limitations 11
Definition of Terms 14

Chapter Two: Review of Selected Literature 20

Founders 20
Leadership 23
Transformational, Visionary, and Symbolic Leadership 24
Perception 32
Paradigms for Understanding 33
Integrating Paradigms, Leadership, and Motivation 43
Summary 45

Chapter Three: Methodology 46

Nature of the Research 46
Restatement of the Research Questions 46
Phenomenological Research Design Overview 47
Phenomenological Approach 48
Sources of Data and Sampling Procedure 52
Phenomenological Interview 53
Instrumentation 56
Item Development 58
Empirical Basis for the Proposed Interview Questions 62
Post Pilot Modifications to Interview Questions 67
Sample Size 69
Data Collection 70

Page

Use of Human Subjects (IRB) 70
Analytical Techniques 72
Summary 77

Chapter Four: Research Findings 78

Introduction 78
Individual Textural Descriptions 79
Findings for Research Question One 84
Findings for Research Question Two 92
Findings for Research Question Three 100
Summary 109

Chapter Five: Summary, Implications, and Recommendations 112

Introduction 112
Summary of the Study 112
Limitations of the Findings 116
Implications 117
Conclusion 124
Recommendations for Future Research 125
Closing Remarks 126

REFERENCES 128

APPENDIX A: Statement of Bracketing 139

APPENDIX B: Interview Protocol 140

APPENDIX C: Expert Panelists' Biographies 144

APPENDIX D: Supplemental Information Provided to the Expert Panel 146

APPENDIX E: Expert Panel Evaluation of Proposed Interview Questions Form 148

APPENDIX F: Merged Expert Panel Feedback 154

APPENDIX G: Pilot Interview Questions 162

APPENDIX H: Pilot Biography 164

APPENDIX I: Mock Interview Biography 165

APPENDIX J: Invitation to Participate 166

APPENDIX K: Informed Consent 167

Page

APPENDIX L: Coding Auditor Biography 169

APPENDIX M: Informant Verification 170

APPENDIX N: Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams Completion Certificate 171

APPENDIX O: Institutional Review Board Approval 172

APPENDIX P: Copyright Permissions 174

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1. Sowell's (1995) Summary of the Construct Differences between the Tragic Vision [Constrained Paradigm] and the Vision of the Anointed [Unconstrained Paradigm] 36

Table 2. Relationship between Research Questions and Proposed Interview Questions...61

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my husband, Luis Pelayo, who has known me extensively in the role of a graduate student. He selflessly tolerated my continued academic pursuits and provided me with steadfast encouragement and support. I look forward to moving into the next chapter in our lives together.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to have learned from each of the selected California small business founders who participated in my study. Thank you for making this study possible.

VITA

Jennifer M. Darling

ACADEMIC HISTORY

Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education & Psychology	Doctoral Candidate, Ed.D. in Organizational Leadership	
Pepperdine University Graziadio School of Business & Management	MBA	2003
University of California, Santa Cruz	BA, Economics Minor, Political Science	1994

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Santa Barbara Instrument Group, Inc. dba SBIG, ERP & Accounting Administrator (Controller) Goleta, California	2004-2011
SkinMarket Inc. (Cosmetics Company), Inventory Planner Carpinteria, California	2002
Ericsson Inc., Materials Forecast Coordinator Goleta, California	2000-2002
Big Dog Sportswear, Inventory Planning Analyst Santa Barbara, California	1998-2000
QuadState Corporation (an Everest Investment Group Company) Executive Assistant & Bookkeeper Capitola, California	1996-1998
The Law Offices of Troy M. Wilkinson, Office Manager Chico, California	1994-1996

ORGANIZATIONS

APICS, The Association for Operations Management
IMA, The Association for Accountants and Financial Professionals in Business
SHRM, The Society for Human Resource Management

ABSTRACT

Organizational vision has become an increasingly important tool in many professions. A founder's vision may permeate an organization's culture and have a lasting impact on how the organization is later run. Organizational vision is a tool that helps leaders create alignment within their organizations and provides flexibility for adaptation to the ever-changing marketplace. In order to facilitate this alignment, leaders often use various motivational techniques. Ideally, the motivational technique the leader selects best motivates his or her employees to act in alignment with the vision. How effective the founder is in selecting the most appropriate motivational technique may be contingent upon his or her understanding of differing paradigms and willingness to explore different incentives and dispositions with their employees. Sowell (1995) provides a conceptual framework in his book *The Vision of the Anointed* that may be useful for evaluating different motivational paradigms.

Sowell (1995) suggests that distinctions between a constrained and an unconstrained paradigm are based on one's underlying belief system. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm look to history to explain possibilities for the future, which implies a smaller set of options than an unconstrained paradigm. A leader who subscribes to a constrained paradigm would tend to use incentives or extrinsic rewards to motivate his or her employees. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm look to the possibilities of what the future may hold and therefore provide a larger set of options than a constrained paradigm. A leader who subscribes to an unconstrained paradigm would tend to use dispositions or intrinsic rewards to motivate employees.

Based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework, this study explored 11 California small business founders' motivational paradigms reflecting either a constrained or unconstrained paradigm. A semi-structured interview format was employed to discover the founders' underlying paradigm (constrained or unconstrained). More specifically, this study explored how selected California small business founders described motivating their employees with similar and differing paradigms. No prior studies known to the researcher have applied Sowell's criteria for evaluating paradigms to small business founders' motivation.

Chapter One: Introduction

Background

Leaders often found organizations based on their vision. Most leadership theories stress the importance of having a vision, including: symbolic leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2008), transformational leadership (Bass, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Northouse, 2007; Robbins, 2003), and visionary leadership (Groves, 2006; Robbins, 2003). Filion (1991) refers to vision as “A projection: an image projected into the future of the place the entrepreneur wants his products to occupy eventually on the market, and also an image of the type of enterprise needed to get there” (p. 28). A leader’s vision effectively provides goals of what he or she desires for his or her enterprise. Leadership vision is adaptive and often serves as the foundation for creating alignment within an organization and its ever-changing market place (Groves, 2006; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; Roswell & Berry, 1993).

One element of leadership vision is the “coping cycle” (Schein, 1992, p. 52), a system that allows an organization to adapt to the ever-changing marketplace and survive. Schein (1992) suggests that founders have the opportunity to develop a coping cycle. A coping cycle begins with the development of a “mission and strategy” and “goals” (p. 52). The coping cycle also provides the *means* for achieving goals, such as the “organizational structure, division of labor, reward system, and authority system” (p. 52). Furthermore, the coping cycle provides the tools for “measurement” (p. 52) to determine how effectively the organization is accomplishing its goals. Finally, the coping cycle provides for “correction” (p. 52) to adjust or alter strategies that are no longer functioning. An organization may be sustained in the long run when the correction mechanism is implemented in conjunction with the use of mission, strategies, goals, means, and measurements. Therefore, it is possible for a founder's leadership vision to permeate an organization's culture when a coping cycle is in place. The initial decisions a founder makes (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993) and the organizational culture that is established (Schein, 1983, 1990, 1992) have an enduring impact on how the organization is later run. As new employees enter the organization, they quickly learn the organization's basic values and assumptions.

An organization's connection to its past is dependent on its rituals and symbols (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Bolman and Deal (2008) suggest that vision itself is a symbol embedded in an organization's culture. Over time, symbols, such as vision, shape an organization's character. "Vision turns an organization's core ideology, or sense of purpose, into an image of the future. It…[illuminates] new possibilities within the realm of myths and values" (p. 255). When confusion exists, vision provides the opportunity for direction, clarity, and cohesiveness (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Thus, vision itself provides a mechanism for the founder's lasting impression on the organization.

In order to achieve their vision, leaders may use motivational techniques based on various motivational theories to facilitate alignment of their employees within the organization (i.e., internal alignment). Motivational techniques are often based on McClelland's *need for achievement* theory (McClelland, 1965; McClelland, Koestner, & Weinberger, 1989), Maslow's (1970) *hierarchy of needs* theory, McGregor's (1980) *Theory Y*, or Locke's *goal setting* theory (Locke & Latham, 2002). Elements of Herzberg's (1973) *motivation-hygiene* theory parallel higher-order needs found in Maslow's hierarchy of needs: social, esteem, and self-actualization. Motivation-hygiene theory holds that motivators create *good feelings* and include opportunities for achievement, advancement, learning (development and growth), recognition, and taking on responsibility. Frequently employed motivational techniques include use of a shared mission or vision (Bass, 1990; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Bygrave, 2004; Cashman, 1999; Collins & Porras, 1996; Conger, 1991, 1999; Covey, 1989; Filion, 1991; Goleman, 1998; Groves, 2006; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Kantabutra & Avery, 2007; Kotter, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2003; Morden, 1997; Northouse, 2007; Robbins, 2003; Roswell & Berry, 1993; Schein, 1992; Senge, 1990), shared ownership such as stock options (Brandes, Dharwadkarr, & Lemesis, 2003), positive role models (Kouzes & Posner, 2002), and performance feedback (Bakker, van Velhoven, & Xanthopoulou, 2010; Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2003). Furthermore, an organization's work design may influence an employee's level of motivation. Employees may benefit from some level of autonomy (Bakker et al., 2010; Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger, & Hemingway, 2005), variety and flow (Csikszentmihalyi & LeFevre, 1989; Shernoff, Csikszentmihalyi, Schneider, & Shernoff, 2003), and flexibility such as telecommuting (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). The founders' effectiveness in motivating their employees may be contingent upon their understanding of these various paradigms. To be effective, leaders need to be willing to explore different incentives and dispositions to best motivate their employees to act in alignment with their organizational vision (Lockwood, Anderson, Fiester, & Somers, 2010). The type of reward or disposition that is most effective may depend on their employees' underlying belief systems.

Such underlying belief systems were discussed in Sowell's (1995) *The Vision of the Anointed.* It is useful for people to understand their existing belief systems about the world to evaluate different motivational paradigms. Sowell suggests that some people are motivated extrinsically by incentives or rewards to accomplish goals. They are further motivated by evidence that the goals set for them are achievable. These people have what Sowell refers to as a *tragic vision* (constrained paradigm). Their view of what is possible in the future is constrained by what exists in the present (that is, possibility exists only in what has already been demonstrated to be effective). In contrast, Sowell suggests that other people are motivated by favorable dispositions (appealing to their morals). These people are intrinsically motivated to do what is deemed right or just. They are not deterred by a lack of historical evidence to achieve their goals. These people have visions of the future that are "unconstrained" by what exists in the present (that is, possibility exists beyond what has already been demonstrated; new, effective avenues have yet to be developed). Thus, people who subscribe to a constrained paradigm are motivated by different means than people who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm.

Motivation is one of Sowell's (1995) 11 constructs that may be used to evaluate paradigms: (a) human capability, (b) social possibilities, (c) social causation, (d) freedom, (e) justice, (f) knowledge, (g) specialization, (h) motivation, (i) process costs, (j) decision-making mechanism preferred, and (k) kinds of decisions preferred. Across these 11 constructs, an individual may tend towards a constrained or unconstrained paradigm. How small business founders perceive their ability to effectively motivate employees to act in alignment with their vision may be impacted by their ability to meet their employees' needs for either intrinsic or extrinsic rewards.

Furthermore, how effectively small business founders motivate themselves and their workforce may be vital to their organization's continued success. Spolsky (2009) found that most start-ups fail due to a "collapse of motivation" (p. 34). In other words, the founders become demoralized and simply stop working on developing their business. However, in general, founders tend to be a highly self-motivated group of people. McClelland (1965) found that people with a greater need for achievement tend to become entrepreneurs or find ways to incorporate entrepreneurial acts into their work. Similarly, Stewart and Roth (2007) discovered that founders' achievement motivation is greater than that of managers. Therefore, while founders are often effective at motivating themselves, they might not be as effective at motivating their workforce.

Research literature suggested several ways that leaders have been found to effectively motivate their workforce. Collins and Porras (1996) discovered that leaders who use emotion when expressing their vision tend to motivate others more effectively. It has been found that conveying a vision with passion, emotion, and conviction motivates others into action (Collins & Porras, 1996). Thus, it may be extrapolated that a founder who uses emotion, passion, and conviction when explaining his or her vision is more likely to motivate his or her employees, resulting in a motivated workforce. Jensen and Luthans (2006) explain that a motivated workforce is essential for an organization's growth and survival, supporting "the assertion that the critical factor in gaining competitive advantage is likely to come from the human side of organizations" (p. 648). Therefore, how effectively small business founders are able to motivate their employees (i.e., their workforce) may not only contribute to an organization's success, but also create a competitive advantage for their organizations.

It may be of interest how 11 selected California small business founders that survived the Great Recession motivated their employees with similar and differing motivational paradigms. As the most populous state in the U.S., California plays a key role in the overall health of the U.S. economy (United States Census, 2010). According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (2008), in 2008 California contributed approximately $1.85 trillion towards the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP). In 2008 this represented the most funds contributed towards the GDP by any state. Based on information obtained by the Central Intelligence Agency (2008) World Fact Book, if California were ranked amongst nations based on GDP alone, it would rank 11th in the world.

While California plays an important role to the U.S. economy so does the small business. The Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy published a *Frequently Asked Questions* (2009) newsletter highlighting the importance of small businesses to the U.S. economy. Overall, small businesses were found to:

- Represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms.
- Employ just over half of all private sector employees.
- Pay 44 percent of total U.S. private payroll.
- Have generated 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years.
- Create more than half of the nonfarm private gross domestic product (GDP).
- Hire 40 percent of high tech workers (such as scientists, engineers, and computer programmers).
- Are 52 percent home-based and 2 percent franchises.
- Made up 97.3 percent of all identified exporters and produced 30.2 percent of the known export value in FY [fiscal year] 2007.
- Produce 13 times more patents per employee than large patenting firms; these patents are twice as likely as large firm patents to be among the one percent most cited. (Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy, 2009, p. 1)

Thus, it may be inferred from the data that founders of new small businesses will likely play a major role in economic growth in the United States. How effective California small business founders are at motivating their employees may further contribute to their organizations' success or demise.

Purpose of the Study

Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework looks to the specific, underlying assumptions of an individual's paradigm to obtain a glimpse of his or her perspective regarding the human condition. Sowell posited regarding the human condition it is "not about the world…[people] wish to create, but what kind of world…[people] think exists already" (p. 104). Sowell suggests distinctions between the constrained paradigm and the unconstrained paradigm are based on one's beliefs regarding the human condition, noting that the difference is based on an individual's belief regarding "human limitations and their corollaries" (p. 106). Examples of differences in fundamental beliefs across Sowell's 11 constructs (previously mentioned) will be described in greater detail in chapter two.

Based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework, this study explored selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms. Moreover, this study explored how selected California small business founders described motivating employees with paradigms that are similar to or different from their own. Thus, the purposes of this phenomenological study were to:

- examine selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms;

- determine what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar paradigms to their own;
- identify what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing paradigms from their own.

Using a phenomenological research design, the researcher distilled the phenomenological meaning of how selected California small business founders view motivation and motivate their employees with similar and differing paradigms. This goal was accomplished by reducing the diverse appearance of the phenomenon from the descriptive data (that is, the interview transcripts provided by the founders) until a commonality was gleaned. This resulted in a phenomenological description of distilled themes, patterns, structure, and essence(s) that the founders share in their lived-experiences. The researcher intended to portray the themes and essences provided in the living descriptions that enable one to know the meaning of the selected California small business founders' internal perceptions and images (paradigms) regarding motivation.

Key to this study was an understanding of the founders' organizational visions and their motivational paradigms. Understanding their organizational vision and motivational paradigm helped to explain how they are able to inspire action. Furthermore, studying the motivational paradigm of today's founders provided valuable insights into the process of opening and operating a successful small business located in California. The literature explored in chapter two formed the conceptual basis of this study and reviews leadership vision as it relates to motivational theories. Areas studied included how selected California small business founders described their experience motivating employees with similar and differing motivational paradigms. Motivation was the primary criterion in this study. How motivation fits into Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework is discussed in greater detail in chapter two.

Research Questions

This study first explored selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms. Next this study explored what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees with who have both similar and differing motivational paradigms compared to their own. The primary research questions answered through this study were:

1. What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?
2. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?
3. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?

Importance of the Study

To date few, if any, empirical studies have utilized Sowell's (1995) 11 constructs and paradigms (constrained versus unconstrained) to examine how selected California small business founders described their experience motivating employees. Evidence supporting answers to the questions in this study may provide future business founders with useful information regarding organizational visioning, motivation, and development practices. This aspect is important because the impact of decisions business founders initially make have consequences that last long after the organization debuts (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993).

This study provides researchers with an increased understanding of current California small business founders' modes of operation. Becker (1992) posits, "Knowing the common aspects of human experience helps us understand and work effectively with particular people" (p. 23). Moreover, this study built upon existing leadership training and educational programs that contribute to the topic of entrepreneurship and motivating others.

The answers to questions within this study contribute to the fields of business, entrepreneurship, leadership, management, organizational change, organizational development, and training by adding to the understanding of founders' paradigms. Furthermore, findings from this study can be incorporated into the curriculum of graduate level coursework in the aforementioned fields of study. A report sponsored by the Small Business Administration Office of Business Advocacy found that "Graduates who have taken entrepreneurship courses are significantly more likely to select careers in entrepreneurship, which the authors define as ever founding, having run, or having been employed in a start-up or entrepreneurial team" (Summit Consulting, 2009, p. 1). Therefore, the potential exists for findings from this study to be incorporated into an entrepreneurship curriculum that will have an impact on future business founders.

Assumptions

Several assumptions underlie this study:

- Organizational vision and values matter to founders;
- Founders can and do influence organizational vision and culture;
- Organizational vision is a necessary but not sufficient condition for a successful organization;
- One can determine whether a founder's paradigm is constrained or unconstrained by asking the founder to answer a series of questions;
- Founders answered questions honestly and truthfully; and
- The researcher completed enough interviews of substance to develop a phenomenological understanding of how the selected California small business founders motivate employees with similar and differing motivational paradigms.

Limitations

Several potential limitations of the research methods can be identified. The sample was purposefully selected using objective criteria. Yet, substantial differences exist among the California small business founders selected for study. The small business founders selected for this study included executives from diverse organizations including public accounting, catering, spa services, financial planning, print media manufacturing, scientific instruments manufacturing, surf board wax manufacturing, quick casual service restaurant, specialty foods wholesaler, senior planning services, and a web design and marketing service firm. Because the small business founders selected for this study work in diverse industries, disparities in the organizational vision and culture were found. This resulted in differences regarding how motivation is approached.

Within this study, purposeful sampling was utilized. The nature of this qualitative research sought to describe how the selected California small business founders view motivation and their lived-experience motivating employees with similar and differing paradigms. Therefore, such findings cannot be used to reliably infer the same behavior across all small business founders. According to Creswell (2009), "The value of qualitative research lies in the particular description and themes developed *in context* of a specific site. *Particularity* rather than *generalizability* (Greene & Caracelli, 1997) is the hallmark of qualitative research" (p. 193). A relatively small sample was utilized, given the available resources and timeline for this study.

The study is further limited because participants do not all hold the same position within the organization. While all are California small business founders, their positions in their organizations vary and include Chairperson of the Board, Chief Executive Officer, President, Sole Proprietor, Managing Partner, and Partner. The perspectives of the informants may differ based upon their respective positions in the organization.

Yet another limitation of this study is a range restriction, due to the complete lack of participants in the study who were unsuccessful or went through bankruptcy (Spolsky, 2009; Stewart Jr. & Roth, 2007) as a result of founding their business. This lack creates a "*survivorship bias*" (Spolsky, 2009, p. 33) that further limits the generalizability of this study.

Another limitation of this study includes the non-random selection of informants, whose founding experiences are based in California small businesses with employees.

Thus, any conclusions that may be reported in chapter five are limited to the founders who participated in this study.

An additional limitation of the study is how participants defined key terms. Participants were not provided with questions in advance. Thus, participants were asked to respond extemporaneously, resulting in instantaneous self-definitions and self-interpretations of terms without preparation. These definitions and interpretations varied from participant to participant, providing context for their answers.

Furthermore, this study was *retrospective* (Hycner, 1985). It relied on the participants' observations of the past to describe their experience in motivating employees with similar and differing beliefs. A quandary related to phenomenological inquiries is that "an entrepreneur may well interpret things differently at different times and in different contexts" (Cope, 2005, p. 170). Thus, the possibility exists that an individual's perspective may change over time (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Cope, 2005; Hycner, 1985). Therefore, data collected from founders must be viewed as suggestive at a specific point in time rather than conclusive evidence of the phenomenon described.

Another limitation of this study was its timing. Since December 2007, there has been a relatively poor economic climate in the United States. As a result, California small business founders might be biased towards a more pessimistic view than they might have been under different circumstances. Data collection began on July 15, 2010, and concluded on August 30, 2010. The end of a recession may only be identified retrospectively. In September 2010 the Great Recession was officially identified as the period of December 2007 through June 2009 (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2010). That is, the recession troughed in June 2009. Thus, when the interviews were conducted it was not known yet that the Great Recession had ended. The timing of this study may therefore result in the findings being skewed towards a constrained motivational paradigm.

A limitation of the phenomenological approach itself is that it can be difficult to fully implement bracketing or epoche as methodological devices in phenomenological studies (Cope, 2005). Easton (1995) suggests that it is possible for the researcher to unconsciously and unintentionally smuggle his or her values and assumptions into the research, “without the decision maker being aware of the process” (p. 411). This is further affirmed by Grant and Perren’s (2002) meta-analysis of small businesses and entrepreneurship. The coding methodology applied in Grant and Perren’s study exemplified the difficulty of obtaining certainty regarding an author’s paradigmatic and ontological stance. However, the intent of bracketing is to mitigate such threats.

An additional limitation of this study is that only Sowell’s (1995) motivation construct was studied in-depth, while the other constructs were not studied exhaustively. That said, the constructs of human capability, social possibilities, social causation, freedom, justice, knowledge, specialization, process costs, decision-making mechanism preferred, and kinds of decisions preferred (Sowell, 1995) were touched upon in some of the founder’s responses. However, this study focused primarily on motivation as a criterion.

Definition of Terms

The following is a list of key terms used in this study and their definitions.

Bracketing or epoche. Becker (1992) describes bracketing as the process whereby the researcher first acknowledges his or her preconceived notions and biases toward a phenomenon and then sets them aside. Phenomenological studies specifically use a methodological device known as epoche to prepare the researcher for "deriving new knowledge…by setting aside predilections, prejudices, predispositions, and allowing things…to enter anew into consciousness" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 85). Both techniques allow the researcher to avoid reliance on their personal experience and biases.

Constrained paradigm or tragic vision. A constrained paradigm is one that looks to history to explain possibilities for the future, which implies a smaller set of options compared to those with an unconstrained paradigm. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm believe that human capacity is severely and inherently limited for all people, that social possibilities have trade-offs and result in unmet needs, that social causation is systematic, that freedom is being exempt from the power of others (autonomous), that justice provides process rules with just characteristics, that knowledge consists largely of the unarticulated experiences of the many, that specialization is highly desirable, that motivation is created by incentives, that process costs are crucial, that the preferred decision-making mechanism involves systematic processes that convey the experience of the revealed preferences of the many, and that decisions made incrementally are preferred (Sowell, 1995). In an effort to mitigate inherent biases with the use of Sowell's (1995) term "tragic vision" (p. 105), the term *constrained paradigm* is used interchangeably. Within this study, founders' motivational paradigms were examined using in-depth, semi-structured interviews.

Employee. An employee is a person working for another person or an organization for pay that is documented annually on a W-2 form.

Epistemology. Epistemology can be defined as the "nature of knowledge; [the] relation between knower and would-be known" (Mertens, 1998, p. 8). "Inquirer and inquired into are fused into a single (monistic) entity. Findings are literally the creation of the process of interaction between the two" (Guba, 1990, p. 27).

Founder or entrepreneur. A founder is someone who establishes something or formulates the basis for something. Founders are often referred to as entrepreneurs (Jensen & Luthans, 2006). An entrepreneur is someone who perceives an opportunity and creates an organization to pursue it (Bygrave, 2004, p. 2). More specifically, "the founder/entrepreneur establishes the vision and rules of operation and charts the course of direction for the new company" (Jensen & Luthans, 2006, p. 648). For the purpose of this study, a founder is an entrepreneur who started a small business located in California.

Founder's vision. According to Filion (1991), a founder's vision is:

> A projection: an image projected into the future of the place the entrepreneur wants his products to occupy eventually on the market, and also an image of the type of enterprise needed to get there. In short, vision refers to where he wants to take his enterprise. (p. 28)

Frame, lens, or mental model. A person's or group's perspective on a matter or subject. Bolman and Deal (2008) posit:

> A frame is a mental model—a set of ideals and assumptions—that you carry in your head to help you understand and negotiate a particular "territory"…Frames are vital because organizations don't come with…navigation systems to guide you to…your destination. Instead managers need to develop and carry accurate maps in their heads. (p. 11)

Furthermore, business leaders, "reframe, consciously or intuitively, until they understand the situation at hand. They use more than one lens to develop a diagnosis of what they are up against and how to move forward" (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 19).

Generalizability. According to Creswell (2009), generalizability is "The external validity of applying results to new settings, people, or samples" (p. 190).

Gross domestic product. Wheelan (2002) suggests that Gross Domestic Product (GDP) "represents the value of all goods and services produced in an economy. Tally up the market price for all goods we manufacture and all the services we provide, and you will get gross domestic product" (p. 150). However, Wheelan qualifies that "what we care about is *real* GDP, which means it has been adjusted to account for inflation. In contrast, *nominal* figures have not been adjusted for inflation" (p. 151).

Leadership. According to Northouse (2007), "Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p. 3).

Motivation. According to Robbins (2003), motivation is "The process that account for an individual's intensity, direction, and persistence of effort toward attaining a goal" (p. 155). According to Sowell (1995), those who subscribe to an constrained paradigm rely heavily on incentives to motivate others, while those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm rely heavily on creating favorable dispositions, understanding, and intrinsic rewards to motivate others.

Need for achievement. Robbins (2003) describes the need for achievement as "The drive to excel, to achieve in relation to a set of standards, to strive to succeed" (p. 162).

Ontology. According to Mertens (1998), ontology is the "nature of reality" (p. 8). Guba (1990) elaborates that "Realities exists in the form of multiple mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific, dependent for their form and content on the person who hold them" (p. 27).

Paradigm or worldview. A paradigm or worldview is "a basic set of beliefs that guide action" (Guba, 1990, p. 17). For the purpose of this study, paradigm or worldview will often refer to Sowell's (1995) distinctions between constrained and unconstrained paradigms based on one's beliefs. The constrained paradigm is rooted in history, based on scarcity, tends to be pessimistic, and encourages specialization. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm seek out possibilities for the future. The unconstrained paradigm is based on abundance, optimism, and collaboration.

Informant. Phenomenological studies often refer to the participant as an informant. Within the context of this study, the informant will also be referred to as the founder.

Phenomenology. According to Creswell (2007), "a *phenomenological study* describes the meaning for several individuals of their *lived experiences* of a concept or phenomenon" (p. 57).

Stakeholder. According to Antonioni (2009):

> A stakeholder is any group or individual who has a vested interest in the project and may exert influence over the project and its deliverables. Key stakeholders include the main customer of the project, the project champion and the business owners of the deliverable. Projects generally have a range of other stakeholders with strategic expectations and operational requirements. (p. 19)

Strategic vision. A strategic vision is one that captures the strategic steps or actions required to realize a vision.

Small business. Kimberly's (1976) comparative research found that, in more than 80% of published articles reviewed, the total number of employees were used to determine organizational size. "For statistical purposes, the SBA [Small Business

Administration] defines a small business as one with fewer than 500 employees" (Gatewood, 2004, p. 225).

Unconstrained paradigm or vision of the anointed. An unconstrained paradigm or vision of the anointed is a paradigm that looks to the possibility of what the future may hold and therefore provides a larger set of options than generated by those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm believe that human capacity is vast, that social possibilities with solutions to society and world problems exist, that social causation is deliberate, that freedom is the ability to achieve goals, that justice provides just (equalized) chances of results, that knowledge consists largely of the articulated intelligence of the more educated few, that specialization is highly questionable, that motivation is created by dispositions, that process costs are incidental, that the preferred decision-making mechanism involves deliberate planning and utilizes special talents and more advanced views of the educated few, and that categorical decisions are preferred (Sowell, 1995). In an effort to mitigate inherent biases with the use of Sowell's (1995) term "vision of the anointed" (p. 4) the term *unconstrained paradigm* is used interchangeably. Within this study, founders' motivational paradigms were examined by in-depth, semi-structured interviews.

Chapter Two: Review of Selected Literature

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to examine selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms, determine what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar paradigms to their own, and identify what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees who had differing paradigms from their own. This chapter examines selected literature to create a theoretical context for the study. The literature review covers the following topics: (a) founders; (b) leadership; (c) transformational, visionary, or symbolic leadership; (d) perception; (e) paradigms for understanding; and (f) integration of paradigms, leadership, and motivation.

Founders

In order to understand a founder's motivational paradigm, one must first understand what a founder is, what motivates a founder to start a business, and what motivates him or her to continue operating the business. A founder is someone who establishes a business or organization, or formulates its basis. Founders are often referred to as entrepreneurs (Jensen & Luthans, 2006). An entrepreneur is someone who perceives an opportunity and creates an organization to pursue it (Bygrave, 2004, p. 2). Pursuant to Jensen and Luthans (2006), the founder first needs to establish an organizational vision. Next, the rules of operation are established and a course of direction is charted for the organization (strategic vision). Yet, it is the employees' responsibility for translating the founder's organizational vision into "a reality for sustainable growth and success. In other words, this is where entrepreneurs become leaders of their employees" (Jensen & Luthans, 2006, p. 648). This is important because "initial choices by business founders have significant repercussions that persist long after the firm emergence" (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993, pp. 316-318). This is in part due to the founder's leadership and influence in shaping an organizational culture (Schein, 1983) that has the potential to last long after the founder's tenure ends at the organization.

Empirical studies have been performed on founders and entrepreneurs in various disciplines. Studies indicate that while personality traits may account for up to 20% of the variance in "the origins of entrepreneurial intentions…this proportion practically drops to zero in explaining business success" (Frank, Lueger, & Korunka, 2007, p. 227). Consequently, factors other than personality may influence a business founder's success, such as: the environment, the marketplace, available resources, systems or processes implemented, motivation and goals, leadership style, and vision.

It is important to understand what motivates a founder to start a business. According to Boyd and Gumpert (1983), entrepreneurs enjoy one of the "most satisfying career experiences available in American life" (p. 44). In their study, Boyd and Gumpert discovered the key motivators for a founder to start a small business include:

- freedom to make decision about business;
- accountability only to yourself;
- financial rewards and perquisites;
- feeling of achievement;
- involvement in all aspects of the business;
- opportunity to respond quickly to change;
- the challenge of taking risking in new arenas;
- personal contact with employees and customers;
- having direct impact on company's direction; [and]
- absence of bureaucracy and organizational politics. (p. 52)

However, this career experience does not come without consequences. Boyd and Gumpert also found that the most frequent costs associated with owning a small business include:

- personal sacrifice;
- burden of responsibility;
- dominance of professional life;
- loss of psychological well-being;
- lack of human resources;
- uncontrollable forces;
- isolation in problems;
- friction with partners and employees;
- commitment of personal finances for start-up; [and]
- difficulty of finding creative time. (p. 52)

Furthermore, 55-65% of entrepreneurs in Boyd and Gumpert's study experienced physical discomfort at least once a week, such as "back problems, indigestion, insomnia, or headaches" (p. 44). The sustained small businesses still in operation by their founders are evidence that the perceived benefits of entrepreneurship outweigh the perceived costs. The entrepreneurial benefits Boyd and Gumpert discovered supply the motivation for entrepreneurs to continue persevering in spite of the high stress levels experienced. If this were not the case, the founder would likely sell or abandon the business he or she started.

In a similar study Kutrako, Hornsby, and Naffziger's (1997) researched entrepreneurial motivation and goals. The researchers specifically looked at entrepreneurs' goal statements using a four-factor analysis. They discovered entrepreneurs are motivated by both intrinsic (e.g. accomplishment, recognition, challenge, excitement, and growth) and extrinsic (e.g. acquiring wealth, increasing income, and increasing opportunities) sources of motivation. Further, they found that entrepreneurs are motivated by autonomy (i.e. freedom from having a boss) and the ability to provide security for their family, especially in times of economic decline and downsizing. However, no relation was discovered regarding motivation and the entrepreneurs' potential ability to retire early. Their research supports the belief that "many entrepreneurs are motivated by and sustained through other means than simply money" (Kuratko, et al., 1997, p. 31). Perhaps leadership opportunities and working towards achieving a shared vision inspire and motivate an entrepreneur to sustain his or her business.

Leadership

In order for a start-up organizational to be successful, it is necessary for its founder(s) to demonstrate leadership with both their employees and with various stakeholders. Leadership is "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (Northouse, 2007, p. 3). Organizational behavior theory notes that the prominent role of leaders is to inspire and motivate others through their organizational vision (Bass, 1990; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Bygrave, 2004; Cashman, 1999; Collins & Porras, 1996; Conger, 1991, 1999; Covey, 1989; Filion, 1991; Goleman, 1998; Groves, 2006; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Kantabutra & Avery, 2007; Kotter, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2003; Morden, 1997; Northouse, 2007; Robbins, 2003; Roswell & Berry, 1993; Schein, 1992; Senge, 1990). According to Kouzes and Posner (2002):

> Leaders must foster conditions under which everyone will do things because they want to, not because they have to. One of *the* most important practices of leadership is giving life and work a sense of meaning and purpose by offering an exciting vision. (p. 112)

Small business founders may give their employees' work a sense of meaning and purpose through the application of transformational leadership theory, visionary leadership theory, or symbolic leadership theory. Organizational vision plays a powerful role in each of these three leadership theories.

Transformational, Visionary, and Symbolic Leadership

If founders are visionary, they are likely transformational leaders. Robbins (2003) describes a transformational leader as a person “who inspires followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the organization, who is capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on his or her followers” (p. 343). Bass (1990) adds that “transformational leaders inspire, energize, and intellectually stimulate their employees” (p. 19) and that transformational leadership can be learned. When transformational leaders communicate their vision, they tend to engage their followers. Further, transformational leaders may shape an organization’s culture (Schein, 1983). Both Conger (1991) and Robbins (2003) suggest that transformational leaders can shape culture by defining organizational reality, or shaping meaning, through the use of framing and vision. Bolman and Deal (2008) suggest that symbolic leaders can shape cultures through the use of symbols, framing experiences, communicating vision, and telling of stories.

There is mounting empirical evidence that transformational leadership positively influences employee motivation and performance. It seems that a high level of motivation experienced by employee(s) corresponds with a high level of loyalty and commitment to the organization and its founder. Barling, Weber, and Kelloway’s (1996) research indicates that transformational leadership training results in a significant impact on the followers’ perception of their leader’s effectiveness and on the followers’ own commitment to the organization. Therefore, it can be inferred that if a founder improves his or her transformational leadership skills, their employees' level of motivation and commitment to organization will increase. In a study similar to Barling et al.'s, Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) conducted field research and tested transformational leadership training and its impact on direct followers' development and indirect followers' performance. They found that leaders receiving transformational leadership training had a positive impact on the development of the followers who reported directly to them. They also found that leaders receiving transformational leadership training had a positive impact on their indirect followers' performance. Simply put, even in more removed levels of supervision, the leaders receiving transformational leadership training still had a positive impact on employees.

Research by Bono and Judge (2003) found that followers of transformational leaders tended to make self-concordant or harmonious, agreeable work goals. "In general, followers of transformational leaders viewed their work as more important and as more self-congruent. The effects of self-concordant work goals on job attitudes and performance were generally positive" (p. 554). In another study by Bono and Judge (2004), "results provided some support for the dispositional basis of transformational leadership" (p. 901). In a study by Rubin, Muz, and Bommer (2005) empirical evidence supported the expression of emotion and use of personality when engaging in transformational leadership behaviors. In order for a small business founder to effectively engage in transformational leadership behaviors, he or she must first have created an organizational vision.

Creating a vision. Vision means different things to different people based on their own images and values, achievements, goals, sources of motivations, societal norms, and popular thought of the day (Collins & Porras, 1996). Among different authors there may be disparities about what constitutes a vision, but one thing is clear; vision plays a central role in most leadership theories that are concerned with employee motivation and organizational alignment. Covey (1989) concisely describes the visioning process as “beginning with the end in mind” (p. 98). The visioning process starts with a lucid understanding of the desired destination. To begin with the end in mind “means to know where you’re going so that you better understand where you are now and so that the steps you take are always in the right direction” (Covey, 1989, p. 98). Visioning is a creative process. “Visions are characterised [sic] by the attributes of brevity, clarity, challenge, stability, abstractness, future orientation, and desirability or ability to inspire” (Kantabutra, 2010, p. 1). Kanji (2008) describes the following characteristics of an *effective vision* for the practitioner or small business founder:

- It unites and inspires people to make an extra effort in pursuit of collective and individual goals.
- It focuses energy on the outcome of collective effort and not simply upon the outcome of individual effort.
- It creates a positive attitude that people can expand in their own immediate work environments.
- It depicts a whole, a totality, into which people can place themselves, their feelings and their attitudes.
- It meets the needs of the new, educated worker to be engaged in making a valued, individual contribution to a large[r], corporate effort. (p. 420)

Collins and Porras (1996) posit that an *envisioned future* provides a vivid description that engages others, and creates an image or paints a picture of what the accomplished vision feels like. Expressing passion, conviction, and emotion is essential in communicating vision because it motivates others. This enables employees to carry around a *mental model* (Senge, 1990) of what accomplishment or success looks like and strive for it.

Collins and Porras (1996) state, “An envisioned future helps an organization only as long as it hasn’t yet been achieved” (p. 76). Frankl (1992) posits,

> What man actually needs is not a tensionless state but rather the striving and struggling for some goal worthy of him. What he needs is not the discharge of tension at any cost, but the call of a potential meaning waiting to be fulfilled by him. (p. 110)

Cummings and Worley (2001) suggest that if a vision is perceived as impossible or unattainable by employees, motivation will wane. Collins and Porras (1996) suggest that the ideal perception of the attainability of the vision, coined as a “*Big Hairy Audacious Goal”* or “BHAG” (p. 73), should be in the 50-70% range. Vision should be perceived as a challenge, but within the realm of possibility.

Collins and Porras (1996) postulate that creating alignment may be a leader’s most important work. Vision provides a context for decision-making and change. “Building a visionary company requires 1% vision and 99% alignment” (p. 77). Kouzes and Posner (2002) suggest the more unique the vision, the greater the probability of obtaining a successful buy-in.

Evidence in the literature suggests that the use of vision is effective for providing motivation and guidance for an organization’s employees. Wong, Tjosvold, and Yu (2005) found that a shared vision may help garner cooperative, collaborative goals instead of competitive, divisive goals. Wong et al. found that “Shared vision was positively and significantly correlated with cooperative goals” (p. 786). Wong et al. also posit, “shared vision can help partners develop cooperative goals that lead to low levels of opportunism” (p. 782). Opportunism is competitive, acting in one’s own self-interest single mindedly while neglecting others’ interests. Wong et al. found that “shared vision had negative and significant relationships with competitive and independent goals” (p.

786). A shared vision provides goals that help to minimize opportunistic behavior by allowing stakeholders to discover how their self-interests may relate to one another and may provide an opportunity to move forward in a highly effective, collaborative manner.

Vision and organizational values. Pursuant to Block (1987), "To avoid creating a vision for oneself [or for an organization] is to protect oneself from disappointment and failure" (p. 111). This protection from disappointment and failure does not provide employees with a sense of direction so they may be empowered to act in alignment with the vision, mission, and values of their organization for its overall betterment. Given an absence of vision, decisions may be made opportunistically, based on what is best for the individual directly impacted, as opposed to what is best for the organization as a whole.

Goleman (1998) suggests that employees with high levels of commitment to organizational values allow employees to "thrive under challenges and pressures that those who feel no particular loyalty to the organization find only stressful and onerous" (p. 121). Furthermore, Goleman notes that "Employees need a clear sense of an organization's core values [in order] to form an allegiance to them" (p. 119). People tend to make the best decision possible based on given information at a specific point in time. Frankl (1992) believes that a person ought to "listen to what…[their] conscience commands… [them] to do and go on to carry it out to the best of…[their] knowledge" (pp. 12 -13). Organizational vision may serve as the guiding conscience in an employee's decision-making process. This information potentially enables employees to answer to the question "Where is our organization going?" for themselves and do their jobs more efficiently and effectively. The organizational leaders' ability to self-assess and continuously realign and clarify the organization's vision, mission, goals, and objectives as they relate to the marketplace may impact an organization's success or failure.

Organizational values often serve as the foundation of a vision (Quigley, 1995). In an exploratory paper, Lichtenstein and Dade (2007) propose leaders' values that drive visions, goals and strategies contribute to the bottom line (that is, shareholder value). Grundstein-Amado (1999) suggest that "the more leaders and followers are conscious about their mutual expectations the better organizational goals and values will be met and internalized" (p. 254). This creates the opportunity for what Senge (1990) describes as a *courageous act;* "Shared visions compel courage so naturally that people don't even realize the extent of their courage. Courage is simply doing whatever is needed in pursuit of the vision" (p. 208). A shared vision based on values may create alignment that would likely contribute to enhanced organizational effectiveness.

Empirical studies tend to support the use of embedding values into a shared vision. Through observation, Filion (1991) found that when founders integrated their personal values into the organizational vision, they were passionate and committed to the organizational vision. Moreover, Wong et al. (2005) found that *moral beliefs* (values) in a shared vision provide an opportunity for community in partner relationships (that is, in business-to-business or stakeholder relationships). Such values "reinforce the feeling of cooperative interdependence" (p. 783). Values embedded in the vision may help to abate the formation of subcultures or *out-groups* across the organizations. Values embedded in a shared vision may foster feelings of being part of a team, committed to a mutual belief. A team member who believes in a shared vision is more likely to view promoting a colleague's self-interest as furthering his or her own self interest (Wong, et al., 2005). Moreover, Lichtenstein's doctoral dissertation (as cited in Lichtenstein & Dade, 2007) asserts that organizational performance is directly and significantly impacted by executive values. Based on the research relating to vision and values, it becomes evident that leaders' values impact strategic decisions (including the development of a shared vision embedded with organizational values) that contribute to an organization's overall effectiveness.

Dangers of visionary leadership. Roswell and Berry (1993) suggest that leaders must first realize that a vision is only a dream without the support and cooperation of others. "Integrity of the leader as promoter and protector of values can also be undermined if the validity of beliefs transmitted are not challenged by institutional members" (Roswell & Berry, 1993, p. 20). What is known as *group think* or *psychic prisons* occurs when:

> blind faith in leaders locks the enterprise into a cycle of self-affirming processes that maintain a self-identity out of tune with reality…False assumptions, beliefs which are taken for granted, and unquestioned rules and procedures, come together "to create self-contained views of the world that provide both a resource for [and] a constraint on organised [sic] action" (Morgan, 1986, p. 202). (Roswell & Berry, 1993, p. 20)

The biggest danger occurs when leaders take their eyes off the external realities to turn inward and admire the beauty of their own organization and are "swept away by the swirling waters of change" (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 193). A continued lack of congruence with stakeholders and the ever-changing environment in the marketplace may ultimately lead to organizational dissolution. Another similar danger is the result of egocentric behavior that locks the enterprise into "modes of thinking that reject innovation and change" (Roswell & Berry, 1993, p. 22).

One of the potential dangers of transformational or visionary leadership is that the leader may become narcissistic. As Whetstone's (2002) research indicates, "A transformational leader can be too instrumentalist, focusing too much on realizing his personal vision to the neglect of respecting the dignity of his followers" (p. 391). Similarly, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) describe pseudo transformational leadership as occurring when the leader acts in his or her self-interest instead of in the best interest of the organization. Such narcissistic tendencies may:

> result in obsessive needs for self-preservation. The narcissistic organization (Walter, 1983) dissipates energy in inter-group efforts to manipulate relations in order to preserve power and achieve position. Anxiety levels increase, establishing a self-perpetuating cycle which exploits the susceptibilities and dependence needs of members. Turned in on itself, the institution fails to adapt to the changing conditions of its competitive environment. (Roswell & Berry, 1993, p. 21)

An organization's inability to adapt exacerbates any organizational issues or problems. A continued lack of congruence with stakeholders and the ever-changing environment in the marketplace may ultimately lead to organizational dissolution.

A study by Kark, Shamir, and Chen (2003) found that transformational leadership has a positive relationship with both followers' empowerment and dependence. This is a danger, as dependence implies that followers may be limited in their ability to make decisions without advisement and may impact their ability to proceed with activities related to their job. Dependence further implies that the follower's self-esteem and motivation are based on approval from the leader. However, Kark et al.'s research also found that personal identification with the leader mitigated the followers' dependence on the leader.

Perception

This section regarding perception is modeled in part after the works of Bolman and Deal (2008), Creswell (2007), and De La Rosa Ducut (2005). Lewis (1990) suggests that individuals are multifaceted in their beliefs and evaluation processes. Robbins (2003) suggests that perception is the process whereby individuals interpret and organize information in an effort to give meaning to their environment. Perception indicates that an experience is filtered by an individual's cognitive lens (including his or her biases).

People have greatly varying cognitive lenses through which they view the world. Thus, their varied styles of thinking create greatly different foundations for making judgments (Lewis, 1990). Cashman (1999) writes, "Every belief [or perception] we have transforms our life in either a life-enriching or life-limiting way" (p. 35). Many authors from a variety of disciplines have identified this filtering process. To illustrate, Becker (1992) refers to *perspectivity*; Bolman and Deal (2008) *frames*; Cashman (1999) *beliefs*; Cronshaw and Lord (1987) *social categorizations*; Crotty (1998) *philosophical stance, epistemologies,* and *ontologies*; Goleman (1995) *inspiring vision*; Creswell (2003) *alternative knowledge claims*; Senge (1990) *mental models*; and Weick and Bougon (1986) *cognitive maps*. To further illustrate, multiple authors refer to the following concepts that relate to perception: schemata or schema theory (Fiedler, 1982; Fiske & Dyer, 1985; Lord & Foti, 1986), representations (Frensch & Sternberg, 1991; Lesgold & Lajoie, 1991; Voss, Wolfe, Lawrence, & Engle, 1991), paradigms (Creswell, 2007; Gregory, 1983; Guba, 1990; Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Kuhn, 1996; Mertens, 1998; Patton, 2002; Rossman & Rallis, 2003), and worldviews or an approach to the world (Becker, 1992; Creswell, 2007, 2009; Guba, 1990; Hycner, 1985; Mertens, 1998; Patton, 2002;

Rossman & Rallis, 2003). While subtle variations exist, and definitions have evolved over time, there appears to be no consensus on what the filtering process should be called. Becker (1992) posits, “Any discipline is an approach to the world as much as it is a body of knowledge…The way in which one approaches the world both opens up and limits what one finds there” (p. 22).

Perception is a manifestation of a leader’s underlying belief system in action. Beliefs impact what is seen (perceived) and what is not seen (omitted). Quite possibly, founders, and thus their organizations, are most vulnerable when they are not aware of *what they do not know*. This is also known as an *unknown* or *blind spot* in Johari’s Awareness Model (Luft, 1969, p. 13). When founders are unaware of *what they do not know*, they are not aware that they need help (blind spot) or an opportunity may be missed (unknown). Perceptions, with all their biases, inform founders to action.

Paradigms for Understanding

According to economist and political theorist Thomas Sowell (1995), how meaning is processed begins with one’s view of the human condition. Does one operate from a paradigm of abundance? Does one operate from a paradigm of scarcity? Sowell uses the terms *vision of the anointed* (unconstrained paradigm) and *tragic vision* (constrained paradigm) to describe two differing positions. Sowell uses these differing paradigms as a means to evaluate the development of public policies. This study extrapolated upon Sowell’s constrained and unconstrained frameworks as an effective means to evaluate selected California small business founders’ paradigms. A founder’s view of the human condition is an element that may frame an organization’s vision and permeate its culture. Sowell suggested paradigms differ based on “their respective conceptions of the nature of man, the nature of the world, and the nature of causation, knowledge, power, and justice” (p. 104).

The tragic vision is based on the ancient Greek belief that fate is inescapably “inherent in the nature of things” (Sowell, 1995, p. 104). The tragic vision is constrained by (or grounded in) the current reality. History is studied to help determine the future course of action. Decisions are based on incremental changes. Those who follow the tragic vision believe that there are stringent limits to the morality that an individual will follow without incentives.

In contrast, the *vision of the anointed* is unconstrained, expansive, and looks to future possibilities. The work of Zander and Zander (2000) resonates with an unconstrained paradigm, looking towards the *art of possibility* and a future of abundance. Sowell (1995) describes important differences between the constrained paradigm and the unconstrained paradigm based on one’s assumption of what people know. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm assume that people can create solutions to problems without evidence that their method has been successful in the past. This allows for the creation of new techniques for solving problems. An unconstrained paradigm is not necessarily based on knowledge of an issue; it is based on human reason, compassion, commitment, and other subjective elements. Those who follow the tenets of an unconstrained paradigm believe that an individual will do what is morally right regardless of incentives. If a crime occurs it is considered a failure of society, while the criminal is considered a “victim of circumstances” (Sowell, 1995, p. 108).

Sowell (1995) believes that conflict is inevitable between those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm and those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm prefer more choices. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm have more limited options and fewer choices based on what has worked historically. The difference in the perceived possible options may create conflict. As previously mentioned, Sowell uses 11 constructs to determine where the policy (or for this study, the motivational paradigm) falls along the continuum; leaning towards a constrained or unconstrained view.

The researcher discovered two doctoral dissertations that utilize Sowell's concepts; both were very different from each other and from this study. Byrne (1996) includes Sowell's theoretical framework in his doctoral dissertation in an effort to "uncover hidden assumption which underlie political discourse" (p. 5) and as a source for "plausible analysis of social processes" (p. 5). Byrne then applies the constrained or unconstrained paradigm concept to great thinkers including Hegel, Marx, Mill, Rousseau, and Smith.

More recently McGrath (2008) applied Sowell's constrained/unconstrained framework to early childhood education and care (ECEC) policy documents of 19 western countries. McGrath developed an instrument to create a "Constrained/Unconstrained Tendency Score (C/UTS)" (p. xiii). Based on progress indicators, McGrath found that neither countries with constrained or unconstrained tendencies "consistently performed better on all of the progress indicators" (pp. xiii-xiv). Countries with a more constrained paradigm tended to excel in the areas of material well-being and educational well-being. Countries with a more unconstrained paradigm tended to excel in the area of familial well-being. Further, McGrath found “evidence that ideological assumptions are important in the creation and analysis of governmental policies, particularly as they affect ECEC” (p. xiv).

The following table reflects the fundamental differences between Sowell’s (1995) constrained and unconstrained paradigms across the 11 constructs.

Table 1

Sowell’s (1995) Summary of the Construct Differences between the Tragic Vision [Constrained Paradigm] and the Vision of the Anointed [Unconstrained Paradigm]

	The Tragic Vision [Constrained Paradigm]	The Vision of the Anointed [Unconstrained Paradigm]
Human capability	Severely and inherently limited for all	Vast for the anointed
Social possibilities	Trade-offs that leave many "unmet needs"	Solutions to problems
Social causation	Systemic	Deliberate
Freedom	Exemption from the power of others	Ability to achieve goals
Justice	Process rules with just characteristics	Just (equalized) chances or results
Knowledge	Consists largely of the unarticulated experiences of the many	Consists largely of the articulated intelligence of the more educated few
Specialization	Highly desirable	Highly questionable
Motivation	Incentives	Dispositions
Process costs	Crucial	Incidental
Decision-making mechanism preferred	Systemic processes that convey the experiences and revealed preferences of the many	Deliberate plans that utilize the special talents and more advanced views of the few
Kinds of decisions preferred	Incremental	Categorical

Note. Adapted from *The Vision of the Anointed: Self-congratulations as a Basis for Social Policy* (p. 105), by T. Sowell, 1995, New York, NY: Basic Books. Copyright 1995 by the author.

Human capabilities. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm believe in human limitations that are moral and or intellectual in nature. They are concerned with how to “cope with the intellectual and moral inadequacies of human beings, so as to limit the damage they do, and to coordinate the society in such a way as to maximize the use of its scattered fragments of knowledge" (Sowell, 1995, p. 117).

Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm attempt to work around intellectual and moral shortcomings by attempting to rectify the mistakes that are inevitably made as soon as possible. They look to the past as a means of understanding the current reality. They attempt to distill the "experience of millions who faced similar human vicissitudes before [them]" (Sowell, 1995, p. 118).

Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to believe the ideal way to solve problems is through the "liberation of human beings from unnecessary social inhibitions, so as to allow repressed creativity to emerge and vast knowledge and talent already available to be applied to existing problems" (Sowell, 1995, pp. 117-118). They tend to discount past experience as it was a simpler time.

Social possibilities. In alignment with a constrained paradigm, the scarce allocation of resources justifies economic and social expenses. Sowell (1995) suggests that the social possibilities for those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm are limited by human and economic deficiencies. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm believe there are innate deficiencies in all people, such as deficiencies "in knowledge, wisdom, morality or courage" (Sowell, 1995, p. 113). According to Sowell, such deficiencies result in suffering and social evils. For those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm, "the available resources are always inadequate to fulfill all the desires of all the people" (p. 113). In alignment with Keynesian economists, the constrained find that there are no solutions: only trade-offs. Such trade-offs result in unfulfilled desires, unrest, and unhappiness in the world. Given such trade-offs the economists' goal is to maximize utility. Markets are amoral. Instituting initiatives that support an organization's vision may help build a reputation based on character and integrity. Any positive externalities that spill over as a result are readily welcomed by society.

In contrast, for those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm, unhappiness is created by "the fact that social institutions and social policies are not as wisely crafted as the anointed would have crafted them" (Sowell, 1995, p. 113). The unconstrained make the assumption that with the proper institutions and upbringing, people would be intrinsically motivated do what is morally right.

Social causation. The constrained paradigm utilizes systemic causation based on history and the experiences of the many. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm believe that:

> human knowledge and foresight are very limited *for all*, causation more often operates in systemic ways, with innumerable interactions producing results controlled by no given individual or group, but falling into a pattern determined by the incentives and constraints inherent in the logic of the circumstances, rather than as a consequence of specifically articulated, syllogistic rationality. (Sowell, 1995, p. 124)

Those who subscribe to the constrained paradigm tend to believe in the free market, and that the individual knows what is best for him or herself.

> The world [is] conceived in the tragic vision [constrained paradigm] as a system of innumerable and reciprocal interactions, all constrained within the confines of natural and human limitations, individual problems cannot be solved one by one without adding to other problems elsewhere, if only by using up the resources available to deal with them. (Sowell, 1995, p. 126)

Again, this is reflective of the constrained view that every decision involves a trade-off.

The unconstrained utilize the experience of the syllogistic rationality or "articulated rationality of a talented few" (Sowell, 1995, p. 125). Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm "see little standing between intention and result, other than such subjective factors as compassion or commitment" (Sowell, 1995, p. 126). The unconstrained prefer articulated reason and are likely to endorse governmental controls of the economy through public policy.

Freedom. According to Sowell (1995), those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm tend to view freedom as an "exemption from the power of others" (p. 105). Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to view freedom as the "ability to achieve goals" (p. 105). For the unconstrained, "the goal is the liberation of human beings from unnecessary social inhibitions, so as to allow repressed creativity to emerge and the vast knowledge and talent already available to be applied to existing problems" (Sowell, 1995, pp. 117-118).

Justice. Justice is largely a mega-level concept governed by nations, society, and international law. Regardless of the perspective regarding justice endorsed, one must follow the set of laws that prescribe justice within his or her respective society. Those who subscribe to a constrained or unconstrained paradigm have differing paradigms for justice.

Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm tend to view justice as a prerequisite for an orderly and efficient economy and society. They focus on how the law is applied and equality of the process. Justice and the legal system may be viewed as a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for conducting business and achieving goals.

Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to view justice as intrinsically desirable regardless of the economic and societal costs. They tend to be concerned with law reform in order to increase the level of justice, thereby increasing the equality of results.

Knowledge. People make decisions based on the information they have at a point in time. Frankl (1992) suggests that a person ought to “listen to what…[their] conscience commands…[them] to do and go on to carry it out to the best of…[their] knowledge” (pp. 12-13). However, Sowell (1995) suggested that those with constrained and unconstrained paradigms have different assumptions regarding what people know how to do: “Those with the tragic [constrained] vision might share the desire for social betterment without sharing the assumptions as to how much knowledge and control of social ramifications exist” (p. 112). Sowell looks to historians Will and Ariel Durant to explain how those who subscribe to the constrained paradigm feel:

> No one man, however brilliant or well-informed, can come in one lifetime to such fullness of understanding as to safely judge and dismiss the customs or institutions of his society, for these are the wisdom of generations after centuries of experiment in the laboratory of history. (p. 112)

In defense of the constrained paradigm, Sowell uses natural resources as an example stating, “no one knows what that fixed amount is and, since the process of discovery is costly, it will never pay anyone to discover that total amount” (p. 70).

Sowell (1995) states that the unconstrained “are seldom deterred by any question as to whether anyone has the knowledge required to do what they are attempting” (p. 109). According to Sowell, the unconstrained make the “implicit assumption that knowledge is far more extensive and less costly than it is” (p. 69). For the constrained it is implied that the answers already exist (in history). Any attempt to further understand the details of a problem through research is deemed an ineffective use of resources.

Sowell (1995) suggests that the morally inspired decisions of the unconstrained tend to dismiss the possibility of negative externalities. A negative externality occurs when an individual or organization making a decision does not have to pay for the full cost of that decision. Thus, society bears a portion of the burden. Sowell suggests that the unconstrained do not view limited resources as a source of unhappiness. Rather, the unconstrained tend to evaluate social institutions and policies by looking for inconsistencies between how they were designed and implemented and what they deem to be optimal. If the social institutions and social policies are not as wisely architected as the unconstrained desired, unhappiness results.

Specialization. According to Sowell (1995), "specialization is a way of coping with inadequacies of the human mind" (p. 204). Buckminster Fuller (as cited in Cashman, 1999) asserted that "biological species become extinct because they over-specialize and fail to adapt" (Cashman, 1999, p. 95). Sowell suggests that those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm regard specialization negatively. According to Sowell, those who subscribe to an unconstrained view tend to use the word interdisciplinary to reflect their "aversion to, or lack of appreciation of, specialization" (p. 205). Sowell suggested the interdisciplinary work that the unconstrained refer to is actually "*nondisciplinary*, in that it simply ignores boundaries between disciplines" (p. 205).

Sowell (1995) suggests that those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm regard specialization positively. In accordance with Adam Smith's division of labor, Sowell suggests "those with the [constrained paradigm]…have often proclaimed the virtues of specialization" (p. 205). Sowell urges those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm that if "more than one field be studied do so without ever suggesting that the barriers between these fields be erased" (p. 206).

Motivation. Sowell (1995) suggests that the unconstrained have discussions in terms of goals and assumptions, whereas the constrained have discussions in terms of incentives and evidence. According to Sowell, those who subscribe to the constrained paradigm rely heavily on incentives in an effort to achieve the desired outcome. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm tend to believe that people will act in their own self-interest unless incentivized to act or behave differently. Simply put, if the desired outcome requires individuals or groups to act or behave in a manner that differs from serving their own self-interest first, the constrained tend to believe carrots must be dangled to motivate people towards the desired outcome.

According to Sowell (1995), those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm rely heavily on creating favorable dispositions and understanding in an effort to achieve the desired outcome. In other words, if those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm want to motivate a person or group to stop a particular act or behavior, they would attempt to deter those involved by appealing to them in an effort to change their disposition. They tend to believe that people are intrinsically motivated to do what is right or just.

Process costs. Those who subscribe to the tenets of an unconstrained paradigm find the process costs to be incidental. In contrast, those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm find process costs to be crucial. The constrained feel that "Doing good on some problem right under one's nose is not enough in a world of constrained options and systemic interactions, where the overlooked costs of immediate benevolence take their toll elsewhere" (Sowell, 1995, p. 112).

Decision-making mechanism preferred. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm look for systemic processes that convey the experiences and revealed preferences of the many. However, those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm prefer making decisions based on deliberate plans that utilize the special talents and more advanced views of the few.

Kinds of decision preferred. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm tend to make choices incrementally and consider the trade-offs. They ask, “What must be sacrificed to achieve this particular improvement” (Sowell, 1995, p. 135)? According to Sowell (1995), their decision-making process includes the evaluation of alternative probabilities and the corresponding alternative consequences. They want to know whether the externalities will be negative or positive. For those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm, “One of the most severe constraints is the constant that time moves in only one direction. Trade-offs that should have been made differently in the past are now irrelevant” (p. 137).

According to Sowell (1995), those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend make choices categorically and speak *in* the language of solutions. They tend to believe the best solutions can be achieved by using “their own presumably superior knowledge and virtue” (p. 142). They believe the ideal solution to the matter at hand can be achieved without compromise. The unconstrained ask, “What will remove particular negative features in the existing situation to create a solution” (p. 135)?

Integrating Paradigms, Leadership, and Motivation

This section connects Sowell’s (1995) constrained and unconstrained paradigms to leadership theories as they relate to motivation. Conflicting information exists regarding the effectiveness of differing motivational techniques that leaders utilize. Leaders who subscribe to an unconstrained motivational paradigm speak in terms of goals and assumptions, and may be as intrinsically motivated. Leaders who subscribe to a constrained motivational paradigm speak in terms of incentives and evidence, and may be viewed as externally motivated. Schein (1992) speaks to a more constrained motivational paradigm, focusing on rewards:

> If the founders or leaders are trying to ensure that their values and assumptions will be learned they must create a reward, promotion, and status system that is consistent with those assumptions. Whereas the message initially gets across in the daily behavior of the leader, it is judged in the long run by whether the important rewards are allocated consistently with that daily behavior. (p. 243)

Rewards tend to fall under the arena of incentives and evidence that may be thought of as externally motivating, and thus fits within a constrained motivational paradigm. On the opposite end of the spectrum, Kouzes and Posner (2002) speak to a more unconstrained motivational paradigm, focusing on goals:

> External motivation is more likely to create conditions of compliance or defiance; self-motivation produces far superior results…People who are self-motivated will keep working toward a result even if there is no reward, but people who are externally controlled are likely to stop trying once the rewards or punishments are removed. (p. 112)

This results oriented approach tends to fall under the arena of goals and assumptions that may be thought of as intrinsically motivating, and therefore fits within an unconstrained motivational paradigm.

The value of the researcher's study resides in the fact that successful small businesses are founded relatively infrequently, with just 51% surviving more than 5 years (Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy, 2009) and studying the motivational paradigms of their founders may provide valuable insights into the process. Furthermore, few empirical studies reflect the intersection of leadership, motivation, and paradigms in a context similar to this study. However, Kanungo's (2001) empirical study findings come close. Kanungo studied the moral foundations of two types of leadership, one of them being transformational leadership. Kanungo describes transformational leaders as having "an organic worldview and moral altruistic motives grounded in a deontological perspective" (p. 257). This reflects the intersection of transformational leadership, paradigms, values, and motivation.

Summary

This chapter examined the literature related to leaders who have founded organizations, leadership vision, perception, paradigms extrapolated from Sowell's (1995) criteria for evaluating public policy, and, finally, integration of paradigms, leadership, and motivation. While extensive literature exists regarding founders' leadership, vision, and perception, no studies known to this researcher use the paradigms extrapolated from Sowell's criteria for evaluating public policy and apply them to small business founders as they relate to motivation.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Nature of the Research

This chapter describes the phenomenological methods that were used in this study. First, the research questions are restated, followed by a description of the qualitative methods that were employed. Rather than focus on hypothesis testing (Seidman, 2006), this phenomenological study used in-depth, semi-structured interviews to describe the lived-experiences of selected California small business founders and the degree to which they tend to motivate their employees from either a constrained or unconstrained paradigm. This approach resulted in a phenomenological description of distilled themes, patterns, structure, and essence(s) that the informants share in common from their lived-experiences. Extrapolating from Spolsky (2009), how small business founders view motivation and motivate their employees may be fundamental to the organization's survival.

Restatement of the Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were as follows:

1. What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?
2. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?
3. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?

Phenomenological Research Design Overview

The phenomenological research design used in this study is, in part, modeled after the qualitative phenomenological research design that Dern (2007) used in his doctoral dissertation. Creswell (2007) posits, "*A phenomenological study* describes the meaning for several individuals of their *lived experiences* of a concept or phenomenon" (p. 57). Phenomenological studies are completed in the *context of discovery* (Cope, 2005; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Schwandt, 1994; Shapiro, 1986; Symon & Cassell, 1998) and provide an opportunity for understanding in areas where limited research has been completed.

This study was completed in the context of discovery based on Husserl's transcendental phenomenology, in which the importance of description is deeply rooted. Pursuant to Husserl (1970), qualitative, descriptive inquiry depends upon lucidity provided by self-evidence or self-giving intuition "through a procedure of insight which ultimately verifies itself by means of descriptive data" (p. 223). In a similar vein, Giorgi (1992) explains that "description is the clarification of the meaning of the objects of experience precisely as experienced" (p. 122). The phenomenological researcher discovers what is described as being present in the informant's experience (Giorgi, 1997). The phenomenological researcher further discovers how the informant describes the presence of the phenomenon (Giorgi, 1997). The meaning or structure of a phenomenon is distilled by systematically applying reduction until "the commonality that is present in the many diverse appearances of a phenomenon" (Hein & Austin, 2001, p. 8) is gleaned from the descriptive data provided by the informants. It is the researcher's intent to discover the commonality or structures, if any, provided in the descriptive data given by the informants regarding their views about motivation and their lived-experiences motivating employees with both similar and differing motivational paradigms.

In the inaugural issue of the *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, Giorgi (1970) attempted to boost qualitative phenomenological research design into acceptance by the greater research community. In order for this to occur, the community needed to acknowledge the inevitable "presence of the researcher…[so that they not] be treated as merely a stimulus object or simply another variable" (p. 95). As phenomenological research design and methodological practices developed further, the necessity of the researcher to act as a filter for data became apparent. In this manner it is this researcher's intent to act as a filter for the descriptions provided by the selected California small business founders. This process may allow the researcher to discover commonalities or underlying structures, if any, in the founders' views regarding motivation and how they experience motivating employees with both similar and differing paradigms.

Phenomenological Approach

The phenomenological approach used in this study is in part modeled after the approach used in Dern's (2007) dissertation. In phenomenological studies informants who have directly experienced the phenomenon under investigation provide the researcher with rich descriptions from their personal perspective (Becker, 1992; Cope, 2005; Creswell, 2007; Dukes, 1984; Hycner, 1985; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Giorgi (1997) suggested the use of informants helps mitigate bias, noting, "The turn to others is chosen in order to avoid the possible objection of bias" (p. 243). However, the researcher plays a central role in phenomenological studies that must be acknowledged.

Edmund Husserl introduced the term *epoche* in the phenomenological context (Natanson, 1973). Phenomenological studies use a methodological device known as epoche or bracketing to prepare the researcher for "deriving new knowledge…by setting aside predilections, prejudices, predispositions, and allowing things…to enter anew into consciousness" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 85). The researcher's contemplation of his or her cognitive lens is a prerequisite to phenomenological analysis. Becker (1992) describes bracketing as the process whereby researchers first acknowledge their preconceived notions and biases toward a phenomenon and then set them aside. In essence, the researcher "look[s] *at* what [he or she]…normally look[s] *through*" (Sokolowski, 2000, p. 50). As a methodological device, epoche or bracketing reduces the researcher's reliance on his or her personal experience and biases.

In phenomenological studies, the researcher is not to rely upon *a priori* claims or hypotheses regarding the phenomenon being studied (Becker, 1992; Cope, 2005; Hycner, 1985). Bracketing is how researchers control for bias in phenomenological studies (Becker, 1992). It is essential that the researcher make any and all attempts to explicate his or her bias, and then attempt to set them aside. In an effort to perform this study *tabula rasa*, the researcher employed the epoche or bracketing technique to explicate any biases or assumptions. The researcher reflected on her lived-experiences working with business founders and entrepreneurs, as well as her lived-experiences motivating others with both similar and differing beliefs, and documented any biases or assumptions discovered by bracketing her experiences (see Appendix A). Then the researcher consciously chose to set those notions aside.

Consciousness (or awareness) also plays a central role in phenomenological studies. In general, phenomenological studies do not formulate or test hypotheses (Seidman, 2006). Therefore, the researcher does not speculate about what underlying structures or essences may be distilled. Objects are intuitable through one's consciousness. Thus, phenomenological researchers organize the objects provided by the informants in their everyday language and reduce the descriptions into a tapered expression or essence of their experience (Giorgi, 1997). To further illustrate, the researcher synthesized the data obtained from the informants in their everyday business language in an effort to reveal an underlying structure or essence of the phenomena that occur when selected California small business founders describe their views regarding motivation and their lived-experience motivating employees with similar and differing paradigms.

Intentionality of consciousness allows the phenomenologist to distill the structure or essence of a phenomenon. Intention in the phenomenological context refers to "the conscious relationship [the phenomenologist has]…to an object" (Sokolowski, 2000, p. 8). Cartesian thinkers attempt to compartmentalize the physical world away from the cognizance of experience in the world (Sokolowski, 2000). In Cartesian thought, objective reality is highly sought after. Houlgate (2001) suggests that Cartesian thinkers believe that objective reality is superior to the subjective reality perceived by the mind. Yet, in epistemological phenomenological pursuits, the mind is the leading actor, melding objectivity and subjectivity. Husserl (1970) postulates:

> The life of the soul and…the properties of a person…[are] what takes place in real human beings, what is experienceable in their human self-consciousness through unprejudiced self-experience or, in the case of others, through the experience of

> others…[with] their human commissions and omissions [comes the reality that] human beings are related to realities which are valid for them. (p. 263)

Every time one has an experience, one witnesses an object. However, the experience may be altered due to the subjectivity of one's perception. The conscious mind is involved every time one perceives something. Perception determines what information one focuses on and what information one omits. Thus, perception causes each person's lived-experience to be unique. Effectively the conscious is *intending* the object, experiencing it. In this study, the melding of objectivity and subjectivity, and of commissions and omissions, impacted the descriptive data that was collected. In essence, the data collected reflected the lived-experience of the selected California small business founders from their perspective.

Shapiro (1986) suggests that subjectivity lies in the laurels between the *context of justification* or explanation and the *context of discovery* or understanding. Kumar (1996) describes subjectivity as "conditioned by [one's] educational background, discipline, philosophy, experience and skills" (p. 6). Sokolowski (2000) finds that "presence and absence are the objective correlates to *filled* and *empty intentions*" (p. 33) or commissions and omissions (Husserl, 1970). In phenomenological research studies, experience is verified by means of pure and proper subjectivity. In other words, "the goal is not to…eliminate subjectivity, but rather to try to clarify the role of subjectivity" (Giorgi, 2002, p. 8). de Vaus (2001) refers to explanations, and Shapiro (1986) refers to validation, both of which imply a logical link or *face validity* (Kumar, 1996) between objects and phenomena. Such logical links are scrutinized as either reasonable or unreasonable (Kumar, 1996). Understanding is entirely dependent on a phenomenon or lived-experience. Duly, Shapiro postulates:

> The process of verification, which here is inseparable from the act of investigation, is active and concretely self-involving. It contrasts to…the detachment of the application of an intellectual mode such as logical deduction. This form of verification involves understanding in the original sense of that term – a standing under or with. (p. 176)

Thus, the source of analysis in phenomenological research studies is the lived-experience. During the in-depth interview process, if the researcher felt understanding was not achieved regarding a specific question, as Becker (1992) suggests, the researcher probed with more questions on that topic until it was possible to develop an understanding of the informant's lived-experience. If questions remained after the interview was completed, the researcher maintained the option to elect to contact the informant via email or telephone to ask a few more brief questions for clarification.

Sources of Data and Sampling Procedure

Phenomenological research is conducted to distill the meaning, themes, structure, and essence(s) that the informants share in common from the lived-experience of the phenomenon. It is essential that study informants have experienced the phenomenon under examination (Becker, 1992; Cope, 2005; Creswell, 2007; Dukes, 1984; Hycner, 1985; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). In this study the unit of analysis was the individual. The informants consisted of founders, each representing different small businesses across a variety of industries located in California. This study utilized purposeful sampling rather than probabilistic sampling.

According to Patton (1987), purposeful sampling is beneficial in qualitative studies as it allows for the selection of "information-rich cases" (p. 52) for in-depth study that are illuminative (Patton, 2002). Purposeful sampling is optimally employed when a study is "aimed at insight about the phenomenon, not empirical generalization from a sample to a population" (Patton, 2002, p. 40). Two forms of purposive sampling were utilized in this study: *criterion* sampling and *snowball* or *chain* sampling. Criterion sampling was utilized to ensure that each participant had personally experienced the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 1987, 2002). More specifically, the selection of informants for participation in the study was purposefully limited to those who met the criteria of: (a) having founded an organization, (b) leading an organization that employed at least one and no more than 500 people, and (c) operating the organization in California. Furthermore, snowball or chain sampling (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 1987, 2002) was also utilized, as a number of professionals were asked for recommendations of other founders available to be interviewed. Nominations broadened and then converged into a smaller number of core, information-rich cases. The researcher knew many of the informants personally or professionally. The researcher sought and gained permission from each individual acting as an informant for participation in this study.

Phenomenological Interview

Phenomenological research data is primarily obtained through interviews (Becker, 1992; Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). This study utilized long, semi-structured, one-on-one interviews to gather information. An in-depth or long interview can last upwards of 2 hours (Creswell, 2007). This research was conducted to develop a rich description of the selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms and how they motivate employees with similar and differing paradigms. Thus, in-depth interviewing was an appropriate means to collect data due to the "flexibility allowed to the interviewer…[that can help] to elicit extremely rich information" (Kumar, 1996, p. 109). There are various strategies for conducting phenomenological inquiry and the long in-depth interview.

Moustakas (1994) advises that a phenomenological interview begin with an informal conversation whereby trust is established and the informant is encouraged to feel relaxed and comfortable, which this researcher did. This was followed by an interactive process of asking the informant open-ended questions and commenting in an effort to coax out their general experience of the phenomenon. Next, the researcher focused on topic-guided questions to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the selected California small business founders' lived-experience motivating others. Interviews can be iteratively sequenced to discover the informant's life history, reveal details of their experience regarding the phenomenon, and allow time for reflection on the meaning of their experience (Rossman & Rallis, 2003; Seidman, 2006). See Appendix B for the complete interview protocol that the researcher followed.

Becker (1992) recommends perspicaciously probing informants for "examples, elaborations, and clarifications…[while simultaneously] assessing whether essential features of the phenomenon are being described adequately" (p. 40). Becker advises that while the phenomenological interview is being conducted, the researcher make ongoing assessments of the depth, and breadth of the participant's response. To help facilitate richness to the qualitative study, the researcher can ask him or herself the following questions during the interview process:

> Do I feel that I can summarize the essential aspects of this phenomenon for this person? Have I got enough examples and details? Can the person say anything else about this aspect of the phenomenon? Do experiences of the phenomenon exist that he or she has not mentioned yet? (Becker, 1992, p. 41)

Interview questions were prepared and appropriately sequenced in advance (Moustakas, 1994). Creswell (2007) recommends the researcher memorize the interview questions in order, enabling him or her to maintain eye contact throughout the interview. Moustakas (1994) further suggests creating an interview or topical guide with questions written out for reference. For this study the researcher had the interview protocol (including interview questions) readily available for reference (see Appendix B). The researcher asked questions and made comments in an effort to establish and maintain an open dialogue with the informant, while simultaneously incorporating Becker's probing questions.

Phenomenological interviews are usually recorded, then transcribed (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Creswell, 2007; Hycner, 1985; Moustakas, 1994), which was the case with this study. When recording an interview, it is imperative that the researcher make proper preparations, taking precautions to avoid equipment failure (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975) and to avoid any environmental or auditory disturbances that may distort the quality of the recording (Easton, McComish, & Greenberg, 2000). The transcripts made from the recordings are an essential component of phenomenological analysis. Recordings create the advantage of having captured a record of the spoken word. However, informants may be intimidated when speaking in the presence of a recording device. This points to possible problems with self-reporting since recordings may induce fear or anxiety, such that what an informant says may return to haunt them, or cause them duress, injury, or harm. Informants were privy to the fact that digital audio recordings would be utilized prior to granting consent to participate in this study.

Instrumentation

The researcher developed an instrument to generate data consistent with answering to the underlying research questions. Kvale (1994) recommends making the "the orienteering questions explicit, thereby providing the reader with a possibility of evaluating their influence upon the research findings and assessing the validity of the finding" (p. 156). This assumes that one accepts the idea that the literature can reliably inform the development of an instrument. This assumption holds true if the questions are in alignment with the objectives of the study (i.e., having face validity). The research questions used in this study were as follows:

Research question 1. What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?

Research question 2. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?

Research question 3. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?

The corresponding proposed interview questions were developed as follows:

Proposed interview question 1a. Could you describe what motivated or inspired you to establish your business?

Proposed interview question 1b. Could you describe for me, how you perceive yourself in terms of your need to make professional achievements?

Proposed interview question 1c. If you worked for someone else, describe for me how you would be most effectively motivated.

Proposed interview question 1di. Describe for me your views on your industry's potential for growth.

Proposed interview question 1dii. Describe for me, how does that potential for growth influence the way you operate your business and structure your incentives and disincentives.

Proposed interview question 1ei. Managers sometimes use stories to motivate their employees. Describe for me, if you would, the kind of stories you tell to motivate your employees.

Proposed interview question 1eii. If you use incentives to motivate your employees, describe them for me. Could you describe how these incentives support your organization's vision?

Proposed interview question 1eiii. Another way some employers motivate their employees is by appealing to their inherent desire to make a contribution to the organization: to do what is best for the company. Describe for me how this applies within your organization.

Proposed interview question 2ai. Please think about employees who may share *similar* beliefs as yours about motivation. Describe for me your approach for leading them.

Proposed interview question 2aii. Describe for me, how effective you feel you are in motivating employees who share beliefs similar to yours on motivation.

Proposed interview question 2b. Describe for me the benefits of working with someone in your organization who shares beliefs similar to yours regarding motivation.

Proposed interview question 2c. Describe for me the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who shares beliefs similar to yours regarding motivation.

Proposed interview question 3ai. Now I'd like you to consider employees who may have beliefs about motivation that *differ* from your beliefs. Describe for me your approach for leading them.

Proposed interview question 3aii. And describe for me, how effective you feel you are in motivating employees with beliefs that differ from your own.

Proposed interview question 3b. Describe for me the benefits of working with someone in your organization who does not share your beliefs regarding motivation.

Proposed interview question 3c. And describe for me the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who does not share your beliefs regarding motivation.

Item Development

Development of the proposed interview questions included a review by an expert panel followed by a pilot test. First, in an effort to ensure validity and conceptual accuracy, the proposed interview questions were reviewed by an expert panel, the members of which were familiar with Sowell's work. The expert panel consisted of Kent Rhodes, Ed.D., who teaches at Pepperdine University's Graduate School of Education and Psychology, and Robert Kaufman, J.D., Ph.D. and Wilfred McClay, Ph.D., who both teach at Pepperdine University's School of Public Policy (see Appendix C). The purpose of the Expert Panel was to ensure that the interview questions aligned with the research questions and accurately reflected Sowell's concept of vision (constrained and unconstrained paradigms) as it relates to motivation. As a courtesy, supplemental material outlining Sowell's (1995) Underlying Vision (see Appendix D) was provided to the members of the expert panel for their review along with the Evaluation of Proposed Interview Questions Form (see Appendix E).

In the Evaluation of Proposed Interview Questions Form, each research question was listed followed by the proposed aligned interview questions. Instructions for evaluating each of the proposed interview questions were provided as follows:

> Below each prospective interview question are three options: (a) "Supports research question # as written," (b) "Does not support research question # (remove question)," and (c) "Modify, as suggested below." Please read each interview question and compare it to the research question with which it is intended to be aligned. Then, please place an "X" to the right of the option you believe is appropriate.

In the event that the expert panelist had any questions they were asked to contact the researcher and then thanked for their participation. It was necessary to follow up with one of the expert panelists. This was due to the fact that the panelist's initial feedback was partial and the researcher had to contact the expert panelist again to request feedback for all of the proposed interview questions. In spite of this effort for thoroughness, one proposed interview question was only evaluated by two of the expert panelists. A Merged Expert Panel Feedback Form was created (see Appendix F) that reflects the panel's aggregated feedback.

The expert panel's feedback resulted in the researcher having a better understanding of what interview questions ought to be kept and modified, or eliminated from the research protocol. The criteria for changing or eliminating a proposed interview question were based on what majority of the expert panel recommended. The result was that a majority of the proposed interview questions were kept, but with modifications or re-phrasing. A sentence providing context was added prior to three of the questions. One question was split into two separate questions. A total of five questions were eliminated because they did not fit within Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework.

Following the incorporation of the revisions suggested by the expert panel, the researcher's Dissertation Chair reviewed the questions and recommended additional changes to increase the clarity of the phrasing. Two additional questions were added to the study to help answer the research questions. Then the proposed interview questions were deemed ready to be piloted (see Appendix G).

Mr. Aaron J. Clark, CFP®, AAMS®, Co-founder, President and Chief Executive Officer of Monarch Wealth Strategies™ (see Appendix H for a full biography) participated in a pilot test with the intent to comment primarily on the quality and clarity of the proposed interview questions and then to briefly answer the questions. Mr. Clark is a representative of the target population; however, data were not collected from this individual for the purpose of answering the research questions. The majority of the questions were deemed clear and well written. However, the proposed interview question "Describe for me, if you would, the freedom your employees have to make meaningful contributions in their professional lives" was deemed difficult to understand, and Mr. Clark felt it needed to be refined. Thus, the question reverted back to language similar to what had originally been submitted to the expert panel. Mr. Clark also felt the sub-question "Can you describe how these incentives support your organization's vision?" needed to be refined. However, upon consultation with the Dissertation Chair, no changes were made to the sub-question. Mr. Clark also recommended incorporating a

Likert-type scale as a way of answering the questions. However, that recommendation was not incorporated into the study, as it conflicted with the qualitative methodology selected. Following the incorporation of the revisions suggested during the pilot, the researcher's Dissertation Chair again reviewed the proposed interview questions and recommended additional changes to increase the clarity of the phrasing.

The researcher designed each of the proposed interview questions to support the study's research objectives. The researcher is allowed some flexibility during the phenomenological interview to ask probing questions to further pursue emergent themes (Becker, 1992). Table 2 identifies the correspondence between the research questions and the proposed interview questions.

Table 2

Relationship between the Research Questions and Proposed Interview Questions

Research Questions	Proposed Interview Questions
1. What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?	1a, 1b, 1c, 1di, 1dii, 1ei, 1eii, 1eiii
2. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?	2ai, 2aii, 2b, 2c
3. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?	3ai, 3aii, 3b, 3c

The remainder of the item development section summarizes the grounding of the proposed interview questions in Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework or justifies them in the context of obtaining a better phenomenological understanding of the selected California small business founders' lived-experience. To reiterate, the constrained paradigm is rooted in history, based on scarcity, tends to be pessimistic, and encourages specialization. A founder who subscribes to a constrained paradigm would tend to use incentives or extrinsic rewards to motivate his or her employees. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm seek out possibilities for the future based on abundance, optimism, and collaboration. A founder who subscribes to an unconstrained paradigm would tend to use dispositions or intrinsic rewards to motivate his or her employees.

Empirical Basis for the Proposed Interview Questions

This section explains how the proposed interview questions are grounded in the literature.

Basis for proposed interview question 1a: Could you describe what motivated or inspired you to establish your business? This question was based on the concept of leadership vision (Bass, 1990; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Bygrave, 2004; Cashman, 1999; Collins & Porras, 1996; Conger, 1991, 1999; Covey, 1989; Filion, 1991; Goleman, 1998; Groves, 2006; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Kantabutra & Avery, 2007; Kotter, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2003; Morden, 1997; Northouse, 2007; Robbins, 2003; Roswell & Berry, 1993; Schein, 1992; Senge, 1990). The intent of this question was to allow the researcher to obtain a better understanding of the founder's belief system. This question, as it relates to Sowell's (1995) concept of vision, was intended to help identify the founder's paradigms (unconstrained or unconstrained) across some or all of Sowell's constructs: human capability, social possibilities, social causation, freedom, justice, knowledge, specialization, motivation, process costs, decision-making mechanism preferred, and the kinds of decisions preferred.

Basis for proposed interview question 1b: Could you describe for me, how you perceive yourself in terms of your need to make professional achievements? This question relates to McClelland's (1965) need for achievement theory that supports the sentiment that people with a higher need for achievement predisposes them to become entrepreneurs or find ways to incorporate entrepreneurial acts into their work. The intent of this question was to allow the researcher to obtain a better understanding of the founder's belief system. This question relates to Sowell's (1995) concept of freedom and may help to identify the founder's paradigms (unconstrained or unconstrained). According to Sowell, those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm tend to view freedom as an exemption from the power of others. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to view freedom as the ability to achieve goals.

Basis for proposed interview question 1c: If you worked for someone else, describe for me how you would be most effectively motivated. The intent of this question was to allow the researcher to obtain a better understanding of the founder's belief system. This question relates to Sowell's (1995) concept of motivation and may help to identify the founder's paradigms (unconstrained or unconstrained). According to Sowell, those who subscribe to the constrained paradigm rely heavily on incentives to motivate others, while those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm rely heavily on creating favorable dispositions, understanding, and intrinsic rewards to motivate others.

Basis for proposed interview question 1di: Describe for me your views on your industry's potential for growth. The intent of this question was to allow the researcher to obtain a better general understanding of the founders' belief systems. Sowell's (1995) constrained paradigm is rooted in history, based on scarcity, encourages specialization, and tends to be pessimistic. Sowell's unconstrained paradigm seeks out possibilities for the future and is based on abundance. In the unconstrained paradigm collaboration is sought to create solutions, and tends to be optimistic.

Basis for proposed interview question 1dii: Describe for me, how does that potential for growth influence the way you operate your business and structure your incentives and disincentives. This question was designed to build upon question 1di to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience. Further, this question was designed to help determine how biased the small business founders were towards Sowell's (1995) constrained paradigm, relying heavily on incentives to motivate others.

Basis for proposed interview question 1ei: Managers sometimes use stories to motivate their employees. Describe for me, if you would, the kind of stories you tell to motivate your employees. This question expanded on the concepts of leadership vision and motivation, as leaders tend to best communicate their desired outcome or vision via storytelling (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Robbins, 2003; Schein, 1983, 1990, 1992; Senge, 1990). This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience. It provided another opportunity for the California small business founders to describe the use of incentives (a constrained paradigm) or the use of favorable dispositions, understanding, and intrinsic rewards (an unconstrained paradigm) in motivating others.

Basis for proposed interview question 1eii: If you use incentives to motivate your employees, describe them for me. Could you describe how these incentives

support your organization's vision? This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founder's lived-experience. Further, this question was designed to help determine how biased the small business founders may have been towards Sowell's (1995) constrained paradigm, relying heavily on incentives to motivate others.

Basis for proposed interview question 1eiii: Another way some employers motivate their employees is by appealing to their inherent desire to make a contribution to the organization: to do what is best for the company. Describe for me how this applies within your organization. The intent of this question was to allow the researcher to obtain a better understanding of the founders' belief systems. Further, this question was designed to help determine how biased the small business founders may have been towards Sowell's (1995) unconstrained paradigm, relying heavily on appealing to morals, creating favorable dispositions and understandings, and developing intrinsic rewards to motivate others.

Basis for proposed interview question 2ai: Please think about employees who may share *similar* beliefs as yours about motivation. Describe for me your approach for leading them. This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience related to working with employees who had similar paradigms regarding motivation.

Basis for proposed interview question 2aii: Describe for me, how effective you feel you are in motivating employees who share beliefs similar to yours on motivation. This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience related to working with employees who had similar paradigms regarding motivation.

Basis for proposed interview question 2b: Describe for me the benefits of working with someone in your organization who shares beliefs similar to yours regarding motivation. This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience related to working with employees who had similar paradigms regarding motivation.

Basis for proposed interview question 2c: Describe for me the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who shares beliefs similar to yours regarding motivation. This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience related to working with employees who have similar paradigms regarding motivation.

Basis for proposed interview question 3ai: Now I'd like you to consider employees who may have beliefs about motivation that *differ* from your beliefs. Describe for me your approach for leading them. This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience related to working with employees who had differing paradigms regarding motivation.

Basis for proposed interview question 3aii: And describe for me, how effective you feel you are in motivating employees with beliefs that differ from your own. This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience related to working with employees who had differing paradigms regarding motivation.

Basis for proposed interview question 3b: Describe for me the benefits of working with someone in your organization who does not share your beliefs regarding motivation. This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience related to working with employees who had differing paradigms regarding motivation.

Basis for proposed interview question 3c: And describe for me the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who does not share your beliefs regarding motivation. This question was designed to obtain a greater phenomenological understanding of the California small business founders' lived-experience related to working with employees who had differing paradigms regarding motivation.

Post Pilot Modifications to Interview Questions

During the preliminary examination of the dissertation proposal, the committee decided that the final interview questions ought to be simplified, be more open-ended, and include the development of additional prompts to help provide context for the informant. This process resulted in eight final interview questions (see Appendix B).

Interview question 1a. What kind of things motivates you at work?

Interview question 1b. What motivated you to start your organization?

Interview question 1c. Are your beliefs about motivation today any different than when your founded the organization?

Interview question 1d. What is the one thing that is so important to you that if it were missing from [name company here] you might walk away from it all?

Interview question 2a. Please think about a person you work with directly who tends to share your beliefs about motivation. Can you describe for me a situation where you were successful in motivating them? How was this helpful?

Interview question 2b. Still thinking about the same person, can you describe for me a situation where you were not successful motivating them? What were the difficulties?

Interview question 3a. Now I'd like you to consider a person who you work with directly who does not tend to share your beliefs about motivation. Can you describe for me a situation where you were successful in motivating them? How was this helpful?

Interview question 3b. Still thinking about the same person, can you describe for me a situation where you were not successful motivating them? What were the difficulties?

In order to further prepare the researcher as an interviewer, the researcher administered a trial run of the final interview questions during a mock interview. Ken Greenlinger, Ed.D. Chief Executive Officer of Valley Home Medical Supply (see Appendix I for a full biography) participated in a mock interview with the intent to give the researcher feedback on her interviewing technique. Dr. Greenlinger is a member of the researcher's cohort in Pepperdine University's organizational leadership doctoral program. Additionally, Dr. Greenlinger is a representative of the target population; however, data were not collected from this individual for the purpose of answering the research questions. During the interview process, Dr. Greenlinger recommended the researcher remain highly engaged in the conversation by asking intermittent, ad hoc probing questions more often.

During the preliminary examination of the dissertation proposal the committee also decided that more financial information ought to be collected about the organization's capitalization at launch and its gross revenues. While this information is valuable, the researcher felt that requesting it might have made the informant feel uncomfortable for the remainder of the interview. Instead, the researcher reviewed the websites (if they existed) for each of the founders' organizations in an attempt to discover financial information about the organization.

Sample Size

The researcher invited potential informants of the sample group to participate in the study via email (Appendix J). The researcher attempted to schedule an interview with each founder until either an appointment for the interview was scheduled or the founder declined. Upon receiving confirmation of intended participation, an appointment was scheduled via phone or email.

While the researcher aspired to interview up to 12 potential informants, it was imperative that no fewer than eight of the potential informants participate. "Qualitative inquiry typically focuses in depth on relatively small samples, even single cases (N=1), selected *purposefully"* (Patton, 2002, p. 230). Creswell (2007) found that the number of informants in phenomenological studies ranges from as few as one (Dukes, 1984) to as many as 325 (Polkinghorne, 1989). There appears to be no consensus regarding the minimum number of informants to interview for a phenomenological study. Becker (1992) suggests obtaining as many informants as possible "because more data [will] make it easier to see the phenomenon's general structure…When data are rich enough to reveal the phenomenon's essential feature and constellation, interviewing stops and data analysis begins" (p. 41). Some authors recommend a minimum of 3-10 informants for phenomenological studies (Creswell, 2007; Dukes, 1984), while others recommend interviewing a minimum of 5-25 informants (Creswell, 2007; Polkinghorne, 1989). Based on this information, it may then be extrapolated that no fewer than 8 and no more than 12 informants is an appropriate sample size for this study.

Based on the informants' recommendations, three additional informants were identified using the snowball technique, as they met the criteria and would contribute to the diversity of the sample group. A recommendation was not explored if it seemed likely to produce redundant information. The researcher intended to cease interviewing participants when this process was exhausted or 12 participants were secured. Ultimately, 11 participants were secured.

Data Collection

Interviews were conducted in the office of the informant or alternatively at a mutually agreed upon location. As each interview was conducted, the interview audio was digitally recorded and later transcribed by the researcher. Easton et al. (2000) suggest that using researchers "who are invested in the project and committed to accuracy at every phase is essential to the integrity of the study and necessary for establishing dependability and confirmability" (p. 707). Thus, many pitfalls of transcribing qualitative research were avoided as the researcher was the interviewer and also the transcriber.

Use of Human Subjects (IRB)

This research project was designed to contribute to the knowledge of how selected California small business founders view motivation and how they motivate employees with similar and differing paradigms. As a part of this research, 11 founders representing different small businesses located in California were interviewed to collect data. No intervention procedures occurred in this study. However, interactions with human subjects did occur. Measures were taken to protect the confidentiality of the informants and the identity of their small businesses. However, securing total anonymity of informants and their small businesses was not possible, due to the fact that the researcher had direct interactions with each of the informants.

An informed consent form (see Appendix K) was given to each of the potential participant at the interview. The informed consent form advised the potential informants of the study’s purpose, the tasks requested, the expected time requirements, the benefits and risk of participation, and the handling of all responses as confidential with aggregate findings to be reported. Participants were informed that brief quotes or descriptions from the data could be used to illustrate a point in chapters four and five; however, the participant and the identity of his or her small business would remain confidential. Furthermore, the consent form noted that participation was completely voluntary, that there was no penalty for nonparticipation or withdrawal from the research, and concluded by providing the researcher’s contact information in the event the informant had any questions regarding the research design or results.

The researcher maintained and continues to maintain both the audio files and transcripts digitally. Any and all research records, including research notes, were kept in a single password protected computer during the research and data analysis. Any working papers printed were promptly destroyed. The digital records will be maintained for a minimum of 5 years after which they may be deleted.

Analytical Techniques

The phenomenological analytical techniques used in this study were modeled after, and at times closely mirrored, the phenomenological analytical techniques used in Dern's (2007) dissertation.

Overview. Phenomenological analysis of data is a process of data reduction. The process includes preparing, organizing, and analyzing data (Becker, 1992; Moustakas, 1994; Rossman & Rallis, 2003; Sokolowski, 2000). Phenomenological reduction occurs when the researcher discovers the salient features of the phenomenon (Becker, 1992). The reduction process results in textural and structural descriptions of the informant's experience. The textural and structural descriptions were synthesized for all of the informants within this study to develop "a Composite Description of the meanings and essences of the experience, representing the group as a whole" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 121). The following sections include a detailed description of how the data reduction processes were employed.

Statement of bracketing. Acknowledging one's own bias is an important part of the phenomenological process. In this instance, the researcher was an employee (as opposed to a business founder). It would be considered inappropriate for the researcher to have expectations or to have prejudged the informants' experience based on her experience in the manufacturing industry. Furthermore, it would be inappropriate for the researcher to draw conclusions too quickly. As previously mentioned, the researcher employed bracketing to mitigate bias.

Review of transcribed data. The researcher listened to the digital recordings, transcribed the data, and reviewed each transcript several times. Reduction is possible "by staying with, dwelling on, and reflecting upon the exact words and meanings of each person['s experience]" (Becker, 1992, p. 43). Following a minimum of three complete readings, the researcher observed a period of reflection.

Horizonalization. Each informant's interview transcript was analyzed separately. The researcher followed Moustakas' (1994) recommendation to include in the analysis any statements made by the informants that were relevant to the phenomenon. In the analysis of the transcript all experiences of the phenomenon were digitally highlighted and color coded (Becker, 1992) to create a broad description with thematic categories of each informant's experience. The resulting statements have equal value, all on the same plane or horizon (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). Major thematic categories in this study included experiences that were perceived to be operating from a constrained or unconstrained paradigm and experiences that could be considered beneficial or limiting.

The researcher followed the recommendation of Boyatzis (1998) to develop her own categories given that one unit of analysis exists, the California small business founder. Rossman and Rallis (2003) recommend that "a qualitative study usually begins with…categories to focus data" (p. 282). From the horizontal outline Moustakas (1994) suggests creating a list of *invariant horizon*s.

Coding audit. Following the horizonalization step, LaRon Doucet, Ed.D., audited the researcher's coding of the interview transcripts. Dr. Doucet is a member of the researcher's cohort in Pepperdine University's organizational leadership doctoral program. The coding auditor's biography may be found in Appendix L. The interview transcripts that the coding auditor received were altered to protect the identity of the founders and their businesses. The coding auditor either agreed or disagreed with each item's coding. If the auditor disagreed with the researcher's coding, he was to provide a brief explanation of how he thought it ought to be coded and why. If the researcher agreed with the auditor's explanation, the coding was revised to reflect the auditor's suggestion. In the event of a disagreement regarding the coding it was to be noted in the limitations of the study. However, no disagreement occurred.

Invariant horizons. According to Moustakas (1994), invariant horizons are discovered through a reduction-of-data distillation process. "The invariant horizons point to the unique qualities of an experience" (p. 128) that enable the delimitation of themes. In order for a statement to qualify as an invariant horizon it must pass two tests. First, the descriptive statement must "contain a moment of the experience that is a necessary and sufficient constituent for understanding it" (p. 121). Second, it must be "possible to abstract and label" (p. 121) the descriptive statement. According to Moustakas, any "overlapping, repetitive, and vague expressions are also eliminated or presented in more exact descriptive terms" (p. 121). The next step is to relate the invariant horizons into clusters that later result in a narrow descriptions of the informant's experience (Becker, 1992; Moustakas, 1994).

Thematic clustering. Thematic clustering has two components: textural descriptions and structural descriptions. A theme is "a phrase or sentence describing more subtle and tacit processes" (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 282). Phrases and sentences could be included verbatim from the transcript. However, when thematic clustering is employed the researcher often paraphrases the descriptions of the informant's experiences. The thematic clustering of invariant horizons allowed the researcher to identify the core themes of this study (Moustakas, 1994).

Informant verification. Following the thematic clustering step, the researcher emailed each informant a summary of her findings. The informant was asked to verify if the themes provided were an accurate reflection of his or her perspective regarding motivation (see Appendix M). These summaries were used as the basis for creating the individual textural descriptions.

Individual textural descriptions. According to Moustakas (1994), textural descriptions must be developed prior to structural descriptions. Moustakas further explains that textural descriptions are "a description of the textures of the experience" (p. 122). For developing textural descriptions Becker (1992) recommends asking two questions: "What stands out about the phenomenon? What is the most important aspect; what is next in importance" (p. 43)? In this study, the researcher developed textural descriptions. Next, the researcher created a summary of the invariant horizons for each of the categories. The textural summaries lay the groundwork for developing the structural descriptions.

Structural description and imaginative variation. Textural descriptions are based on what has been experienced. Structural descriptions are derived from textural descriptions and are based on how the experience came into being (Moustakas, 1994). Moustakas (1994) explains that "Describing the essential structures of a phenomenon is the major task of Imaginative Variation" (p. 98). Creating the imaginative variation is a process that starts with reflection. During this reflection phase "many possibilities are examined and explicated reflectively" (p. 99). During this phase, the researcher acts as a filter to determine any correspondences regarding constrained and unconstrained paradigms and motivation, and benefits and limitations of motivating others with similar and differing paradigms. The researcher reviewed the first section of interview questions to determine whether each informant tended to have a more constrained or unconstrained point of view regarding motivation. If the data provided by an informant appeared to be equally balanced towards both viewpoints, the researcher used the informant's response to interview question 1d as the tie-breaker: "What is the one thing that is so important to you that if it were missing from [name company here] you might walk away from it all?"

Textural-structural synthesis and composite description. During the phenomenological analysis an integrated description of the phenomenon is created. This integrated or composite description is built on the meanings and essential structures discovered in each informant's described experience by combining or synthesizing the textural and structural descriptions (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). Moustakas (1994) suggests that the composite description of textural-structural descriptions will result in "a universal description of the experience representing the group as a whole" (p. 122). Becker (1992) provides the following guidance for developing a composite description:

> I look for how all these parts of the phenomenon are interrelated, how these pieces go together to make one phenomenon…[for each informant] I stay as close as I can to the person's words, while also trying to articulate the situated meanings of the phenomenon…I highlight the typical situations, events, and meanings that the phenomenon has in a person's life. (p. 43)

The final step of the analysis involved developing a composite description from the themes discovered and the textural-structural description to identify the meaning(s) of the phenomenon. In other words, the composite description may have included the salient essence(s) that apply universally to the phenomenon of how selected California small business founders view motivation and describe motivating employees with similar and differing paradigms.

Summary

This chapter described the methods used by the researcher for this study. First, the research questions were restated. Then the rationale for using a qualitative phenomenological approach was addressed. Next, the process for participant selection was described. Subsequently, the development of the interview protocol was described. Finally, the analytic techniques section outlined the procedures followed in chapter four for reducing the data into a phenomenological description of distilled themes, patterns, structure, and essence(s).

Chapter Four: Research Findings

Introduction

As stated in chapter one, based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework, this study explored selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms reflecting either a constrained or unconstrained perspective. More specifically, the purpose of this phenomenological study was to: (a) examine selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms, (b) determine what selected California small business founders described as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar paradigms to their own, and (c) identify what selected California small business founders described as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing paradigms from their own.

This researcher interviewed the founders of 11 California small businesses. Six of the informants were females and five of the informants were males. This chapter attempts to answer the three specific research questions posed in chapter one. For ease of presentation, the individual textural descriptions, vignettes of the interviews based on all three research questions, will be presented first. The researcher developed and presented these textural descriptions to each of the informants. Only one informant requested a minor modification of the textural description. For each research question, thematic clusters of invariant horizons are presented. Phrases and quotes are included from the descriptive data in the thematic clusters. Next, the structural description of the informants' experience was derived through imaginative variation process. Finally, the composite description or textural-structural synthesis will be presented.

Individual Textural Descriptions

Participant A's interview reflected both constrained and unconstrained views; overall, he appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. Participant A tends to be optimistic and enjoys challenges. Regarding his personal motivation, he believes that "if you really like what you are doing and you do it pretty well, the money follows" (Participant A, personal communication, July 15, 2010). Participant A tends to be a dreamer and focuses on his ability to solve problems and achieve goals. He uses both incentives, such as bonuses and department profit sharing, and dispositions, such as training and education, to motivate and reward his employees, and believes that leaders should treat their employees as if they were partners. In addition, Participant A maintains a flexible work environment to accommodate his employees' needs. Participant A feels that what motivates a person is highly personal.

Overall, Participant B appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. She tends to be optimistic. Her main motivators are based on behaviors such as teamwork, collaboration, and building consensus. Values and a sense of purpose tend to drive Participant B's actions. Participant B tends to dislike specialization to the extent that it may result in feelings of isolation. The type of motivation that is used at Participant B's firm is based on dispositions or behaviors such as the use of a vision, engagement and collaboration, investing in employees' education and ensuring their development, and providing a flexible work environment; no benefits in the traditional sense are given as incentives (e.g., health insurance, 401k, or bonuses). Participant B's desire to change the industry reflects her preferences regarding knowledge, decision-making mechanisms, kinds of decisions, motivation, human capability, and social possibility. Participant B's values and ethics reflect her strong sense of justice (Participant B, personal communication, July 19, 2010).

Participant C's interview reflected both constrained and unconstrained views; overall, Participant C appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. Participant C tends to be optimistic. Maintaining a lifestyle tends to drive Participant C's actions. Participant C's main motivators are based on behaviors such as creativity, autonomy, independence, flexibility, and a well-functioning team/organization. Participant C uses both incentives and dispositions to motivate his employees. Participant C uses financial incentives such as commissions and bonuses to encourage his employees to achieve goals. Participant C uses events such as company picnics and holiday parties to encourage goodwill. At quarterly meetings employees see how their work fits into the vision of the organization. Participant C also maintains a flexible work environment to accommodate his employees' needs, such as allowing employees to telecommute from other states or countries. Participant C feels that what motivates a person is highly personal (Participant C, personal communication, July 20, 2010).

Participant D appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. She tends to be optimistic. Participant D saw a need in the community and acted on it; this response is a reflection of her preferences regarding knowledge, kinds of decisions, motivation, social causation, human capability, and social possibility. Passion, a sense of purpose, and vision tend to drive Participant D's actions. Her main motivators are creativity and the freedom to make continuous improvements. Two types of motivation are used at Participant D's organization. She uses dispositions or behaviors by encouraging employees to adopt her vision. She also uses incentives (e.g. commissions) to encourage sales, as is often the case in the industry. However, she admits that the use of commissions is tricky. Conversely, the adoption of her vision throughout the organization is not a problem; “They love the vision of this [organization]” (Participant D, personal communication, July 20, 2010).

Participant E appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view and tends to be optimistic. His main motivators include ideas, creativity, inventions, and the momentum of building on prior successes. The type of motivation that is largely used at Participant E’s company is based on dispositions or behaviors such as praising and recognizing achievements, providing a flexible work environment, and creating a family-like atmosphere. Participant E tries to hire people with similar beliefs that are “company and family oriented” as himself. “The attitude people had around the company was always ‘you need to take care of the business because they take care of you’” (Participant E, personal communication, July 21, 2010).

Participant F’s interview reflected both constrained and unconstrained views; overall, she appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. Participant F tends to be optimistic. She is inspired by teamwork, collaboration, human development and growth. Participant F appreciates diversity of thought. Her primary motivator to start the organization was based on the need to provide stability for her family. Participant F enjoys finding solutions to her clients’ needs. Participant F’s organization is mission driven. Motivators used at Participant F’s organization are based on dispositions or behaviors such as the use of vision. She focuses her attention on helping her employees succeed by providing them with opportunities to take courses or obtain training for career development. Participant F also uses incentives to motivate her employees for increased productivity or increased knowledge that applies directly to their work. She feels that what motivates a person is highly personal (Participant F, personal communication, July 21, 2010).

Participant G appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. She tends to be optimistic. A sense of purpose and vision tends to drive Participant G's actions. Her main motivators are based on behaviors such as teamwork and collaboration. Participant G likes specialization to the extent that allows her to work alone. However, she also appreciates diversity of thought and cohesive teamwork and attributes her organization's continued success to these two factors. The type of motivation that is used at Participant G's organization is based on dispositions or behaviors such as the use of a vision, building cohesive teams, and the use of games and activities to reinforce behaviors. Incentives have not been effective in Participant G's experience. Participant G saw a need in the elder care market due to a fragmented industry and acted on it. This is a reflection of her preferences regarding knowledge, decision-making mechanism, kinds of decisions, motivation, social causation, human capability, and social possibility (Participant G, personal communication, August 6, 2010).

Participant H appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. Participant H tends to be optimistic. His main sources for motivation include ideas, vision, and goal accomplishment. Values and a sense of purpose tend to drive Participant H's actions. To build his team, Participant H tends to hire people with common beliefs. In the past, Participant H attempted to use incentives, but found that they did not work. Now, Participant H motivates his employees with the following types of dispositions and behaviors: vision, development of employees' skill sets, flexible work environment, and a family-like atmosphere (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).

Participant I's interview reflected both constrained and unconstrained views. Overall, Participant I appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. Specifically, Participant I's vision includes a hiring practice to employ individuals that round out the needed skill sets and fill in the gaps of the organization. Participant I tends to be optimistic. Values and a sense of purpose drive Participant I's organization. Innovation and employee development both motivate and inspire Participant I's actions. Motivators used at Participant I's organization are based on dispositions or behaviors such as the use of praise and creating a culture where employees feel they are part of the family. He also uses incentives (e.g., bonuses, equity sharing) to motivate his managers. However, he believes giving praise and creating feelings of value are more effective motivators (Participant I, personal communication, August 16, 2010).

Participant J's interview reflected both constrained and unconstrained views; overall, she appears to subscribe to an unconstrained view. Participant J tends to be optimistic. Her primary motivator to start the organization was based on her family's needs. However, she is inspired by human capability, human development, and growth. Values and a sense of purpose tend to drive Participant J's actions. Motivators used at Participant J's organization are based on dispositions or behaviors such as the use of vision and hope. She focuses her attention on helping her employees to succeed by getting them into the right classes and ensuring their development. She also uses incentives (e.g., cars, vacations) to motivate her employees. She feels that what motivates a person is highly personal (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).

Overall, Participant K tends to operate from a mix of constrained and unconstrained paradigms. Participant K tends to be optimistic about his business and industry. However, Participant K tends to be pessimistic about working with various stakeholders. Participant K mainly uses incentives to motivate his employees. Participant K primarily believes in free will; upon reflection of his past experiences he also acknowledges elements of kismet (destiny, fate) were present (Participant K, personal communication, August 30, 2010).

Findings for Research Question One

Research question one asked, “What are selected California small business founders’ motivational paradigms?” Based on Sowell’s (1995) conceptual framework, this study explored 11 selected California small business founders’ motivational paradigms reflecting either a constrained or unconstrained paradigm. It was during this phase that the researcher acted as a filter to determine any correspondences regarding constrained and unconstrained paradigms and motivation. However, some themes emerged that do not fit into Sowell’s conceptual framework.

Thematic clusters of invariant horizons for research question one. This step in the analysis relates the invariant horizons into thematic clusters that will later result in a narrow descriptions of the informant’s experience (Becker, 1992; Moustakas, 1994). Several thematic clusters emerged including (a) freedom and challenge; (b) social possibility, freedom and creativity; (c) service; (d) teamwork; and (e) enjoyment.

Freedom and challenge. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to view freedom as the "ability to achieve goals" (Sowell, 1995, p. 105). Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm view freedom as the "exemption from the power of others" (Sowell, 1995, p. 105). The following statements reflect the participants' views of freedom and challenge:

- "It was just having the ability to take chances and make decisions on your own and seeing how they panned out. [To] see if you are as smart as you think you are" (Participant E, personal communication, July 21, 2010).
- "Being able to make the decision 'oh we are going to make this, oh we are going to do that'. Having that control in some ways; just having the freedom to do that" (Participant C, personal communication, July 20, 2010).
- "Being challenged. Success snowballs into more motivation" (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).
- "[My] main motivation is more a sense of purpose" (Participant B, personal communication, July 19, 2010).
- "I have always set fairly high goals for myself. I sometimes got in over my head trying to achieve them but that was the challenge of it. That is what made me go. That was what made me work" (Participant A, personal communication, July 15, 2010).
- "I wasn't really keen on working for other people. I like being my own boss. I like doing things differently. Being independent. The freedom that offered" (Participant K, personal communication, August 30, 2010).

The 11 informants used the word *freedom* 11 times, *goals* 4 times, *purpose* 2 times, and *challenge(s)* 13 times in the descriptive data.

Social possibility, freedom and creativity. Elements of social possibility, freedom, and creativity were common motivators of the selected California small business founders. According to Sowell (1995), those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm look for solutions to problems with fresh ideas: social possibility. They do not tend to review historical successes or failures to determine how to negotiate the current set of circumstances. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to view freedom as the ability to achieve goals. Further, for those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm, "the goal is… to allow repressed creativity to emerge and the vast knowledge and talent already available to be applied to existing problems" (Sowell, 1995, pp. 117-118). The data revealed the following elements of social possibility, freedom and/or creativity:

- "Things that keep me active mentally…Creating new things" (Participant K, personal communication, August 30, 2010).
- "Success, seeing things, building…making [products] superior to others or inventing new things that had not ever been invented before. That was the fun part of it. The idea of building something that no one had done before" (Participant E, personal communication, July 21, 2010).
- "I am motivated by the journey we set out to accomplish. So there is this backdrop of an overall vision and an overall plan or creating something in a general sense…I am motivated by ideas" (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).

- “I am very creative. I am always trying to create new ways for making the [organization] better for people’s enjoyment. (Participant D, personal communication, July 20, 2010).

The words *create*, *created*, *creating*, or *creativity* were mentioned a total of 16 times.

Service. Service relates to Sowell’s (1995) social possibility category. The idea of service means providing for an unmet need. For those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm, unhappiness is created by “the fact that social institutions and social policies are not as wisely crafted as the anointed would have crafted them” (Sowell, 1995, p. 113). The unconstrained make the assumption that with the proper institutions and upbringing, people would be intrinsically motivated do what is morally right. Sowell suggested that the social possibilities for those who subscribe to the constrained paradigm are limited by human and economic deficiencies. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm find that there are no solutions, only trade-offs. Such trade-offs result in unfulfilled desires, unrest, and unhappiness in the world. The following statements reflect the participants’ views of service:

- “I think the biggest motivation for me as an entrepreneur…is the ability not only to motivate but to enhance other peoples’ lives. To watch other people grow around you…just the ability to do something for other people. That is by far the biggest motivator” (Participant I, personal communication, August 16, 2010).
- “My clients really motivate me at work. I think that’s our philosophy. We are very client focused. A good day is when I can solve client problems, or give

them piece of mind, or come up with solutions" (Participant F, personal communication August 6, 2010).

- "What does the client need? How can we help them accomplish their goals" (Participant F, personal communication August 6, 2010)?
- "I just get motivated by helping people and making people feel good. And my employees as well, making them feel like a family here" (Participant D, personal communication, July 20, 2010).
- "Most of the services [we provide] are not covered by any kind of public benefit or insurance" (Participant G, personal communication, August 7, 2010).
- "As a services company, we are implementing our knowledge to solve problems. The problems are in a general sense the same. It is the tactics and the nuances that change all the time" (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).
- "Probably recognition of…what the organization does to help people [motivates me]. I really enjoy being asked complex questions of a nature that most people wouldn't know the answer. I appreciate, enjoy the opportunity to use my brain and try to figure out both what is the answer and how it applies to that specific situation" (Participant G, personal communication, August 7, 2010).

The words *service* or *services* were used 10 times. In addition, the concept of service was discussed in the transcripts several times without actually using the word service or services.

Teamwork. Those who subscribe to Sowell's (1995) unconstrained paradigm seek out possibilities for the future. The unconstrained paradigm is based on abundance, optimism, and collaboration. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm believe that human capacity is severely and inherently limited for all. Extrapolating from Sowell, teamwork is a necessary element for collaboration to occur. The following statements reflect the participants' views of teamwork:

- "We stuck together this whole time" (Participant I, personal communication, August 16, 2010).
- "We are trying to keep the core six people that we have here together because we really work well together. I like everybody and all that. So [during this difficult economic time], that is their reward." (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).
- "We worked very well together because he knew exactly what I needed and what I wanted. And, he knew how to go about making it happen" (Participant A, personal communication, July 15, 2010).
- "It is about the feeling that everybody could work together to solve [the problem]. It doesn't matter who… it is about all of us working together" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).
- "With rare exceptions, it is really about how those people [employees] coalesce. Getting the right quality people" (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).
- "I am motivated by working with people that like to work together and have an appreciation for each other. I like seeing it. I realize it takes a lot of work,

effort and skill to have a team that does work together. That it is not by happenstance, that we do work well together" (Participant G, personal communication, August 7, 2010).

- "I get really motivated most of all by teamwork and collaboration…. When I am fired up on a project I typically feel a sense of team" (Participant B, personal communication, July 19, 2010).

The informants mentioned *team(s), teamwork*, or *teambuilding* 15 times in the descriptive data. *Together* was mentioned 21 times in the descriptive data.

Enjoyment. In the course of this study, enjoyment was a recurring theme that emerged. Many informants revealed that joy or a sense of fulfillment is one of their key motivators to continue in their line of work. That said, enjoyment is a theme that does not easily fit into Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework. The following statements reflect the participants' views of enjoyment:

- "Liking what I am doing is very important to me…I always found that if you really like what you are doing and you do it pretty well, the money follows" (Participant A, personal communication, July 15, 2010).
- "I just felt that was really my calling. I really enjoy that" (Participant I, personal communication, August 16, 2010).
- "I really enjoy being asked questions of a complex nature" (Participant G, personal communication, August 7, 2010).
- In response to the question: *What is the one thing that is so important to you that if it were missing from [name the company here] you might walk away*

from it all? "My joy, my enthusiasm" (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).

Composite description for research question one. The researcher reviewed the first set of interview questions to determine whether the informants tended to have a more constrained or unconstrained motivational paradigm. In the event the data provided by an informant appeared to be equally balanced towards both viewpoints, the researcher used the informant's response to interview question 1d as the tie-breaker; "What is the one thing that is so important to you that if it were missing from [name company here] you might walk away from it all?"

In summary, selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms can be described as a mixture of constrained and unconstrained views; overall, their motivational paradigms were predominantly unconstrained. All of the selected California small business founders interviewed discovered a way to serve an unmet need in the marketplace. This finding represents an unconstrained paradigm under Sowell's (1995) social possibility category by "finding a solution to a problem" (p. 105). With respect to freedom, all of the informants referred to challenges, goals, or purpose. This finding is reflective of an unconstrained paradigm. However, three of the informants also referred to their preference for autonomy or independence; this finding represents a constrained paradigm under Sowell's freedom category. The constrained view of freedom is "the exemption of power from others" (p. 105). Given the timing of when the interviews were taken, during a poor economic climate, the informants were overwhelmingly optimistic. Being optimistic is representative of Sowell's unconstrained paradigm. Additional themes emerged that reflect an unconstrained paradigm, including service and teamwork.

One theme that does not easily fit into Sowell's conceptual framework is the founder's enjoyment of his or her work. The implications of the aforementioned findings will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five.

Findings for Research Question Two

Research question two asked, "What do selected California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?" Based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework, this study explored what California small business founders described as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees who have similar motivational paradigms to their own. During this phase, the researcher acted as a filter to determine any correspondences regarding constrained and unconstrained paradigms and the benefits and limitations of motivating employees who have similar motivational paradigms. That said, some themes emerged that did not easily fit into Sowell's conceptual framework.

Thematic clusters of invariant horizons for research question two. This step in the analysis relates the invariant horizons into thematic clusters that will later result in a narrow descriptions of the informant's experience (Becker, 1992; Moustakas, 1994). The California small business founders felt that there are several benefits of working with employees who have similar motivational paradigms. Trust, shared values, teamwork, and opportunity are themes that emerged when they described the benefits of working with employees who have motivational paradigms similar to their own. An inability or unwillingness to train or mentor and problem-solving are themes that emerged when small business founders described the limitations of working with employees who have similar motivational paradigms to their own.

Trust and shared values. In reference to social possibility, those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm "see little standing between intention and result, other than such subjective factors as compassion or commitment" (Sowell, 1995, p. 126). Extrapolating from Sowell (1995), the subjective factor, *trust*, may also be included in the unconstrained social possibility construct, as trust is generally a prerequisite for compassion and commitment. Extrapolating further, *shared values* may be a building block upon which trust is built. The following statements illustrate the importance of trust and shared values as a benefit of working with employees who have similar motivational paradigms.

- "We communicated well because we came from the same background, the same belief system so to speak. We worked very well together because he knew exactly what I needed and what I wanted and he knew how to go about making it happen" (Participant A, personal communication, July 15, 2010).
- "He is always my voice of reason" (Participant I, personal communication, August 16, 2010).
- "Everybody feels that way, especially the partners. But, I don't feel that I motivated them. I don't think they would be a partner if they didn't feel the same way. If you didn't have the same philosophy, it never works. You have to trust one another 100%. You don't even think about what they are doing because you know they are doing the right thing for the firm" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).

- "So when you find someone who does it similarly, it is nice because you don't have to course correct for them. They are already doing it the way that you are doing it. Especially in a small company, you are really looking for people that just extend your methods and your personality to places in the company or with customers where you can't be" (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).
- "I like people that see the work that needs to be done and they are doing it. I don't have to go and ask them 'hey, can you stay 20 minutes late'… In that sense, I try to motivate the person to weigh in on what's [best for] the firm. Just being able to see that" (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).
- "About 3 years ago, we took our head marketing person and we made him CEO…We gave this guy free reign to run this company. It was one of the best decisions we ever made. He gets along with the partners. We share common beliefs…It was more like 'do your best to make this company run well and be profitable and we will give you all the latitude you need.' If you pick the right person that works really well" (Participant C, personal communication, July 20, 2010).
- "Basically I'll start with an example of something that happened in the industry that I hate and typically he'll hate it just as much as I do. And then we'll be motivated to change it" (Participant B, personal communication, July 19, 2010).

- "My [business] partners [and I], we are aligned in that sense…We like the idea of growing slowly and having the ability to take time off when we want. When we have been approached by people who have wanted to buy the company in the past and it like 'well, they would have to give us a lot more money to make it worth it.' I think that it is philosophy that we bring to the company" (Participant C, personal communication, July 20, 2010).
- "He really wants to add value. He thinks of others before himself, which is just a really cool quality. He said, 'I don't want to come on board unless I can add value'" (Participant I, personal communication, August 16, 2010).

Teamwork. To reiterate, those who subscribe to Sowell's (1995) unconstrained paradigm seek out possibilities for the future. The unconstrained paradigm is based on abundance, optimism, and collaboration. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm believe that human capacity is severely and inherently limited for all. Extrapolating from Sowell, teamwork is a necessary element for collaboration to occur. The following statements reflect the participants' views of the benefits of teamwork:

- "[The product] was a great success, an idea we both collaborated on" (Participant E, personal communication, July 21, 2010).
- "[You focus] on the intent of making the customer happy. And, it starts with your employees being happy and loving what they do. Having that culture" (Participant I, personal communication, August 16, 2010).
- "[The business] is so diverse. There are so many different aspects to it and nobody could be good at it all. That's what I love, where it evolved. I would never, ever want to be a sole proprietor ever again. I love being surrounded

by really, really talented people that can help in that process" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).

- "I realize it takes a lot of work, effort and skill to have a team that works together. It is not by happenstance that we do work well together. People have a very common work ethic here" (Participant G, personal communication, August 7, 2010).

Opportunity. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to believe that the goal to maximize human capability is possible via the "liberation of human beings from unnecessary social inhibitions, so as to allow repressed creativity to emerge and vast knowledge and talent already available to be applied to existing problems" (Sowell, 1995, pp. 117-118). Lack of experience would not deter the unconstrained as they tend to believe the past was a simpler time. Informants described providing employees with the opportunity to be successful in new endeavors as one of the benefits of working with employees who shared their motivational paradigms. The following statements exemplify how founders have provided or created opportunities for their employees to succeed.

- "The truth is to make people feel successful perhaps before they are. That inspires their belief in themselves and the possibilities. We just finished a meeting and I said, 'You guys, you're doing this, you're doing it. Look at all these numbers. You're doing this next thing too. You've got it. No problem. It's in the bag'" (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).

- "Giving her that value and opportunity to be successful. And, that opportunity becomes a reality, [a success]" (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).
- "I motivated her by giving her the [management] job and putting my trust in her that she could do the job; even though she never had done that sort of job before. She has done great. Better than I could have expected" (Participant D, personal communication, July 20, 2010).

Inability or unwillingness to train or mentor. Those who subscribe to a constrained paradigm believe that there are human limitations that are moral and or intellectual in nature. Such beliefs may contribute to a small business founder's inability or unwillingness to train or mentor their employees. Sowell (1995) suggested that social possibilities for those who subscribe to the constrained paradigm are limited by human and economic deficiencies. The constrained find that there are no solutions, only trade-offs. Such trade-offs result in unfulfilled desires, unrest, and unhappiness in the world. These constrained views are reflected in the following statements:

- "We're so small if somebody is not doing, not responding to kind of the way I want 'em to go, I just do it myself" (Participant K, personal communication, August 30, 2010).
- "We had one staff person that had been in a very, very structured environment and wasn't allowed to think. You did, but you didn't make decisions. She didn't do well here. She said, 'I don't want that responsibility. I want to be told what to do all the time.' We don't function that way" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).

Problem solving. To reiterate, those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to believe the goal is "liberation of human beings from unnecessary social inhibitions, so as to allow repressed creativity to emerge and vast knowledge and talent already available to be applied to existing problems" (Sowell, 1995, pp. 117-118). An unconstrained view regarding problem solving reflected in the following statement about discovering solutions:

- "Everybody has different needs, different personal goals. So you try to match how they can reach their personal goals within this environment. It is recognizing that something is not working. Then, trying to come up with solutions for what's not working. To me that's not motivational; it's problem solving" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).

Composite description for research question two. The composite description was derived from an analysis of the data. "The composite summary describes the 'world' in general, as experienced by the participants" (Hycner, 1985, p. 294). The composite description was produced through a series of steps described in chapter three that yielded a description based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework of what California small business founders described as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees who have similar motivational paradigms to their own. The composite description includes the salient essence(s) that apply universally to the phenomenon of how California small business founders view the benefits and limitations of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms.

The researcher reviewed the second set of interview questions to determine if the informants tended to operate from a constrained or unconstrained motivational paradigm.

The circumstances regarding the informants' experiences were varied. The composite description is delineated into the categories of benefits and limitations. Several themes emerged regarding benefits. However, fewer themes emerged regarding limitations that were experienced motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms.

Benefits. In essence, California small business founders utilize an unconstrained paradigm when describing the benefits of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms to their own. Themes in the descriptive data that support the use of an unconstrained paradigm include trust, shared values, teamwork, and providing their employees with opportunities.

Limitations. Informants utilized a mixture of constrained and unconstrained paradigms when describing the limitations of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms to their own. A theme in the descriptive data that supported the use of a constrained paradigm included an inability or unwillingness to train or mentor, which fits into Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework under the human capability construct. For the constrained, human capability is inherently and severely limited for all.

Themes in the descriptive data that supported the use of an unconstrained paradigm included problem solving. For the unconstrained, under the social possibility construct, solutions to problems are highly sought after. To reiterate, said essences are reflective of a mixture of both constrained and unconstrained paradigms. The implications of the aforementioned findings will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five.

Findings for Research Question Three

Research question three asked, "What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?" Based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework, this study explored what California small business founders described as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees who have differing motivational paradigms from their own. During this phase the researcher acted as a filter to determine any correspondences regarding constrained and unconstrained paradigms and the benefits and limitations of motivating employees who have differing motivational paradigms from the California small business founders.

Thematic clusters of invariant horizons for research question three. This step in the analysis relates the invariant horizons into thematic clusters that will later result in a narrow descriptions of the informant's experience (Becker, 1992; Moustakas, 1994). Several thematic clusters emerged. The selected California small business founders described both the benefits and limitations of working with employees in their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own. First the benefits are described, followed by the limitations. The benefits included creative tension. Themes related to limitations included: (a) employee personal issues and timing, (b) founder ability to influence outcomes, (c) employee opportunity for career growth and training, and (d) employee termination.

Creative tension. California small business founders tended to describe what is known as *creative tension* as a benefit of motivating employees who have differing motivational paradigms than their own. Senge (1999) explains, "With creative tension, the energy for change comes from the vision, from what we want to create, juxtaposed with [the perception of the current] reality" (p. 12). Some informants found that they benefited from working with employees who have differing motivational paradigms. When working with someone who has a different motivational paradigm, creative tension ensues as a result of differing views of the current reality. Creative tension can be positive in the workplace. Based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework, creative tension fits into two constructs: freedom, the ability to achieve goals and social possibility, the ability to create solutions for problems. In the following examples, California small business founders describe creative tension in their organizations:

- "Everybody could think differently and that's okay. In fact, it'd be good because then you say 'oh, I didn't think of that' and that's healthy if it is done in a positive way" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).
- "At times in the last couple years we've referred back to that document [regarding our values], as way of bringing back consensus and leaving our egos at the door. Because the other thing we can't be too committed to is our own opinion here. Especially since we don't always agree what to do with client accounts and what is the best thing for them or how much. If it gets personal and you become personally committed to your idea, then you shut out every other option and it becomes a battle of who is going to win. Ultimately there are two people who have co-ownership so there is no winner. You have to always be thinking about the business and it's the business' idea" (Participant B, personal communication, July 19, 2010).

- "With newer partners sometimes they have different views on what should or shouldn't be done based on assumptions. But when you explain what has worked and not worked then they will either modify their thinking or still not really feel real comfortable. But, we don't do things until everyone is comfortable…It's healthy to have a different approach and checks and balances…Everybody won't do it exactly the same, but when the objective is the same it's okay…I think you have to give people the freedom to do it their own way. Otherwise it doesn't work. You can explain your way and they can take a little bit and find what is comfortable for them. That's different" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).
- "I have hundreds of things I think are priorities. It is not uncommon for her to say 'Let's think this through. Is this really what you want us to do? Is this really a priority? They can't all be priorities.' That's pretty common…And there are times when I see it differently and I push it. And she respects me enough, or because I am the boss, she'll listen. But, it's not uncommon for her to put up a 'Squelch me, ick!' Much of the time: much needed" (Participant G, personal communication, August 7, 2010).

Employee personal issues and timing. Small business founders reported experiencing scenarios in which their employees could not be motivated due to personal issues or circumstances and timing. These limitations may be explained by Sowell's (1995) constrained paradigm regarding the social possibility construct. Those who subscribe to a constrained social possibility paradigm believe that trade-offs leave many "unmet needs" (p. 105): in this case, for the organization. The following quotations illustrate situations in which founders perceived employees' personal issues outweighing the needs of the organization:

- "His wife passed away early in his life and there was a period of about a year and a half…it was obvious why he was having problems but it was something I wasn't able to put a fix on. It was something that he had to cure himself and it just took time" (Participant A, personal communication, July 15, 2010).
- "People have times in their life when they have a lot of pressure or divorce. So you give them latitude as long as they can maintain. You don't expect them to go to another level" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).
- "I have had some disastrous hires. I realized during that process that these people need to be fixed, as people, first. I can't even motivate them until they are fixed because they are all messed up" (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).
- "I think they have emotional issues, barriers that keep them from succeeding. Different mental ailments that keep them from succeeding…they trip themselves up or disable themselves from moving forward…Often times it is an identifiable diagnosis that is disabling them from reaching their own personal potential" (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).
- "At the root of it, I don't think it's the job; it is that they have personal issues going on in their life. It is almost like nothing I do really makes a difference. I give the person freedom, suggest things very nicely; it doesn't seem to make any difference. They are just pissed off. That is a situation where I don't

think any amount of motivation, money, or whatever is going to change that situation until the person gets the rest of their life sorted out" (Participant C, personal communication, July 20, 2010).

- "Timing is huge. I can remember years where I had so many demands from my family and kids. It was like 'Oh, my gosh, don't make me do this right now. Don't make me learn this now. Not that I don't want to, I will later. But I can't, my plate is too full.' I think you have to recognize full plates" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).
- "There are times that you just can't get through. The windows are locked shut. The shutters are bolted and there is no way in. I think every human has that moment. Some humans have more moments like that. The best thing to do, in my experience, is to just walk away and come back [later]…Give them time" (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).

Founders' ability to influence outcomes. Small business founders reported that they were often able to influence outcomes when their employees were not necessarily achieving the desired goal. Their effectiveness may be explained by Sowell's (1995) unconstrained paradigm regarding motivation. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm regarding motivation tend to use dispositions or intrinsic rewards to motivate their employees. The following quotation highlights one California small business founder's ability to alter his employee's behavior based on dispositions.

- "I needed to motivate the person to think about the company and what the company needs to do and place that on a higher pedestal than just 'Does this customer like me a lot?' Because the customer will like you a lot if you give

> them stuff for free…I had to motivate him by saying we have no option but for you to go back and this guy…I am not sure how much motivation that is. It's not carrot or stick; it's just you have got to do it. But it is also about explaining why. Because I don't want them just to do stuff because I pay them and resent me later. Because I really want them to make it a part of their working so that next time they are modifying their approach at the right time. So it doesn't even have to get to that. I guess in essence I am motivating him to accept my business philosophy and then to believe it enough to do it on his own" (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).

Employee opportunity for career growth and training. As previously discussed, for those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm unhappiness is created by "the fact that social institutions and social policies are not as wisely crafted as the anointed would have crafted them" (Sowell, 1995, p. 113). Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm make the assumption that with the proper institutions and upbringing, people would be intrinsically motivated do what is morally right. It may be extrapolated from Sowell (1995) that the proper upbringing would include education, training, and human development. One of the small business founders recognized that learning and adult education is a very individual process and it is helpful for the adult learner to incorporation their personal experience into their training, making the following statements:

- "[Regarding] motivation [it is about] providing a safe environment, the tools [or training], and the encouragement. Most of it they have to do on their own" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).

- "Everybody won't do it exactly the same, but when the objective is the same it's okay…I think you have to give people the freedom to do it their own way. Otherwise it doesn't work. You can explain your way and they can take a little bit and find what is comfortable for them. That's different" (Participant F, personal communication, August 6, 2010).

Surprisingly, during a less than ideal economic period, small business founders were experiencing situations in which their employees rejected opportunities for career growth and training. The following examples illustrate this type of situation:

- "I actually purchased a set of learning CDs that never got off the shelf…So within their tool box, they would do just about anything they could, but they wouldn't expand their tool box. That was a bit shocking for me because I feel like I am constantly throwing tools out and putting new tools in because the business world is very dynamic. IT and tech is dynamic. . . My business partner had a saying, 'If you have a hammer, every problem looks like a nail.' As long as he comes across nails it is great. If he comes across other things, it is not so great" (Participant H, personal communication, August 13, 2010).
- "She is very comfortable in her work. And she wants to do her work. She does not want the challenge of what we are going to need to do to survive" (Participant J, personal communication, August 27, 2010).
- Regarding sending an employee for additional training "It was more 'what's in it for me'" (Participant B, personal communication, July 19, 2010)?

Employees' rejection of the opportunity to receive additional training is indicative of their differing motivational paradigms from that of the founder.

Employee termination. Another scenario commonly described was that employees either shared the organization's vision, parted ways with the organization, or were considering parting ways. Termination of employment is a theme that emerged related to Sowell's (1995) social possibility construct. When the founder considers termination of employment, it is likely that the employee is not meeting the organization's needs. By firing the employee, the founder in essence is conceding there are no solutions, only trade-offs. Therefore, termination of employment is a theme that falls under the auspice of a constrained paradigm. The following examples illustrate this scenario as perceived by the founders:

- "That would probably be one of my [employees]. She actually doesn't work here anymore…She didn't share my beliefs in a lot of ways. She changed some of the training to fit her more. Which is okay but not in a situation of this sort where everyone is supposed to be providing the same kind of [service]. So I motivated her actually, gave her the confidence to go out and start her own business. She is doing well and it worked out. There are no hard feelings" (Participant K, personal communication, July 30, 2010).
- In response to a question regarding the small business founder's ability to appeal to their employees' inherent desire to make a contribution to the organization, Participant G stated, "Absolutely, to every single one of them except for the person we let go last week" (personal communication, August 7, 2010).

- "I have one employee that I am having a lot of trouble with right now. We might have to end up replacing him" (Participant C, personal communication, July 20, 2010).

Composite description for research question three. The composite description was derived from an analysis of the data. "The composite summary describes the 'world' in general, as experienced by the participants" (Hycner, 1985, p. 294). The composite description was produced through a series of steps described in chapter three that yielded a description based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework of what California small business founders described as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees who had differing motivational paradigms from their own. The composite description includes the salient essence(s) that apply universally to the phenomenon of how California small business founders view the benefits and limitations of motivating employees with different motivational paradigms. The researcher reviewed the third set of interview questions to determine whether the informants tend to operate from a more constrained or unconstrained paradigm when motivating employees with different motivational paradigms. The composite description is divided into two subsections based on the finding of benefits and limitations.

Benefits. In summary, California small business founders tended to use an unconstrained paradigm when describing the benefits of motivating employees with differing motivational paradigms. Based on the descriptive data, creative tension represented the theme that was most consistently valued by California small business founders working with employees who had differing motivational paradigms from their own. Creative tension is reflective of an unconstrained paradigm based on Sowell's

(1995) conceptual framework with respect to the constructs: freedom, the ability to achieve goals, and social possibility, the ability to create solutions for problems. By effectively leveraging creative tension, solutions to problems are discovered and goals are achieved.

Limitations. In this study, California small business founders described the limitations of motivating employees with differing motivational paradigms by utilizing a mixture of constrained and unconstrained views. Derived from the descriptive data, employment termination and overcoming personal issues and timing were themes that emerged reflecting a constrained paradigm. A constrained paradigm was reflected as the founders experienced a trade-off when the organization's needs were not being met. The California small business founders tended to use an unconstrained paradigm when describing the themes of influencing outcomes and providing opportunities for career growth and training. To reiterate, said themes are reflective of a mixture of both constrained and unconstrained paradigms. The implications of the aforementioned findings will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five.

Summary

In summary, the selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms can be described as a mixture of constrained and unconstrained views. That said, on balance their motivational paradigm is predominantly unconstrained. Given the timing of when the interviews were conducted – during a poor economic climate – the informants were overwhelmingly optimistic. Being optimistic is representative of Sowell's (1995) unconstrained paradigm. All of the California small business founders interviewed discovered a way to serve an unmet need in the marketplace. This finding in itself is representative of an unconstrained paradigm under Sowell's social possibility construct by "finding a solution to a problem" (p. 105). With respect to Sowell's freedom construct, all of the informants referred to challenges, the ability to achieve goals, or a sense of purpose. This is reflective of an unconstrained paradigm. That said, three of the informants also described their preference for autonomy. This finding represents a constrained paradigm under Sowell's freedom construct. The constrained view of freedom is "the exemption of power from others" (p. 105). Additional themes emerged that reflect an unconstrained paradigm, including service and teamwork. One theme that does not easily fit into Sowell's conceptual framework is the founders' enjoyment of their work.

In this study, California small business founders tended to use an unconstrained paradigm when describing the benefits of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms to their own. Themes in the descriptive data that supported the use of an unconstrained paradigm included trust, shared values, teamwork, and providing their employees with opportunities. In contrast, participants tended to use a mixture of constrained and unconstrained paradigms when describing the limitations of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms to their own. A theme that emerged in the descriptive data that supported the use of a constrained paradigm included an inability or unwillingness to train or mentor. A theme that emerged in the descriptive data that supported the use of an unconstrained paradigm included problem solving.

Selected California small business founders tended to use an unconstrained paradigm when describing the benefits of motivating employees with differing motivational paradigms from their own. One of the themes that emerged as a benefit of working with an employee with a different motivational paradigm included creative tension. Participants tended to use a mixture of constrained and unconstrained paradigms when describing the limitations of motivating employees with differing motivational paradigms from their own. Several themes emerged regarding the limitations small business founders experienced in working with employees who had differing motivational paradigms from their own. From a constrained perspective, small business founders described the limitations of employee termination and employee personal issues and timing. From an unconstrained paradigm, small business founders described limitations in their ability to influence outcomes and employee development.

Chapter Five: Summary, Implications, and Recommendations

Introduction

First, this chapter presents a summary of the study. Second, the limitations of the study are reviewed. Third, the implications of the research findings based the descriptive data are discussed and conclusions the researcher has drawn are presented. Next, a discussion of the recommendations for further research is provided. And finally, a reflection upon what the researcher has learned from the California small business founders is provided in the closing remarks.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to: (a) examine selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms, (b) determine what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees who had similar motivational paradigms to their own, and (c) identify what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees with motivational paradigms different from their own. The conceptual framework for this study was examined in chapter two.

Sowell (1995) provided a conceptual framework in his book *The Vision of the Anointed* that was useful for evaluating California small business founders' motivational paradigms. Pursuant to Sowell, meaning is processed according to a person's view of the human condition. Do selected California small business founders operate from a paradigm of abundance? Or do selected California small business founders operate from a paradigm of scarcity? Sowell suggested distinctions between a constrained and an unconstrained paradigm are based on one's underlying belief system. A small business founder who subscribes to a constrained paradigm would tend to look at what has occurred historically to explain possibilities for the future, which implies a smaller set of options than an unconstrained paradigm. A small business founder who subscribes to a constrained paradigm would tend to use incentives or extrinsic rewards to motivate his or her employees. A small business founder who subscribes to an unconstrained paradigm would look to the possibility of what the future may hold, which provides a larger set of options than a constrained paradigm. A small business founder who subscribes to an unconstrained paradigm would tend to use dispositions or intrinsic rewards to motivate his or her employees.

Based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework, this study explored selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms reflecting either a constrained or an unconstrained paradigm. This study examined the founders of 11 California small businesses. An in-depth, semi-structured interview format was employed to discover the founders' underlying motivational paradigm (constrained or unconstrained). No studies known to the researcher have applied Sowell's criteria for evaluating paradigms to what small business founders describe as their lived-experience. The research questions explored included:

1. What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?
2. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?

3. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?

Rather than focus on hypothesis testing (Seidman, 2006), this phenomenological study used in-depth, semi-structured interviews to describe the lived-experiences of California small business founders and the degree to which they tend to motivate their employees from either a constrained or unconstrained paradigm. The heuristic nature of phenomenological analysis was also discussed. The method of analysis that was incorporated into this study was a necessary part of the analytical process. The analytical process was described in detail in chapter three. The findings resulted in a phenomenological description of distilled themes, patterns, structure, and essence(s) that the informants shared in common based on their lived-experience as California small business founders.

Overall, the California small business founders interviewed predominantly tended to subscribe to an unconstrained motivational paradigm. That said, they did describe using a mixture of constrained and unconstrained paradigms in the descriptive data. Given the timing of when the interviews were conducted – during a poor economic climate – the informants were overwhelmingly optimistic, a quality indicative of Sowell's (1995) unconstrained paradigm. All of the California small business founders interviewed discovered a way to serve an unmet need in the marketplace, also indicative of an unconstrained paradigm under Sowell's social possibility construct by "finding a solution to a problem" (p. 105). With respect to Sowell's freedom construct, all of the informants referred to challenges, the ability to achieve goals, or a sense of purpose. This finding is reflective of an unconstrained paradigm. That said, three of the informants also referred to their preference for autonomy. This finding represents a constrained paradigm under Sowell's freedom construct. The constrained view of freedom is "the exemption of power from others" (p. 105). Additional themes in the descriptive data that supported the use of an unconstrained vision included service and teamwork. Enjoyment of their work is a theme that emerged that does easily fit into Sowell's framework.

In this study, selected California small business founders tended to use an unconstrained paradigm when describing the benefits of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms to their own. Themes in the descriptive data that supported the use of an unconstrained paradigm included trust, shared values, teamwork, and providing their employees with opportunities. Informants tended to use a mixture of constrained and unconstrained paradigms when describing the limitations of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms to their own. One theme that emerged in the descriptive data that supported the use of a constrained paradigm was an inability or unwillingness to train or mentor. One theme that emerged in the descriptive data that supported the use of an unconstrained paradigm was problem solving.

California small business founders tended use an unconstrained paradigm when describing the benefits of motivating employees with differing motivational paradigms from their own. One of the themes that emerged as a benefit of working with an employee with a different motivational paradigm was creative tension. Informants tended use a mixture of constrained and unconstrained paradigms when describing the limitations of motivating employees with differing motivational paradigm from their own. Several themes emerged regarding the limitations small business founders experienced working with employees who had different motivational paradigms from their own. They tended to describe the themes of employment termination and personal issues and timing from a constrained paradigm. Themes California small business founders tended to describe from an unconstrained paradigm included influencing outcomes and creating opportunities for career growth and training.

Limitations of the Findings

To reiterate from chapter one, several limitations of the study were identified. For example, this study utilized purposeful sampling. The nature of this qualitative research sought to describe how selected California small business founders view motivation and their lived-experience motivating their employees with similar and differing paradigms. Therefore, such findings cannot be used reliably to infer the same behavior across all small business founders. According to Creswell (2009), "the value of qualitative research lies in the particular description and themes developed *in context* of a specific site. *Particularity* rather than *generalizability* (Greene & Caracelli, 1997) is the hallmark of qualitative research" (p. 193). A relatively small sample was required given the available resources and timeline for this study.

Further limitations of this study included the non-random selection of informants, whose founding experiences are based in small California businesses with employees. Thus, any conclusions reported in this chapter are limited to the founders who participated in this study.

This study is *retrospective* (Hycner, 1985). It relies on the participants' observations of the past to describe their experience in motivating employees with similar and different motivational paradigms. A quandary related to phenomenological inquiries is that “an entrepreneur may well interpret things differently at different times and in different contexts” (Cope, 2005, p. 170). Thus, it is possible that an individual’s perspective may change over time (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Cope, 2005; Hycner, 1985). Therefore, data collected from founders must be viewed as suggestive at a specific point in time rather than conclusive evidence of the phenomenon described.

Procedural limitations. The researcher’s coding of the data and the coding auditor’s verification were congruent with each other. No discrepancies were found.

Implications

Strengths of the study include a repetition in the expression of themes found in the descriptive data, thereby supporting the validity of the study (de Vaus, 2001; Kumar, 1996; Shapiro, 1986), and the internal coherence of the findings with the literature. Notwithstanding, inferences from small, qualitative studies need to be made cautiously. The nature of this qualitative, in-depth research was to describe selected California small business founders’ motivational paradigms and their lived-experience motivating their employees with similar and different paradigms. Therefore, such findings cannot be used to reliably infer like experiences across all small business founders. Any conclusions are specific to the founders interviewed in this study; any attempt to generalize findings beyond this group must be done tentatively.

The sample was purposefully limited to those who met the criteria of: (a) having founded an organization, (b) leading an organization that employed at least one and no more than 500 people, and (c) operating the organization in California. The informants consisted of founders representing different small businesses across a variety of industries located in California. This heterogeneous aspect, reflected by number of variant themes, suggested that theoretical saturation was likely not achieved. A larger sample may be needed to maximize the variation of themes. Despite its limitations, this study began a process of documenting California small business founders' motivational paradigms and their experience motivating employees with similar and different motivational paradigms. This study built upon the knowledge base regarding founders and motivational paradigms in the business world.

Implications of research question one. Research question one asked, "What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?" Selected California small business founders' motivational paradigm can be described as a mixture of constrained and unconstrained views. That said, their motivational paradigm is predominantly unconstrained. All of the California small business founders interviewed discovered a way to serve an unmet need in the marketplace. This finding represents an unconstrained paradigm under Sowell's (1995) social possibility construct by "finding a solution to a problem" (p. 105). With respect to freedom, all of the informants referred to challenges, the ability to achieve goals, or a sense of purpose. This finding is reflective of an unconstrained paradigm. That said, three of the informants also referred to their preference for autonomy, indicating a constrained paradigm under Sowell's freedom construct: "the exemption of power from others" (p. 105).

One overarching theme that characterized the data was optimism. In spite of the difficult economic climate at the time the interviews were conducted, the California small business founders were surprisingly optimistic. Being optimistic is representative of Sowell's (1995) unconstrained paradigm. Indeed, a clear correspondence was evident between California small business founders and optimism. The California small business founders looked forward to the possibility of what the future may hold with hope, determination, and commitment. “Failure is not an option” (Participant D, personal communication, July 20, 2010) was a common sentiment shared by the founders. Organizational growth and development is validated by the bottom-line (that is, profit).

The difficult economic climate may have provided the stimulus small business founders need to leverage a combination of social possibility, freedom, and creativity necessary for development of new products and services to help ensure their organizations’ survival. A small business founder who truly wants to strengthen his or her organization must take on a leadership role and establish a clear vision against which employees can predictably measure their contributions. When the founder’s role as a leader is clarified, the employees can orient themselves vis-à-vis the organizational vision to accomplish the goals set before them. Cashman (1999) asserts, “Every belief [or perception] we have transforms our life in either a life-enriching or life-limiting way” (p. 35). Therefore, it may be useful for small business founders to reflect on their motivational paradigm and how it helps and/or hinders their employees from achieving the organizational vision.

Implications of research question two. Research question two asked, “What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?” To reiterate from chapter four, the circumstances regarding the informants’ experiences were varied. The composite description was delineated into the categories of benefits and limitations. Several themes emerged regarding benefits. However, fewer themes emerged regarding limitations that were experienced motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms.

Benefits. In essence, California small business founders utilize an unconstrained paradigm when describing the benefits of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms to their own. Enveloped in optimism, small business founders weave together a vision for their organizations. Vision can be used to leverage trust, values, and teamwork to help their employees excel (i.e., the benefits of motivating employees with similar paradigms to their own). Shared events, meanings, and commitments tie the founders' lives loosely but strongly together with their employees.

Based on trust, the founder is able to provide employees with opportunities to have new experiences that lead to professional growth, which positively impacts both the employees and the organization. This finding coincides with the mounting empirical evidence that developing transformational leadership skills positively influences employee motivation and performance. It seems that a high level of motivation experienced by employees corresponds with a high level of loyalty and commitment to the organization and its founder (Barling, et al., 1996). Founders who use transformational leadership and organizational vision will likely have a significant impact on the followers' perception of their leader's effectiveness and on the followers' own commitment to the organization.

Limitations. In summary, California small business founders utilize a mixture of constrained and unconstrained paradigms when describing the limitations of motivating employees with similar motivational paradigms to their own. One theme in the descriptive data that supported the use of a constrained paradigm was an inability or unwillingness to train or mentor. This finding implies that the founders' paradigms include the idea that human capabilities are limited. Again, it may be useful for small business founders to reflect on their paradigm and how it helps and/or hinders their employees from achieving the organizational vision. Cashman (1999) asserts, "Every belief [or perception] we have transforms our life in either a life-enriching or life-limiting way" (p. 35). If the small business founder is interested learning or improving his or her training skills it may be worthwhile for them to focus on *context-based adult learning* (Hansman, 2001).

One theme in the descriptive data that supported the use of an unconstrained paradigm was problem solving. Those who subscribe to an unconstrained paradigm tend to believe in the goal of "liberation of human beings from unnecessary social inhibitions, so as to allow repressed creativity to emerge and vast knowledge and talent already available to be applied to existing problems" (Sowell, 1995, pp. 117-118). This finding is reflective of an optimistic paradigm based on abundance. Use of this paradigm encourages out-of-the-box thinking, allowing for the development of new products, services, and technologies that might not have been conceived of otherwise.

Implications of research question three. Research question three asked, "What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?" To reiterate from chapter four, the researcher reviewed the interview questions to determine whether the founders tended to operate from a more constrained or unconstrained paradigm when motivating employees with different motivational paradigms from their own. The composite description was divided into two subsections based on the finding of benefits and limitations.

Benefits. In summary, California small business founders tended to use an unconstrained paradigm when describing the benefits of motivating employees with differing motivational paradigms. Derived from the descriptive data, creative tension is the theme that is most consistently valued by California small business founders working with employees who have differing motivational paradigms from their own. Creative tension is reflective of an unconstrained paradigm based on Sowell's (1995) conceptual framework with respect to the construct of freedom (the ability to achieve goals) and social possibility (the ability to create solutions for problems).

Senge (1999) explains, "With creative tension, the energy for change comes from the vision, from what we want to create, juxtaposed with [the perception of the current] reality" (p. 12) When working with someone who has a different motivational paradigm, creative tension ensues based on diverse views of the current reality. Creative tension can be a positive factor in the workplace. The small business founder can invite employees to bring their life experiences and understandings to the dialogue. By affirming the life experiences employees brings to organization, the small business founder in a leadership role welcomes them as whole people and not just employees. By recognizing the importance of knowledge gained through experience, the small business founder validates the employees' experiential expertise as it relates to the matter at hand. Founders are then better able to effectively leverage creative tension and create solutions to problems, bringing them closer towards their organizational vision.

Limitations. To summarize, California small business founders described the limitations of motivating employees with differing motivational paradigms using a mixture of constrained and unconstrained views. The themes derived from the descriptions California small business founders provided regarding the limitations of motivating employees who have different motivational paradigms included overcoming personal issues by acknowledging priorities and timing, the ability to influence outcomes based on dispositions, employees' rejection of opportunities for career development, and ultimately, the termination of employment.

Often the informants were able to influence outcomes when their employees were not necessarily achieving the desired goal. In order to be effective, founders need to be willing to explore different incentives and dispositions to best motivate their employees to act in alignment with their organizational vision (Lockwood, et al., 2010). The type of reward or disposition that is most effective may depend on their employees' underlying belief systems. The founders' effectiveness in this study may be explained by Sowell's (1995) unconstrained paradigm regarding motivation, which recommends using dispositions to motivate their employees. Founders were able to influence their employees' behavior by taking the time to discuss the matter, and really explain why what needed to be done needed to be done. Participant H expressed this sentiment by stating, "In essence, I am motivating him to accept my business philosophy and then to believe it enough to do it on his own" (personal communication, August 13, 2010). The implication is that communication and understanding are paramount to changing patterns and influencing employee behaviors to act in alignment with the organizational vision.

Overwhelmingly, the California small business founders interviewed encouraged their employees to become active participants in their own personal and professional development. They wanted to help their employees realize their potentials, possibilities, and freedoms to the extent that they could. Their goal is to connect people with resources and to enable them to be and become competent, dynamic employees who are able to change and grow within the organization. The implication is that building knowledge in the organization among peers may contribute to the organization's survival, yet, at times, employees still rejected opportunities for additional development.

Overcoming personal issues by acknowledging priorities and timing was sometimes necessary, as employees worked to unravel their emotional blocks and heal problems outside of the workplace. Most of the founders interviewed sought to enhance their employees' health and livelihood. They wanted to help their employees realize their potentials, possibilities, and freedoms to the extent that they could. At times, it became necessary to give their employees latitude, time, and space to heal. Other times, it was acknowledged that a solution could not be found and an employee needed to be let go. These difficult situations are common to the small business founders' experience.

Conclusion

High unemployment, foreclosures, and bankruptcy are among the tattered remnants the Great Recession has left in its wake. It may be possible for small business founders using a mixture of criteria from both constrained and unconstrained motivational paradigms to survive difficult economic times by maintaining optimism and commitment to their vision and by constantly adjusting to the ever-changing market conditions and course correcting for their miscalculations. At times, this style may include terminating employees who are unable to align with their vision. Founders must clarify commitments, speak honestly, and listen to and reassure their employees regardless of the similarities or differences in their motivational paradigms. If California small business founders are able to do this in a poor economic climate, imagine what could be achieved when the economic climate improves.

Recommendations for Future Research

Due to the previously described limitations of the study, inferences cannot be made to small business founders in general. That said, there are several recommendations for future research.

Additional research with a larger sample is necessary to test any correspondences that may be suggested in this study, as well as to test any implications suggested in this study. Because the California small business founders selected for this study work in diverse industries, disparities were found. This finding resulted in differences regarding how motivation is approached. It is recommended that a future study explore founders' motivational paradigms within a particular industry to determine if there are increased similarities among them.

The study was further limited because not all of the small business founders interviewed held the same position within their organizations. The perspectives of the informants may differ based upon their respective position in their organizations. It is therefore recommended that this study be replicated with only small business founders who are the sole proprietors of their organization.

Another limitation of this study was a range restriction due to the complete lack of participants in the study who were unsuccessful or went through bankruptcy (Spolsky, 2009; Stewart Jr. & Roth, 2007) as a result of founding their business. This lack creates a "survivorship bias" (Spolsky, 2009, p. 33). Therefore, it is recommended that a future study be conducted to examine the motivational paradigms of small business founders who have experienced bankruptcy.

Yet another limitation of this study was how participants defined key terms. Participants were not provided with questions in advance. Thus participants were asked to respond extemporaneously, resulting in instantaneous self-definitions and self-interpretations of terms without preparation. These definitions and interpretations varied from participant to participant providing different contexts for their answers. Therefore, it is recommended that a future study be conducted in which the participants are given written interview questions in advance with relevant definitions in an effort to increase consistency and clarity of the findings.

Another limitation of this study was its timing. The Great Recession likely influenced the California small business founders' responses. As a result, the timing of this study may have resulted in the findings being skewed towards a more mixed or constrained motivational paradigm than might have been found otherwise. This fact may necessitate a reconsideration of the issues addressed here to ensure that the empirical knowledge based on small business founders remains up-to-date and reflective of current economic conditions. It is recommended that this study be replicated when the economy is more stable.

Closing Remarks

Based on the aforementioned implications and conclusion, a few closing remarks are warranted. On a personal note, the researcher has learned over the course of this research that many correspondences and interconnections exist among people who work in the shared context of having founded a small business located in California. This experience has led the researcher to a deeper understanding and appreciation of the intricacies and coherence of the small business founders' experiences operating from both constrained and unconstrained motivational paradigms. This study has led the researcher to a greater conscious awareness of the underlying motivational paradigms that guide small business founders' actions. The interviewing process has provided the researcher with a deeper understanding of the issues that imbue the California small business founders' stories. This study has also given the researcher a fuller appreciation of the complexities and difficulties small business founders experience when motivating employees with both similar and different motivational paradigms. Importantly and almost always, interviewing led the researcher to gain a deeper respect of the small business founders' experience. The researcher enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to have learned from each of the California small business founders who participated in this study.

REFERENCES

Antonioni, D. (2009). Crafting the art of stakeholder management. *Industrial Management, 51*(1), 18-22. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com /bibliographic_databases.htm?id=1787808&show=abstract

Bakker, A. B., van Velhoven, M., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2010). Beyond the demand-control model: Thriving on high job demands and resources. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 9*(1), 3-16. doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000006

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(6), 827-832. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.827

Bass, B. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061 -S

Bass, B., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 181-217. doi:10.1016/S1048 -9843(99)00016-8

Becker, C. S. (1992). *Living & relating: An introduction to phenomenology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Block, P. (1987). *The empowered manager: Positive political skills at work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. J. (1975). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A phenomenological approach to the social sciences*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(5), 554-571. doi:10.2307/30040649

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901-910. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Boyd, D. P., & Gumpert, D. E. (1983). Coping with entrepreneurial stress. *Harvard Business Review, 61*(2), 44-64. Retrieved from http://web.ebscohost.com.lib.pepperdine.edu/ehost/detail?vid=4&hid=126&sid=bcbd812f-2a8e-43d0-b851-aa61ef89798e%40sessionmgr111&bdata=JmxvZ2luLmFzcD9jdXN0aWQ9czg

Brandes, P., Dharwadkarr, R., & Lemesis, G. V. (2003). Effective employee stock option design: Reconciling stakeholder, strategic, and motivational factors. *Academy of Management Executive, 17*(1), 77-93. doi:10.5465/AME.2003.9474813

Bureau of Economic Analysis. (2008). *Regional economic accounts.* Retrieved from http://www.bea.gov/regional/gsp/action.cfm

Bygrave, W. D. (2004). The entrepreneurial process. In W. D. Bygrave & A. Zacharakis (Eds.), *The portable MBA in entrepreneurship* (3rd ed., pp. 1-27). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Byrne, P. M. (1996). *Jealousy and confidence: An essay on the limits of authority* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations & Theses Database. (AAT No. 9714088)

Cashman, K. (1999). *Leadership from the inside out*. Provo, UT: Executive Excellence.

Central Intelligence Agency. (2008). World fact book. Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2001rank.html

Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (1996). Building your company's vision. *Harvard Business Review, 74*(5), 65-77. Retrieved from http://hbr.org/1996/09/building-your-companys-vision/ar/1

Conger, J. A. (1991). Inspiring others: The language of leadership. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*(1), 31-45. doi:10.5465/AME.1991.4274713

Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 145-170. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/10489843/10/2

Cope, J. (2005). Researching entrepreneurship through phenomenological inquiry: Philosophical and methodological issues. *International Small Business Journal, 23*(2), 163-189. doi:10.1177/0266242605050511

Covey, S. R. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. New York, NY: Fireside Simon Schuster.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cronshaw, S. F., & Lord, R. G. (1987). Effects of categorization, attribution, and encoding processes on leadership perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(1), 97-106. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.72.1.97

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & LeFevre, J. (1989). Optimal experience in work and leisure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*(5), 815-822. doi:10.1037 /0022-3514.56.5.815

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2001). *Essentials of organization development & change*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College.

De La Rosa Ducut, J. (2005). *Nurturing the ethical reasoning of leaders: The illumination of ethics education, demographics, and teaching methods* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations & Theses Database. (AAT No. 3224165)

de Vaus, D. A. (2001). *Research design in social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dern, G. R. (2007). *A collaborative process model for community based organizations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations & Theses Database. (AAT No. 3264773)

Dukes, S. (1984). Phenomenological methodology in the human sciences. *Journal of Religion and Health, 23*, 197-203.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(4), 735-744. doi:10.2307/3069307

Easton, G. (1995). Methodology and industrial networks. In K. Moller & D. T. Wilson (Eds.), *Business marketing: An interaction and network perspective* (pp. 411-492). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic.

Easton, K. L., McComish, J. F., & Greenberg, R. (2000). Avoiding common pitfalls in qualitative data collection and transcription. *Qualitative Health Research, 10*(5), 703-707. doi:10.1177/104973200129118651

Fiedler, K. (1982). Causal schemata: Review and criticism of research on a popular construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*(6), 1001-1013.

Filion, L. J. (1991). Vision and relations: Elements for an entrepreneurial metamodel. *International Small Business Journal, 9*(2), 26-40. doi:10.1177/026624269100900202

Fiske, S. T., & Dyer, L. M. (1985). Structure and development of social schemata: Evidence from positive and negative transfer effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*(4), 839-852. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.48.4.839

Frank, H., Lueger, M., & Korunka, C. (2007). The significance of personality in business start-up intentions, start-up realization and business success. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 19*(3), 227-251. doi:10.1080/08985620701218387

Frankl, V. E. (1992). *Man's search for meaning: An introduction to logotherapy* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Frensch, P. A., & Sternberg, R. J. (1991). Skill-related differences in game playing. In R. J. Sternberg & P. A. Frensch (Eds.), *Complex problem solving: Principles and mechanisms* (pp. 343-381). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, the unknown about telecommunting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1524-1541. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524

Gatewood, E. J. (2004). External assistance for startups and small business. In W. D. Bygrave & A. Zacharakis (Eds.), *The portable MBA in entrepreneurship* (3rd ed., pp. 223-265). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Giorgi, A. (1970). Toward a phenomenologically based research in psychology. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 1*(1), 75-98. doi:10.1163/156916270X00076

Giorgi, A. (1992). Description versus interpretation: Competing alternative strategies for qualitative research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 23*(2), 119-135. doi:10.1163/156916292X00090

Giorgi, A. (1997). The theory, practice, and evaluation of the phenomenological method as a qualitative research method. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 28*(2), 235-260. doi:10.1163/156916297X00103

Giorgi, A. (2002). The question of validity in qualitative research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 33*(1), 1-18. doi:10.1163/156916202320900392

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York, NY: Bantam.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam.

Grant, P., & Perren, L. (2002). Small business and entrepreneurial research: Meta-theories, paradigms and prejudices. *International Small Business Journal*, *20*(2), 185-211. doi:10.1177/0266242602202004

Gregory, K. L. (1983). Native-view paradigms: Multiple cultures and culture conflicts in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *28*(3), 359-376. doi:10.2307/2392247

Groves, K. S. (2006). Leader emotional expressivity, visionary leadership, and organizational change. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 27*(7), 566-583.

Grundstein-Amado, R. (1999). Bilateral transformational leadership: An approach for fostering ethical conduct in public service organizations. *Administration & Society*, *31*(2), 247-260. doi:10.1177/00953999922019111

Guba, E. G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 17-27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hansman, C. A. (2001). Context-Based Adult Learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *The New Update on Adult Learning Theory* (Vol. 89, pp. 43-51). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. L. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, *75*(1), 124-134.

Hein, S. F., & Austin, W. J. (2001). Empirical and hermeneutic approaches to phenomenological research in psychology: A comparison. *Psychological Methods, 6*(1), 3-17. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.6.1.3

Herzberg, F. (1973). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland, OH: New American Library.

Houlgate, S. (2001). G. W. F. Hegel (1770-1831). In S. M. Emmanuel (Ed.), *Modern philosophers: From Descartes to Nietzche* (pp. 278-305). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology. (D. Carr, Trans.)*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1954)

Hycner, R. H. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies*, *8*(3), 279-303. doi:10.1007/BF00142995

Jensen, S. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Entrepreneurs as authentic leaders: Impact on employee's attitudes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*(8), 646-666. doi:10.1108/01437730610709273

Kanji, G. K. (2008). Leadership is prime: How do you measure leadership Excellence? *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence, 19*(4), 417-427. doi:10.1080 /14783360802002834

Kantabutra, S. (2010). Negative vision effect on Thai retail stores. *Singapore Management Review, 32*(1), 1-27.

Kantabutra, S., & Avery, G. C. (2007). Vision effects in customer and staff satisfaction: An empirical investigation. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 28*(3), 209-229. doi:10.1108/01437730710739648

Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 18*(4), 257-265.

Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 246-255. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.246

Kimberly, J. R. (1976). Organizational size and the structuralist perspective: A review, critique, and proposal. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*(4), 571-597. doi:10.2307/2391717

Kotter, J. P. (1990). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(3), 103-111. http://hbr.org/2001/12/what-leaders-really-do/ar/1

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Encouraging the heart: A leader's guide to rewarding and recognizing others.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Krueger, N. F., Jr., & Carsrud, A. L. (1993). Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behavior. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 5*, 315-330. doi:10.1080/08985629300000020

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The route to normal science. The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed., pp. 10-22). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Naffziger, D. W. (1997). An examination of owner's goals in sustaining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management, 35*(1), 24-33. Retrieved from http://web.ebscohost.com.lib.pepperdine.edu /ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=f33a3073-2e69-4d5e-9217 -bfae0e1248bc%40sessionmgr111&vid=4&hid=108

Kvale, S. (1994). Ten standard objections to qualitative research interviews. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 25*(2), 147-173. doi:10.1163/156916294X00016

Lesgold, A., & Lajoie, S. (1991). Complex problem solving in electronics. In R. J. Sternberg & P. A. Frensch (Eds.), *Complex problem solving: Principles and mechanisms* (pp. 287-316). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lewis, H. (1990). *A question of values: Six ways we make the personal choices that shape our lives*. San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins.

Lichtenstein, S., & Dade, P. (2007). The shareholder value chain: Values, vision and shareholder value creation. *Journal of General Management, 33*(1), 15-31. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/bibliographic_databases.htm ?id=1646527&PHPSESSID=out2q06ugmg5nilfnias22r351

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. *American Psychologist, 57*(9), 705–717. doi:10.1037//0003 -066X.57.9.705

Lockwood, N. R., Anderson, C., Fiester, L., & Somers, K. (2010). Motivation in today's workplace: The link to performance. *Society for Human Research Management Research Quarterly, Second Quarter*, 1-9. Retrieved from http://www.shrm.org /Research/Articles/Articles/Documents/10-0235%20Research%20Quarterly-Q2 -FNL.pdf

Lord, R. G., & Foti, R. J. (1986). Schema theories, information processing, and organizational behavior. In H. P. Sims Jr. & D. A. Gioia (Eds.), *The thinking organization: Dynamics of organizational social cognition* (pp. 20-48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Luft, J. (1969). *Of human interaction*. Palo Alto, CA: National Press.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Harper Collins.

McClelland, D. C. (1965). N achievement and entrepreneurship: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1*(4), 389-392. doi:10.1037 /h0021956

McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R., & Weinberger, J. (1989). How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ? *Psychological Review, 96*(4), 690-702. doi:10.1037/0033 -295X.96.4.690

McGrath, M. M. (2008). *Government initiatives in early childhood education and care: Visions of human nature and indicators of progress in nineteen western countries* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations & Theses Database. (AAT No. 3313156)

McGregor, D. (1980). *The human side of enterprise* (25th Anniversary ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Monarch Wealth Strategies™: Our Team. (2010). Retrieved March 9, 2010, from http://www.monarchwealthstrategies.com/new/monarchwealthstrategies/

Morden, T. (1997). Leadership as vision. *Management Decision, 35*(9), 668-676.

Morgeson, F. P., Delaney-Klinger, K., & Hemingway, M. A. (2005). The importance of job autonomy, cognitive ability, and job-related skill for predicting role breadth and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(2), 399-406. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.399

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Natanson, M. (1973). Introduction. In *Edmund Husserl: Philosopher of infinite tasks* (pp. 3-19). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

National Bureau of Economic Research. (2010). *Business cycle dating committee, National Bureau of Economic Research.* Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/cycles/sept2010.html

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology: Meet the Faculty. (n.d.). Retrieved December 19, 2009, from http://gsep.pepperdine.edu/welcome/faculty/default.htm?faculty=kent_rhodes

Pepperdine University School of Public Policy: Meet the Faculty. (n.d.). Retrieved December 19, 2009, from http://publicpolicy.pepperdine.edu/academics/faculty/

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology: Exploring the breadth of human experience* (pp. 41-60). New York, NY: Plenum.

Quigley, J. (1995). *Vision: How leaders develop it, share it, and sustain it*. San Francisco, CA: McGraw-Hill.

Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organizational Behavior* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Roswell, K., & Berry, T. (1993). Leadership, vision, values and systemic wisdom. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 14*(7), 18-22.

Rubin, R. S., Munz, D. C., & Bommer, W. H. (2005). Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and personality on transformational leadership behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(5), 845-858. doi:10.5465 /AMJ.2005.18803926

Schein, E. H. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*(1), 13-28. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(83)90023-2

Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 109-119. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.109

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 118-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seidman, I. E. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.

Senge, P. (1999). Creative tension. *Executive Excellence, 16*(1), 12-13. doi:10.1002 /chin.199915029

Shapiro, K. J. (1986). Verification: Validity or understanding. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 17*(2), 167-179. doi:10.1163/156916286X00196

Shernoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Shernoff, E. S. (2003). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of flow theory. *School Psychology Quarterly, 18*(2), 158-176. doi:10.1521/scpq.18.2.158.21860

Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy. (2009). Frequently asked questions. *Advocacy: The voice of small business research,* (September), 1-2. Retrieved from http://www.sba.gov/advo/stats/sbfaq.pdf

Sokolowski, R. (2000). *Introduction to phenomenology*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Sowell, T. (1995). *The vision of the anointed: Self-congratulations as a basis for social policy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Spolsky, J. (2009). Start-up static. *Inc., 31*(2), 33-34.

Stewart Jr., W. H., & Roth, P. L. (2007). A meta-analysis of achievement motivation differences between entrepreneurs and managers. *Journal of Small Business Management, 45*(4), 401-421. doi:10.1111/j.1540-627X.2007.00220.x

Summit Consulting. (2009). Toward effective education of innovative entrepreneurs in small business: Initial results from survey of college students and graduates. *Small business research summary.* In *Advocacy: The voice of small business in government, 353*, 1-2. Retrieved from http://www.sba.gov/advo/research /rs353.pdf

Symon, G., & Cassell, C. (1998). Reflections on the use of qualitative methods. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research: A practical guide* (pp. 1-9). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

United States Census. (2010). *Population map.* Retrieved from http://2010.census.gov /2010census/popmap/

Voss, J. F., Wolfe, C. R., Lawrence, J. A., & Engle, R. A. (1991). From representation to decision: An analysis of problem solving in international relations. In R. J. Sternberg & P. A. Frensch (Eds.), *Complex problem solving: Principles and mechanisms* (pp. 119-158). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Weick, K. E., & Bougon, M. G. (1986). Organizations as cognitive maps: Charting ways to success and failure. In H. P. Sims Jr. & D. A. Gioia (Eds.), *The thinking organization: Dynamics of organizational social cognition* (pp. 102-135). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wheelan, C. (2002). *Naked economics: Undressing the dismal science*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Whetstone, J. T. (2002). Personalism and moral leadership: The servant leader with a transforming vision. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 11*(4), 385-392. doi:10.1111/1467-8608.00298

Wong, A., Tjosvold, D., & Yu, Z. (2005). Organizational partnerships in China: Self-interest, goal interdependence, and opportunism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(4), 782-791. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.782

Zander, R. S., & Zander, B. (2000). *The art of possibility: Transforming professional and personal life*. New York, NY: Penguin Putnam.

APPENDIX A

Statement of Bracketing

I grew up in an entrepreneurial family. While it kept things interesting, it was also stressful. Not every endeavor was a success. My mother suffered from stress related tendinitis from her shoulder into her neck. She died of cancer at the age of 53. In my mother's case, stress was the only known precursor she had that would increase the chance of her cancer diagnosis.

I have been employed by small business founders at three different organizations: a law office, a software development company, and a company that researches and develops, manufactures, and sales scientific instruments often used in field of astronomy (i.e. astrophotography). Further, I have several friends and family members who have established small businesses; some that are successful, others that have resulted in bankruptcy.

In 2005, I lead a companywide infrastructure change that impacted everyone in the organization. During the transition I experienced ease motivating others with similar paradigms. My experience motivating others with differing paradigms was met with some difficulty. One person in particular was a struggle to deal with. However, reflecting on the experience now (with several years behind me), I now know this person is highly resistant to *any* change and very vocal about it.

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol

Introductions and establish rapport.

Interviewee Screening.

While the researcher will attempt to pre-screen all interviewee candidates to the best of her ability based on information obtained through personal and professional networks, it is necessary to verify each potential interviewee is qualified to participate in the study.

Name: ______________________________ Date: _______________ Time: __________

Review purpose of study, amount of time required to complete the interview, plans for using the results of the interview, offer copy of the abstract to the informant.

The purpose of this research is tri-fold. This study first examines selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms (e.g. preferences for intrinsic or extrinsic rewards). Second, this study determines what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar paradigms to their own. Finally, this study identifies what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing paradigms from their own.

The following questions will be used to screen interview candidates for participation in this study and provide some demographic information about the organization. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability.

Are you a founder or co-founder of an organization (or organizations)?

What is your position at the organization?

What year was your organization founded?

The organization is positioned in what industry (or industries)?

Approximately how many employees work for your organization?

Does the potential Interviewee meet the criteria for the study: Yes / No (circle one)

May I answer any questions before we begin?

Note to researcher: Be a good listener.

Note to researcher: Obtain consent to participate in the study.

Please speak from your everyday experiences just as you remember them. Please be as specific as possible (avoid speaking abstractly) when answering questions. Please do not hesitate to ask me any questions you may have during the interview process.

Interview question 1a. What kind of things motivates you at work?

Interview question 1b. What motivated you to start your organization?

Interview question 1c. Are your beliefs about motivation today any different than when your founded the organization?

Interview question 1d. What is the one thing that is so important to you that if it were missing from [name company here] you might walk away from it all?

In this next section of questions, I will ask you to describe four different situations you may have experienced.

Interview question 2a. Please think about a person you work with directly who tends to share your beliefs about motivation. Can you describe for me a situation where you were successful in motivating them? How was this helpful?

Interview question 2b. Still thinking about the same person; can you describe for me a situation where you were not successful motivating them? What were the difficulties?

Interview question 3a. Now I'd like you to consider a person who you work with directly who does not tend to share your beliefs about motivation. Can you describe for me a situation where you were successful in motivating them? How was this helpful?

Interview question 3b. Still thinking about the same person; can you describe for me a situation where you were not successful motivating them? What were the difficulties?

Note to researcher: Probe the informants for "examples, elaborations, and clarifications…[while simultaneously] assessing whether essential features of the phenomenon are being described adequately" (Becker, 1992, p. 40). Use Bogdan and Taylor's recommended asking follow-up questions such as:

> Can you describe what the place looked like?
> How did you feel at that time?
> Can you remember what you said then?
> Can you give me an example of that?
> What did you mean by that?
> I'm still not clear on that. What happened exactly? (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975, p. 114)

Note to researcher: During the interview process any of the proposed interview questions in chapter three may be drawn upon in an effort to obtain more detailed information. Before concluding the interview, review Becker's (1992) suggestions:

> Do I feel that I can summarize the essential aspects of this phenomenon for this person? Have I got enough examples and details? Can the person say anything else about this aspect of the phenomenon? Do experiences of the phenomenon exist that he or she has not mentioned yet? (p. 41)

Note to researcher: Ask additional questions as needed.

If necessary, may I contact with follow up questions? In the next month I will send you a brief summary of our interview. You will need to review the summary and let me know if it is an accurate reflection of your thoughts. Do you know anyone else who would be a good candidate to participate in my study? Thank you for taking the time to participate in my study.

Researcher's post interview reflections:

Questions:

Insights:

Challenges:

APPENDIX C

Expert Panelists' Biographies

This study’s interview questions were reviewed by a panel of three experts with relevant content knowledge. The expert panel included: Dr. Robert Kaufman, Dr. Wilfred M. McClay, and Dr. Kent Rhodes. Their biographies follow.

Robert G. Kaufman, J.D., Ph.D.

Robert G. Kaufman is a political scientist specializing in American foreign policy, national security, international relations, and various aspects of American politics. Kaufman received his JD from Georgetown University Law School in Washington, D.C., and his BA, MA, M. Phil., and PhD from Columbia University in the city of New York.

Kaufman has written frequently for scholarly journals and popular publications, including *The Weekly Standard, Policy Review*, *The Washington Times,* the *Baltimore Sun*, *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, and the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer.* He is the author of three books. His most recent book *In Defense of the Bush Doctrine* was published by the University Press of Kentucky in May 2007. In 2000, his biography, *Henry M Jackson: A Life in Politics* received the Emil and Katherine Sick Award for the best book on the history of the Pacific Northwest. His first book*, Arms Control During the Prenuclear Era,* which Columbia University Press published, studied the interwar naval treaties and their linkage to the outbreak of World War II in the Pacific. Kaufman also assisted President Richard M. Nixon in the research and writing of Nixon's final Book, *Beyond Peace.* He is currently in the research phase of a biography of President Ronald Reagan, focusing on his presidency and his quest for it.

Kaufman is a former Bradley Scholar and current adjunct scholar at the Heritage Foundation. He has taught at Colgate University, The Naval War College, and the University of Vermont. ("Pepperdine University School of Public Policy: Meet the Faculty," 2004-2009)

Wilfred M. McClay, Ph.D.

Wilfred M. McClay is the SunTrust Bank Chair of Excellence in Humanities at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, where he is also professor of history, since 1999. He is Senior Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC, Senior Fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center, and has served since 2002 on the National Council on the Humanities. Among his books is The Masterless: Self and Society in Modern America, which won the Merle Curti Award of the Organization of American Historians.

McClay was Fulbright Senior Lecturer in American Studies for Spring 2007 at the University of Rome, and has been the recipient of fellowships from the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Academy of Education, the Howard Foundation, the Earhart Foundation, and the Danforth Foundation. He serves on the editorial boards of First Things, Wilson Quarterly, Society, and The New Atlantis, and is a frequent contributor to a wide variety of both scholarly and general-interest publications. He was educated at St. John's College (Annapolis) and the John's Hopkins University, where he received a Ph.D. in history in 1987. ("Pepperdine University School of Public Policy: Meet the Faculty," 2004-2009)

Kent Rhodes, Ed.D.

Dr. Rhodes teaches courses in organizational behavior and ethics. He is the ombudsman for the Graduate School of Education and Psychology and he maintains a consulting practice, coaching executive teams through merger and acquisition integration strategies. Dr. Rhodes founded and served as chief executive officer of OnCourse Network, Inc., an Internet distance education company. He successfully negotiated the sale of the company to a Silicon Valley publicly traded corporation and subsequently served as a principal with that company in San Jose, California until successfully completing its acquisition and integration strategies in 2001, when he joined the Pepperdine faculty. He holds membership in the American Management Association and the Industrial/Organizational Psychology Division with the American Psychological Association, Academy of Management, and the United States Ombudsman Association. His research interests include how concepts of mercy and justice are enacted within values-based organizations, ethical leadership, interaction of systems and culture on individual values and faith formation, and mergers and acquisitions integrations as ethical strategies. ("Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology: Meet the Faculty," 2004-2009)

APPENDIX D

Supplemental Information Provided to the Expert Panel

Dear Professor [redacted],

Thank you again for agreeing to serve on the Expert Panel for the interview questions I am developing for my dissertation.

Attached please find the Expert Panel Evaluation of Interview Questions Form. Please type directly into the Word document with your feedback, save, and email back to me. Again, I anticipate this process should take no longer than one hour. For your convenience, I have also attached a copy of a Table from Sowell's *The Vision of the Anointed* that quickly outlines the differences between the Tragic Vision (constrained paradigm) and The Vision of the Anointed (unconstrained paradigm).

I would appreciate it if I could get your feedback no later than Jan 29th, 2010. If you do not think this is possible, please let me know when you anticipate being able to complete the evaluation.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thanking you in advance for your help.

Kindest regards,
Jennifer Darling

Sowell’s (1995) Underlying Paradigms presented schematically:

	THE TRAGIC VISION [CONSTRAINED]	THE VISION OF THE ANNOINTED [UNCONSTRAINED]
Human capability	severely and inherently limited for all	vast for the anointed
Social possibilities	trade-offs that leave many "unmet needs"	solutions to problems
Social causation	systemic	deliberate
Freedom	exemption from the power of others	ability to achieve goals
Justice	process rules with just characteristics	Just (equalized) chances or results
Knowledge	consists largely of the unarticulated experiences of the many	consists largely of the articulated intelligence of the more educated few
Specialization	highly desirable	highly questionable
Motivation	incentives	dispositions
Process costs	crucial	incidental
Decision-making mechanism preferred	systemic processes that convey the experiences and revealed preferences of the many	deliberate plans that utilize the special talents and more advanced views of the few
Kinds of decisions preferred	incremental	categorical

Sowell, T. (1995). The vision of the anointed: Self-congratulations as a basis for social policy. New York: Basic Books (p. 105).

APPENDIX E

Expert Panel Evaluation of Proposed Interview Questions Form

The research questions for my dissertation are as follows:

1. What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?
2. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?
3. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?

In the tables below, I have listed the prospective interview questions I have developed to gain answers to these three research questions. Interview questions 1a through 1f (inclusive of their sub-questions) are aligned with my first research question, while interview questions 2a through 2c are aligned with my second research question, and interview questions 3a through 3d (inclusive of their sub-questions) are aligned with my third research question.

Instructions:

Below each prospective interview question are three options: a) "Supports research question # as written," b) "Does not support research question # (remove question)," and c) "Modify, as suggested below." Please read each interview question and compare it to the research question with which it is intended to be aligned. Then, please place an "X" to the right of the option you believe is appropriate.

If you have any questions regarding this process, please do not hesitate to contact me via email, [redacted] or by phone at [redacted]. Your time, support and input regarding this process are greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Research Question 1. What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?	**EXPERT PANELIST OPINON**
Aligned Interview Questions:	
1a. Could you describe what motivated or inspired you to found your business?	
a) Supports research question 1 as written	
b) Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
c) Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
1b. Could you describe how you perceive yourself in terms of your need for achievement?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
1c. Could you describe how you would be most effectively motivated if you worked for someone else?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
1di. To motivate people, what kind of stories do you tell?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	

1dii. How do you demonstrate support of a vision: use of incentives or use of intrinsic rewards?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
1diii. In motivating others, what is most important hard work or efficient, effective work?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
1ei. Generally speaking, are your views of the future organizational potential more optimistic or more pessimistic?	
Supports a research question 1 as written	
Does not support a research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
1eii. Could you provide an example?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	

1fi. In an ideal world how would you prefer to motivate people within your organization?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
1fii. In the real world to what extent do you find these ideal approaches can or cannot be used?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
Research Question 2. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar motivational paradigms to their own?	**EXPERT PANELIST OPINON**
Aligned Interview Questions:	
2a. Could you describe how effective you feel you are in motivating employees whose beliefs regarding motivation that are similar to your own views?	
Supports research question 2 as written	
Does not support research question 2 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
2b. What are the benefits of working with someone in your organization who has a similar motivational style as your own?	
Supports research question 2 as written	
Does not support research question 2 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	

2c. What would you say are the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who has a similar motivational style as your own?	
Supports research question 2 as written	
Does not support research question 2 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
Research Question 3. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing motivational paradigms from their own?	**EXPERT PANELIST OPINON**
Aligned Interview Questions:	
3a. Could you describe how effective you feel you are in motivating employees whose beliefs regarding motivation differ from your own views?	
Supports research question 3 as written	
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
3b. What are the benefits of working with someone in your organization who has a different motivational style than your own?	
Supports research question 3 as written	
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
3c. What would you say are the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who has a different motivational style than your own?	
Supports research question 3 as written	
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	

3di. Could you describe how authentically you are able to lead when motivating employees within your organization who are motivated by a different means than you prefer?	
Supports research question 3 as written	
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
3dii. If differences exist, please describe how you are able to reconcile those differences?	
Supports research question 3 as written	
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	

APPENDIX F

Merged Expert Panel Feedback

Research Question 1. What are selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms?	**EXPERT PANELIST OPINON**
Aligned Interview Questions:	
1a. Could you describe what motivated or inspired you to found your business?	
a) Supports research question 1 as written	McClay; Kaufman – yes but…; Rhodes
b) Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
c) Modify, as suggested below	
Modification: Kaufman: Good question, but I would start with two preliminary questions that provide a foundation for asking what follows? What inspired you to pursue a career in business rather than the public sector or any other alternative realm? What are your first principles about how the business word operates and how to succeed in it? What incentives and disincentives do people operating in the business world need to succeed? What are the obstacles to success --- intrinsic and extrinsic?	
1b. Could you describe how you perceive yourself in terms of your need for achievement?	
Supports research question 1 as written	McClay; Rhodes
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	Kaufman
Modification: Kaufman: Can you describe what motivates you as a business person? Rhodes: You might consider changing your questions so they can't be answered with "yes" or "no". "Please describe…" is a good, direct way to phrase these kinds of questions.	

1c. Could you describe how you would be most effectively motivated if you worked for someone else?	
Supports research question 1 as written	McClay
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	Kaufman; Rhodes
Modification: Kaufman: How would an employer best motivate you if you worked for someone else. I wonder if this question is not specific enough to be easily answered. Maybe something more like, “if applicable, please describe how you were best motivated in the past when you worked for someone else” This also gives them a tangible point of reference instead of having to guess about how they might respond in that setting which could lessen the quality of your responses and research data.	
1di. To motivate people, what kind of stories do you tell?	
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	McClay; Kaufman; Rhodes
Modification: McClay: Not clear what you are asking for. Do employers generally “tell stories”? I think you need to modify this, to clarify what you are looking for. Kaufman: What are your methods for motivating your employees? Do you use inspirational examples, stories, cautionary tales or a combination of all three to motivate them? Is there a generic approach for motivation? Or do different types of employees respond best to different types of incentives? Rhodes: I’m not sure that your assumption that people who motivate, tell stories, so you might start with that. “Managers who motivate, often use stories to do so. What kind of stories do you tell?”	

1dii. How do you demonstrate support of a vision: use of incentives or use of intrinsic rewards?	Kaufman
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	McClay; Rhodes
Modification: McClay: What do you mean by "support of a vision"? And are incentives or intrinsic rewards the only possibilities? What about personal example? Kaufman: Define your terms. What do you mean by an incentive versus an intrinsic reward. What combination of incentives and intrinsic rewards do you employ? Provide examples. Rhodes: Rhodes: Add brief examples of what you mean my incentives and intrinsic rewards… OR just ask, how do you use incentives and intrinsic rewards to motivate employees. Can you describe how these support your organization's vision? 1diii. In motivating others, what is most important hard work or efficient, effective work?	
Supports research question 1 as written	Rhodes
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	McClay; Kaufman
Modification: McClay: This is a bit tendentious. No one is going to support inefficient or ineffective work. You need to think about what you are really asking here. Kaufman: This is a non-question. Everyone will encourage productive work rather than hard work. Everyone will encourage their employees to work smart, with hard work as a derivative of it, but not an end in itself. Is hard work an end in itself, or productive work? What is your metric for measuring an employee's performance?	

1ei. Generally speaking, are your views of the future organizational potential more optimistic or more pessimistic?	
Supports a research question 1 as written	
Does not support a research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	McClay; Kaufman; Rhodes
Modification: McClay: You mean "the organization's future potential," correct? Kaufman: What views of about the nature of people inform the way in which you structure and operate your organization? Do you assume the best, the worst, somewhere in between? How does that affect the way in which you operate your business and structure incentives and disincentive? Rhodes: You might be clearer about what you mean by "potential" Generally speaking, do you view your organization's future potential (growth, earnings) more optimistically or more pessimistically? Why?	
1eii. Could you provide an example?	
Supports research question 1 as written	Rhodes
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	McClay
Modification: McClay: An example of what? Clarify! Kaufman (Skipped this question)	
1fi. In an ideal world how would you prefer to motivate people within your organization?	Rhodes
Supports research question 1 as written	
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	McClay; Kaufman
Modification: McClay: Leave off "in an ideal world," which confuses things. Kaufman: irst, you have to elicit their views of the world, which are probably non-utopian in the first place. See Sowell. Then you ask, based on that answer, how best practicably to motivate employees.	

1fii. In the real world to what extent do you find these ideal approaches can or cannot be used?	
Supports research question 1 as written	Rhodes
Does not support research question 1 (remove question)	Kaufman
Modify, as suggested below	McClay
Modification: McClay: Say, “your preferred approaches” rather than “ideal” Kaufman: See above	
Research Question 2. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar paradigms to their own?	**EXPERT PANELIST OPINON**
Aligned Interview Questions:	
2a. Could you describe how effective you feel you are in motivating employees whose beliefs regarding motivation that are similar to your own views?	
Supports research question 2 as written	McClay
Does not support research question 2 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	Kaufman; Rhodes
Modification: Kaufman: What methods work best overall for motivating employees? What methods succeed best with employees sharing the world view of the entrepreneur (how do you measure that by the way)? What methods work least well with all types of employees, and why. Here you need some methodology for identifying congruence in world views, and divergence in world views, among employees and employer. Here you need some set of questions to elicit whether congruent world view is a critical variable, whether and how employers try to instill the requisite commonality, and how employers motivate, or terminate, when world views diverge, or whether employers adopt other alternative methods for dealing with employees who operate differently. Rhodes: Think about employees who may share similar beliefs with yours about motivation. Please describe how effective you think you are in motivating them?	

2b. What are the benefits of working with someone in your organization who has a similar motivational style as your own?	
Supports research question 2 as written	McClay; Rhodes
Does not support research question 2 (remove question)	Kaufman
Modify, as suggested below	Rhodes
Modification: Kaufman: : Is working with someone who has a similar motivational style a critical variable in your effectiveness and the performance of your company? Rhodes: Not sure what you might mean by "motivational style"… is this defined for respondents somewhere?	
2c. What would you say are the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who has a similar motivational style as your own?	Rhodes
Supports research question 2 as written	McClay
Does not support research question 2 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification: Kaufman (no box checked): What are the limitations of working with someone with a shared world view? Do you need enough diversity in approaches to take into account the wide variety of employee types?	
Research Question 3. What do California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing paradigms from their own?	**EXPERT PANELIST OPINON**
Aligned Interview Questions:	
3a. Could you describe how effective you feel you are in motivating employees whose beliefs regarding motivation differ from your own views?	
Supports research question 3 as written	McClay; Kaufman
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	Rhodes
Modification: Rhodes: See 2a	

3b. What are the benefits of working with someone in your organization who has a different motivational style than your own?	
Supports research question 3 as written	McClay; Kaufman
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	Rhodes
Modification: Rhodes: See 2b	
3c. What would you say are the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who has a different motivational style than your own?	
Supports research question 3 as written	McClay; Kaufman; Rhodes
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	
Modification:	
3di. Could you describe how authentically you are able to lead when motivating employees within your organization who are motivated by a different means than you prefer?	
Supports research question 3 as written	
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	McClay; Rhodes
Modification: McClay: Not sure what you mean by "authentically." Do you mean "effectively"? Kaufman (no box checked): What does the word authentically mean here? How effectively can you motivate employees who do not respond best to your preferred method of motivation? Or generically how do you motivate different types of people, including those who respond to different motivations than you prefer to employ? Rhodes: Not sure what "authentically you are able to lead" means…	

3dii. If differences exist, please describe how you are able to reconcile those differences?	
Supports research question 3 as written	McClay; Rhodes
Does not support research question 3 (remove question)	
Modify, as suggested below	McClay; Kaufman
Modification: McClay: This is a good question, but it doesn't admit of a simple one-phrase answer in many cases. Kaufman: This questions assumes a conclusion. One way of dealing with differences is to figure out what motivates certain people and go with that. You should read some of the literature on successful baseball managers, basketball and football coaches for this.	

APPENDIX G

Pilot Interview Questions

Mr. Clark, a California small business founder, was asked to primarily give feedback on the clarity of each of the pilot questions and then briefly answer each of the pilot questions. The pilot questions follows.

Pilot question 1a. Describe for me, if you would, what motivated or inspired you to found your business?

Pilot question 1b. Describe for me, if you would, the freedom your employees have to make meaningful contributions in their professional lives.

Pilot question 1c. If you worked for someone else, describe for me how you would be most effectively motivated?

Pilot question 1di. Managers who motivate, often use stories to do so. Describe for me, if you would, the kind of stories you tell to motivate your employees?

Pilot question 1dii. Describe for me, if you would, how you use incentives to motivate your employees? Can you describe how these incentives support your organization's vision?

Pilot question 1diii. Another way employers motivate their employees is by appealing to their inherent desire to make a contribution to the organization: to do what is best for the company. Describe for me, if you would, how this applies in your organization?

Pilot question 1ei. Describe for me, if you would, your views regarding your industry's potential for growth.

Pilot question 1eii. Describe for me, if you would, how does that potential for growth affect the way you operate your business and structure your incentives and disincentives?

Pilot question 2ai. Please think about employees who may share similar beliefs as yours about motivation. Describe for me, if you would, your approach for leading them?

Pilot question 2aii. Describe for me, if you would, how effective you feel you are in motivating employees who share beliefs similar to yours regarding motivation?

Pilot question 2b. Describe for me, if you would, the benefits of working with someone in your organization who shares beliefs similar to yours regarding motivation?

Pilot question 2c. Describe for me, if you would, the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who shares beliefs similar to yours regarding motivation?

Pilot question 3ai. Please think about employees who may have beliefs about motivation that differ from your beliefs. Describe for me, if you would, your approach for leading them?

Pilot question 3aii. Describe for me, if you would, how effective you feel you are in motivating employees with beliefs that differ from your own?

Pilot question 3b. Describe for me, if you would, what are the benefits of working with someone in your organization who do not share your beliefs regarding motivation?

Pilot question 3c. Describe for me, if you would, the drawbacks of working with someone in your organization who does not share your beliefs regarding motivation?

APPENDIX H

Pilot Biography

This study's interview questions were piloted by Mr. Aaron J. Clark, CFP®, AAMS®, a California small business founder. Mr. Clark was asked to focus his feedback primarily on the clarity of the question and then briefly answer the question. His biography follows.

> Aaron Clark is the President and Chief Executive Officer of Monarch Wealth Strategies. He is also the Principal and Co-Founder. Mr. Clark is responsible for the direction, strategy, and focus of the firm.
>
> Santa Barbara native Mr. Clark graduated with honors from San Diego State University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice Administration and a minor in Sociology. In 2003, his career began at A. G. Edwards & Sons, Inc., which operated as a full-service securities broker-dealer in the United States and Europe. Mr. Clark was duly recognized as being one of the firm's top financial consultants while working with high net worth individuals. He was employed by Wachovia Securities, LLC after their acquisition of A. G. Edwards & Sons in 2007. Mr. Clark realized the need for an independent, objective, and trustworthy financial firm that would personalize the experience for high net worth individuals. In 2008, Monarch Wealth Strategies was born.
>
> Understanding the importance of education in the financial planning arena, Mr. Clark has made an adamant effort to perpetually improve his credentials. He is currently working on his Master of Science degree in Personal Financial Planning. In 2008, he passed the CFP® (CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER™) National Board Examination and is currently CFP® certified. He earned his designation as an AAMS® (Accredited Asset Management Specialist) in 2004. Mr. Clark also possesses the following industry registrations as an LPL Wealth Consultant: General Securities Principal (Series 24), General Securities Representative (Series 7), Uniform Combined State Law (Series 66), and California Life and Health Insurance License (California Insurance License #0E44777).
>
> Being passionate about protecting his clients and advocating positive change in the financial industry, Mr. Clark is a member of the Financial Abuse Specialist Team for Santa Barbara County. He also serves on the Board of the Montecito Rotary Club. Mr. Clark is an active athlete and enjoys spending his free time traveling the world ("Monarch Wealth Strategies™: Our Team," 2010).

APPENDIX I

Mock Interview Biography

In order to further prepare the researcher as an interviewer, the final interview questions were given a trial run during a mock interview. Dr. Greenlinger volunteered to participate in the mock interview with the intent to give the researcher feedback on her interviewing technique. Dr. Greenlinger is a representative of the target population; however data was not collected from this individual for the purpose of answering the research questions. Dr. Greenlinger is a member of the researcher's cohort in Pepperdine University's organizational leadership doctoral program.

Ken Greenlinger, Ed.D. was born in New York and moved to California approximately 35 years ago. Dr. Greenlinger holds a B.S. in Bio-Medical Engineering from the New York Institute of Technology and has earned two graduate degrees from Pepperdine University; an M.B.A. and Ed.D. in Organizational Leadership. Dr. Greenlinger has always worked in the health care industry. Dr. Greenlinger has served on the board of a community hospital. Likewise, Dr. Greenlinger also served as the President of a hospital foundation. In 1982 he founded Valley Home Medical Supply in the Los Angeles basin. In 1995 he moved the company to a larger facility. In 1998 the building burnt down and Dr. Greenlinger rebuilt his company. Today, in the role of Chief Executive Officer, Dr. Greenlinger leads Valley Home Medical Supply through a rapidly changing marketplace.

APPENDIX J

Invitation to Participate

Dear [Potential Participant],

My name is Jennifer Darling. I am requesting your assistance in a doctoral dissertation study I am completing at the Graduate School of Education and Psychology at Pepperdine University. The purpose of this research is tri-fold. This study first examines selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms (e.g. preferences for intrinsic or extrinsic rewards). Second, this study determines what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar paradigms to their own. Finally, this study identifies what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing paradigms from their own.

I wish to conduct an in-depth, semi-structured interview with you. The audio of the interview will be recorded. I anticipate the interview will take no more than 90 minutes. I pledge to be respectful of your time. Participation in the study is voluntary and you have the right to refuse to answer any question. After the interview is concluded I might contact you with a few follow up questions for clarification. Within one month of conducting the interview I will send you a brief summary of the interview. I will request that you review the brief summary and let me know whether the summary provides an accurate reflection of your beliefs regarding motivation or not. This project has been reviewed by the Graduate School of Education and Psychology at Pepperdine University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Please advise me of the best way to arrange a meeting with you, at your office or at a mutually agreed upon location. Please let me know if you have any questions or wish to discuss this study further.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration.

Regards,
Jennifer Darling, MBA
Doctoral Candidate
Graduate School of Education & Psychology
Pepperdine University

APPENDIX K

Informed Consent

A Phenomenological Study of California Small Business Founders' Motivational Paradigms

I, ________________________________, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Jennifer Darling under the direction of Dr. John McManus, Pepperdine University.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this research is tri-fold. This study first examines selected California small business founders' motivational paradigms (e.g. preferences for intrinsic or extrinsic rewards). Second, this study determines what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have similar paradigms to their own. Finally, this study identifies what California small business founders describe as the benefits and limitations of motivating employees of their organization who have differing paradigms from their own.

Duration of the Study
The study will consist of an in-depth, semi-structured interview and will be conducted at the office of the participant or a mutually agreed upon location. Each interview will last approximately 90 minutes.

Procedures
The study will consist of a brief qualifying survey followed by an in-depth, semi-structured interview. There will be no risk or discomfort. First, participants will discuss in an exploratory manner their paradigms regarding motivation. Then, participants will describe their experience motivating employees with similar and differing views. Participation is strictly voluntary. Participants have the right to refuse to answer any question they choose not to answer. After the interview is concluded participants may be contacted and asked additional questions for clarification. Within one month of the interview each participant will be sent a brief summary of their interview. It will be requested that the participant review the summary and assess whether or not it provides an accurate reflection of their beliefs regarding motivation. If necessary, the participant may also provide corrections.

Risks
The researcher anticipates no physical, mental, emotional or professional risks to the participant.

Benefits
Benefits to the participants in the study may include a greater understanding of how they themselves are motivated and how they perceive themselves motivating others with similar and/or differing views.

Alternatives
No alternative courses of action exist.

Confidentiality
The researcher will maintain both the audio files of the interview and transcripts digitally. Any and all research records, including research notes, will be kept in a single password protected computer during the research and data analysis. Any working papers that may be printed will be promptly destroyed. The digital records will be maintained for a minimum of five years after which they may be deleted. Measures will be taken to protect the confidentiality of the participants and their small business' identity. Brief quotations or descriptions from the data may be used to illustrate a point in Chapter IV: Research Findings and Chapter V: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations; however the participant and their small business' identity will remain confidential.

Compensation
There is no compensation for participation in the study.

Contact Person
If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I may contact Dr. John McManus, the faculty advisor for this study at (310) 568-5600 or Dr. Doug Leigh, the chairperson of the Pepperdine University Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB) at (310) 568-2389.

Any additional questions regarding the research should be directed to:
Jennifer Darling, MBA
Doctoral Candidate
Graduate School of Education & Psychology
Pepperdine University
[redacted]
Cell [redacted]

____ ________________
Participant's signature Date

APPENDIX L

Coding Auditor Biography

LaRon Doucet, Ed.D., volunteered to be the coding auditor for this study. Dr. Doucet is a member of the researcher's cohort in Pepperdine University's organizational leadership doctoral program.

Dr. Doucet has worked in engineering and manufacturing since December of 1985. In recent years Dr. Doucet served as Project Lead for both Power Supply Magnetics and Sub-Contracts. He also served as the Precision Cleaning subject matter expert. Currently Dr. Doucet works as an Engineering subject matter expert. Dr. Doucet's duties include insuring performance to budget and schedule as well as compliance to customer requirements for both manufacturing and test. His additional duties include coordinating deliverables with program schedule, test flow, test plans, hardware configuration, budgets, financial earned value and coordinating outside vendors. Dr. Doucet is fluent in French and speaks conversational Spanish. Dr. Doucet enjoys teaching martial arts, horseback riding and fishing.

APPENDIX M

Informant Verification

Dear [Informant],

I want to thank you again for participating in my research.

Would you please take a few moments to look over the summary I have provided? Please email me and let me know if you feel the summary is an accurate reflection of your beliefs regarding motivation or not. If needed, please provide me with correction(s) to increase the accuracy of the summary. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or if you wish to discuss the summary.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance.

Kindest regards,
Jennifer Darling, MBA
Doctoral Candidate
Graduate School of Education & Psychology
Pepperdine University

APPENDIX N

Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams Completion Certificate

Completion Certificate

This is to certify that

Jennifer darling

has completed the **Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams** online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 09/15/2004.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.

National Institutes of Health
http://www.nih.gov

APPENDIX O

Institutional Review Board Approval

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board

June 28, 2010

Jennifer Darling
[redacted]

Protocol #: E0610D03
Project Title: ***A Phenomenological Study of California Small Business Founders' Worldviews Regarding Motivation***

Dear Ms. Darling:

Thank you for submitting your application, *A Phenomenological Study of California Small Business Founders' Worldviews Regarding Motivation,* for exempt review to Pepperdine University's Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB). The IRB appreciates the work you and your faculty advisor, Dr. Doug Leigh, have done on the proposal. The IRB has reviewed your submitted IRB application and all ancillary materials. Upon review, the IRB has determined that the above entitled project meets the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations (45 CFR 46 - http://www.nihtraining.com/ohsrsite/guidelines/45cfr46.html) that govern the protections of human subjects. Specifically, section 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) states:

> (b) Unless otherwise required by Department or Agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:
>
> **Category (2) of 45 CFR 46.101**, research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: a) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit a **Request for Modification Form** to the GPS IRB. Because your study falls under exemption, there is no requirement for continuing IRB review of your project. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exemption from 45 CFR 46.101 and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the GPS IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the GPS IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the GPS IRB and the appropriate form to be used to report this information can be found in the *Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual* (see link to "policy material" at http://www.pepperdine.edu/irb/graduate/).

6100 Center Drive, Los Angeles, California 90045 ▪ 310-568-5600

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all further communication or correspondence related to this approval. Should you have additional questions, please contact me. On behalf of the GPS IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,

Jean Kang

Jean Kang
Manager, GPS IRB & Dissertation Support
Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education & Psychology
6100 Center Dr. 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
jean.lee@pepperdine.edu
W: 310-568-5753
F: 310-568-5755

cc: Dr. Lee Kats, Associate Provost for Research & Assistant Dean of Research, Seaver College
Dr. Doug Leigh, Chair, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB
Ms. Jean Kang, Manager, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB
Ms. Christie Dailo

APPENDIX P

Copyright Permissions

From: Rights, Domestic [mailto:Domestic.Rights@perseusbooks.com]
Sent: Fri 3/5/2010 8:18 AM
To: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Subject: RE: Thesis/Dissertation Use and the UMI/DAI repository

Hi Jennifer,

You should be fine to include the thesis in the UMI/DAI repository. Re-use of book material in a thesis is gratis simply because it's not our aim to make doctoral candidates, etc. pay reprint fees. Rightslink exists to charge money for re-use in academic textbooks, trade books, and the like, whereas theses are read by a specific, limited audience. So it's no problem to have them kept in a database.

Hope that helps clear up the matter.

Best,

Permissions Dept.
The Perseus Books Group

From: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 5:27 PM
To: Permissions
Subject: Thesis/Dissertation Use and the UMI/DAI repository

Permissions Coordinator
Basic Books
A Member of the Perseus Books Group
Eleven Cambridge Center
Cambridge, MA 02142

Dear Permissions Coordinator,

Enclosed is a copy of the Thesis/Dissertation Use statement issued by Rights Link - Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. Please be aware a majority of thesis and dissertations written are maintained in the UMI/DAI repository. I called the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. to determine if the UMI/DAI repository is covered by Thesis/Dissertation Use statement. The person I spoke with said that I would have to contact the publisher directly to determine if the UMI/DAI repository is covered by the Thesis/Dissertation Use statement. Therefore, please let me know if the UMI/DAI repository (where my dissertation will be maintained) is covered by the Thesis/Dissertation Use statement.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Regards,

Jennifer Darling
Pepperdine University Doctoral Student
[redacted]

Rightslink® by Copyright Clearance Center

Powered by RIGHTSLINK COPYRIGHT CLEARANCE CENTER, INC. | Home | Create Account | Help

THE PERSEUS BOOKS GROUP

Title: The Vision of the Anointed Self-Congratulation as a Basis for Social Policy
Author: Thomas Sowell
Publication: Book
Publisher: Perseus Books Group
Date: 1996

User ID

Password

Enable Auto Login

LOGIN

Forgot Password/User ID?

If you're a copyright.com user, you can login to Rightslink using your copyright.com credentials.

Already **a Rightslink user** or want to learn more?

Thesis / Dissertation Use

Provided the material is original to our book and this is for limited dissertation distribution only (i.e., 12 copies or users maximum), you have our permission to use the material. Should you wish to publish your dissertation in the future, you would need to return to the Perseus website and use Rightslink again at that time for further permission.

BACK | CLOSE WINDOW

From: Kaufman, Robert
Sent: Mon 6/28/2010 3:55 PM
To: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Subject: RE: Copyright Permission

Sure.

-----Original Message-----
From: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Sent: Mon 6/28/2010 3:45 PM
To: Kaufman, Robert; McClay, Wilfred M; Rhodes, Kent
Subject: Copyright Permission

Hello Professor Kaufman, Professor McClay, and Professor Rhodes,

I would like to thank you again for being a member of my expert panel for my doctoral research. I am requesting permission to reprint your biography (located in the School of Public Policy's website or the Graduate School of Education and Psychology's website) in the Appendices of my dissertation.

Please let me know if this is acceptable to you. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Kindest regards,
Jennifer Darling
Pepperdine University Doctoral Candidate
[redacted]

From: Wilfred McClay
Sent: Mon 6/28/2010 3:53 PM
To: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Subject: RE: Copyright Permission

No problem. Feel free. And congratulations on the successful completion of your dissertation!

WM

From: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 6:46 PM
To: Kaufman, Robert; McClay, Wilfred M; Rhodes, Kent
Subject: Copyright Permission

Hello Professor Kaufman, Professor McClay, and Professor Rhodes,

I would like to thank you again for being a member of my expert panel for my doctoral research. I am requesting permission to reprint your biography (located in the School of Public Policy's website or the Graduate School of Education and Psychology's website) in the Appendices of my dissertation.

Please let me know if this is acceptable to you. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Kindest regards,

Jennifer Darling
Pepperdine University Doctoral Candidate
[redacted]

From: Rhodes, Kent
Sent: Mon 6/28/2010 3:51 PM
To: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Subject: Re: Copyright Permission

Absolutely, yes.

Kent

On Jun 28, 2010, at 3:45 PM, Darling, Jennifer (student) wrote:

Hello Professor Kaufman, Professor McClay, and Professor Rhodes,

I would like to thank you again for being a member of my expert panel for my doctoral research. I am requesting permission to reprint your biography (located in the School of Public Policy's website or the Graduate School of Education and Psychology's website) in the Appendices of my dissertation.

Please let me know if this is acceptable to you. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Kindest regards,

Jennifer Darling
Pepperdine University Doctoral Candidate
[redacted]

From: Huard, Megan
Sent: Tue 5/4/2010 1:55 PM
To: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Subject: Copyright Permission

Hi Jennifer,

Thanks for your note. Please contact the professors directly for permission to reprint the biographies. This will also give them the opportunity to updates the bios if necessary before print.

Please let me know if there's anything else I can help you with.

Best,
Megan

--
Megan Huard
Director of Content Development
University Communications
Pepperdine University
[redacted]

From: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Sent: Saturday, May 01, 2010 2:57 AM
To: Web Feedback, General
Subject: Copyright Permission

Pepperdine University
24255 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90263

To whom it may concern,

I am requesting permission to reprint biographies for Professor Kaufman, Professor McClay, and Professor Rhodes in the Appendix of my dissertation. Professor Kaufman and Professor McClay's biographies can be found on the School of Public Policy's website located at: http://publicpolicy.pepperdine.edu/academics/faculty/ Professor Kent Rhodes' biography can be found on the Graduate School of Education and Psychology's website located at: http://gsep.pepperdine.edu/welcome/faculty/default.htm?faculty=kent_rhodes

Please let me know if this is acceptable. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Kindest regards,

Jennifer Darling
Pepperdine University Doctoral Student
[redacted]

From: Aaron Clark [redacted]
Sent: Fri 4/30/2010 2:22 PM
To: Darling, Jennifer (student)
Subject: Re: Copyright Permission

Jennifer,

That should be fine.

Sincerely,

Aaron J. Clark, CFP®, AAMS®
President

Monarch Wealth Strategies™
[redacted]
http://www.monarchwealthstrategies.com

Securities offered through LPL Financial, Member FINRA/SIPC
LPL Wealth Consultant/CA Insurance License #0E44777

From: "Darling, Jennifer (student)"
Date: Fri, 30 Apr 2010 14:17:06 -0700
To: Aaron Clark [redacted]
Subject: Copyright Permission

Mr. Aaron J. Clark, CFP®, AAMS®
President & CEO
Monarch Wealth Strategies™
[redacted]

Dear Mr. Clark,

I am requesting permission to reprint your biography (located on Monarch Wealth Strategies' website at: http://www.monarchwealthstrategies.com/new/monarchwealthstrategies/) in an Appendix of my dissertation. Please let me know if this is acceptable.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Kindest regards,

Jennifer Darling
Pepperdine University Doctoral Student
[redacted]