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This study examined how management styles of supervisors in public parks and recreation influence their use of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Eighty-six supervisors from two midwestern states were asked to assess their management style and reward use. Management styles were measured using the Blake Mouton Management Grid, and reward use was measured using 24 rewards that were categorized as either intrinsic or extrinsic by a jury of researchers. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant interaction between management styles and reward use. This indicated that a person’s management style did not impact the types of rewards they chose to use. It was found that there were a preponderance of managers who considered themselves to be both highly people oriented and production oriented. This information lead to several discussion points related to the types of managers in public parks and recreation.
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Public park and recreation agencies face special management challenges in their day-to-day operations. They may have centrally controlled budgets, legislatively limited funding sources, continually expected to “do more with less”, and they are constantly accountable to the public and elected officials. Given the potential of these stressors, it is imperative to have motivated employees who meet the needs and expectations of the public. The perceived needs of individual employees differ as often as personalities differ. Deeprose (1994) suggests that what employees want most from their jobs is recognition for a job well done, and people who receive recognition tend to have higher self-esteem, more confidence, are more willing to take on new challenges, and are more eager to contribute new ideas to improve productivity. Even though research indicates recognition is a strong need, it is still appropriate to ask what makes these professionals continue to stay in the field, provide creative programs year after year, and work long hours for public level pay. More directly, what motivates parks and recreation professionals to come to work each day and contribute to the quality of life in their community? Blake and McCanse (1991) stated, “only when we have a means for understanding what motivates people can we expect to appreciate how leaders, others, and ourselves included, work with one another to get results” (p. 32). In addition, numerous authors (i.e. Rodney & Toalson, 1981; Kraus & Curtis, 1990; Culkin & Kirsch, 1986) have substantiated the fact that effective motivation is an essential component in the management of parks and recreation agencies. Furthermore, successful motivation is seen to have a multiplier effect. When one person in an organization is satisfied, this person affects the work and enthusiasm of those around them (Edginton, Neal, & Edington, 1989).

This study considered the importance of motivation in public parks and recreation by addressing what behaviorists label as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. There has been a long standing controversy between those who believe that desired behaviors are best reinforced by the work itself (intrinsic reinforcement) and those who believe that rewards and recognition are a
necessary condition to achieving desired outcomes (extrinsic reinforcement) (Deeprose, 1994; Eisenberger & Cameron, 1996; Kohn, 1993; Wilson, 1995). These motivators take many different forms. Extrinsic rewards entail things as simple as writing notes of appreciation, cash bonuses, extra vacation time, and trips. Those in favor of utilizing intrinsic rewards suggest that companies praise employees or redesign jobs and work conditions so people receive value from the work itself. This value gives individuals room for self-determination and personal fulfillment (Deci, 1975; Kohn, 1993; Wiersma, 1992; Wilson, 1995). The effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation have been a research conundrum for almost 30 years. A major contention is that if people are reinforced or rewarded for doing something that they like to do and already spend time doing, then they will be less intrinsically motivated to engage in that activity once the reward is removed. Other researchers contend that supplying a reward shifts the locus of causality from internal to external factors and heightens the perceived performance of the task (Tripathi & Agarwal, 1987). A third contention is that extrinsic rewards can, under specific conditions, heighten intrinsic motivation (Eisenberger & Cameron, 1996). However, based on seemingly overwhelming empirical evidence of the decremental effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation, the use of rewards to alter human behavior has been challenged in literature reviews, textbooks, and the popular media (Eisenberger & Cameron, 1996; Kohn in Kerr, 1997; Larwood, 1984; Lovrich, 1987). Since Deci’s 1971 study of intrinsic motivation, which was the first research that examined the negative effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation (Carton, 1996; Wiersma, 1992), scholars have presented both positive and negative data regarding the use of extrinsic rewards (Deeprose, 1994; Eisenberger & Cameron, 1996; Kohn, 1993; Wilson, 1995).

In addition to dichotomies of these motivational theories, it is important to understand the management styles of supervisors as they may influence the use of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Management theories can be viewed as a continuum of characteristics and styles. These commonly used characteristics give some definition to management styles that exist within the corresponding theories. Management theories can be categorized as classical/behavioral theories, human relations theories, and contemporary theories. These management styles are not a time line through the history of management, but a continuum of management practices that have evolved and changed with different organizational cultures. Each of these three categories of management styles has its own defining characteristics.

Traditional management styles encompass both Classical and Behavioral Management Theories (Aldag & Stearns, 1991; Kraus & Curtis, 1990). Classical management theories, developed with the emergence of the industrial revolution, focused on efficiency of productivity and the view that people work only for money. Rapid economic growth, following the boom in technology during this time period, prompted the further development of management theories that focused on human aspects. These theories had begun to be developed but were virtually ignored in order to focus on production efficiency (George, 1972). Called Behavioral Management Theories, these new ideas about the wants and needs of the workers emanated in the literature from such theorists as Taylor, (1911), Fayol (1916), Weber (1947). Although more modern theories have been developed, many practices from these developmental theories still exist.

Human relations management styles addressed a new set of problems that managers faced from the 1940’s through the early 1980’s. Humanist theorists such as Argyris (1957), Maslow (1970), and McGregor (1960) proposed that humans have a propensity to work and have certain
expectations from their work to satisfy needs that they have. As a result Theory X, Theory Y, Theory Z, Contingency Theory, and the Systems Theory emerged.

Explanations and descriptions of the contemporary management styles are rising from the works of Kouzes and Posner (1995), Block (1996), Drucker (1998), Deming (1986), Mintzberg (1989), and Covey (1991). These authors convey an eclectic perspective of where management is. Taken individually they provide minimal insight. When viewed as a collective, however, they demonstrate movement towards an emerging theory in management. Issues addressed by the authors include visionary thinking, empowerment, recognition, strength of individual leadership, and change (McLean, 1996).

Each of these theories has its own characteristics that can be measured using the Blake/Mouton Management Grid. This instrument, although not aligned with the three theoretical categories, has characteristics that are measured on a continuum and allow for variability of behaviors.

Considering motivational options and management styles, the challenge for park and recreation professionals is to determine and understand what drives human behavior within an organization. Secondly, it is imperative that managers also understand their own behavior and its effects on employees. Managerial style, whether it is traditional, human relations, or contemporary plays an instrumental role in the performance and motivation of employees.

The purpose of this study was to investigate how management styles, as measured by the Management Grid, influence a supervisor’s use of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards in public parks and recreation agencies.

Methodology

This study included supervisory level employees in public parks and recreation departments in two Midwest states. A systematic random sampling method was used to select 300 participants. Ninety-four supervisors completed and returned the survey with 86 being usable.

For this study the instrument must have the ability to measure both management styles and rewards use. Permission was granted by Scientific Methods, Inc. to use the Blake and Mouton Management Grid (Blake & McCanse, 1991). This Grid is based on the interaction of three concerns, 1) the concern for people, 2) the concern for production, results, or profits, and 3) the underlying motivation of employee behavior. The Managerial Grid questionnaire consists of six leadership elements and seven statements that depict different leadership approaches which respondents select as matching their own behaviors. The six elements include conflict solving, initiative, inquiry, advocacy, decision-making, and critique. Rank order responses to these statements allow respondents to determine their dominant and back-up management style. Once these statements were ranked, the researcher had to code the instrument and add the rankings to determine each individual management style. At the completion of this section, the respondent was unaware which statements indicated which type of management style, which management style they were labeled, what the management styles were, or what characteristics were indicative of each style.

Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards were measured using a list of 24 rewards that were developed from the literature (i.e. DeGraaf & Edginton, 1992; Edginton, Neal, & Edginton, 1989; & Lankford, Neal, and Buxton, 1992) and reviewed by a jury of experts. The rewards were evenly divided among intrinsic and extrinsic categories, and the five point Likert Scale responses were totaled. The totals resulted in an extrinsic score and an intrinsic score that were then compared to management styles. Since there was no clearly defined definition in the
literature as to what rewards should be classified as intrinsic and what rewards are extrinsic, the rewards were classified according to studies by Neal (1984), Edginton, Neal, and Edginton (1989), and Lankford, Neal, and Burton (1992). Between these three studies, all 24 rewards used in this study could be labeled as either intrinsic or extrinsic. The jury was also utilized to delineate in which of the seven categories each reward belonged as well as screening them for application to the field of parks and recreation. The 24 intrinsic and extrinsic rewards statements were evenly divided and listed alternately on the instrument. The researcher was capable of categorizing the rewards into intrinsic and extrinsic rewards based on the literature. The respondents were given a Likert scale from 1 to 5 on which they were requested to choose to what extent they agreed or disagreed with their use of the element described by the statement as a reward for their staff. A score of “one” represented strongly disagree with the statement and a “five” was strongly agree. The responses to the odd numbered statements were totaled and resulted in an extrinsic reward score, and the total from the even numbered statements determined the intrinsic reward score. It was only these total scores that were used and not individual reward statement scores because the purpose of the study was to examine rewards as intrinsic and extrinsic categories rather than as individual rewards. The total score possible for each section was 60 points.

Data Analysis

A repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the data in order to determine if there was a significant difference between the use of both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and management styles. It was determined that there was no difference (F (1,81) \( p = .341 \)) in how managers used these two types of rewards. Since there was no statistical significance between reward types, one can infer that people tend to balance the use of each type of reward when attempting to motivate their staff members.

When examining the interaction between management styles and reward use, there was no significant difference (F (3,81) = .473, \( p = .702 \)). Because the research question addresses the overall influence of rewards and management styles, the ANOVA in Table 1 examines the variables as a group rather than providing a breakdown of individual management styles. The results indicate that management styles do not influence the use of rewards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Rewards and Management Styles ANOVA Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards &amp; Management Style</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Distribution of Management Styles (N=86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>People/Productivity Orientation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>High productivity &amp; high people</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>Moderate productivity &amp; people</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+9</td>
<td>Combination of 9,1 &amp; 1,9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>Low productivity, high people</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>Low productivity, low people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>High productivity, low people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic</td>
<td>Combines Grid types</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was assumed that the sampling frame adhered to the assumption of normality. However, when management styles were calculated it was found that a preponderance of styles were labeled as 9,9. Blake and McCanse (1991) labeled this the Team Management Style and characterized it as “all for one, and one for all” (p. 200) because of its high concern for people and production. This group is able to integrate the two by involving people in determining the end product and the strategies for reaching this goal. These people expect staff members to make extraordinary contributions, participate in decision-making, as well as be committed to a team effort. The smallest categories of managers selected were the 1,1 (low productivity, low people), the 9,1 (high productivity, low people), and the Opportunistic Manager, which are all characterized by a low people orientation. Possible explanations for a large sector of 9,9 and a small sector of 1,1, 9,1, and Opportunistic management styles will be discussed further.

To measure the use of rewards, scores were obtained from responses to the 24 intrinsic and extrinsic rewards statements. Table 3 illustrates there were modest differences between the two individual scores as well as a relatively high mean for each reward. Three of the top five most used rewards were intrinsic, however, six of the top 10 are extrinsic in nature. It was found that the top ranked reward was “a fun work environment.” DeGraaf and Edginton (1992) found this to be the top reward desired by camp counselors who would be returning to work at the same camp in the future. In the Hoff, Ellis, and Crossley (1988) study, “having fun” was ranked number four and “learning new skills” was ranked number three as desired aspects in parks and recreation positions. In this study, “learning new skills was ranked just behind “having fun.”
Table 3

Rewards Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Reward (Reward Category)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A fun work environment (E)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Development of new skills through training &amp; education (I)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Appropriate equipment to do the job right (E)</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support attempts to balance home and work life (I)</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Autonomy to try new ideas (I)</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Publicly recognize staff (I)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Set clear performance standards for employees (E)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Enough full and part time staff to do the job right (E)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Flexible work schedules (E)</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Opportunities for interaction in a less formal atmosphere (E)</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Intrinsic rewards are denoted with (I) and extrinsic are denoted with (E)

Discussion

The results of the study indicate that overall a person’s management style does not influence the way they use rewards, and managers are not inclined to use one type of reward over the other. The lack of significant differences has led to several conclusions.

First, there is a concern that a vast majority of the respondents indicated they had a 9,9 (high productivity, high people) management style. This may suggest there is homogeneity in the types of people who choose to enter and stay in the parks and recreation profession. The results indicate that the managers view themselves as being both highly people oriented and highly product oriented. This could be an indication of the nature of public parks and recreation. It is a very demanding profession in terms of time and energy required by staff, and often the financial rewards are absent. However, could the motivation that attracts people to stay in the field come from the product they create and deliver as well as the people with whom they are involved? The motivation necessary to be a parks and recreation professional may emerge when determining management styles. A positive aspect of this homogeneity is that the manager is very people and product driven. It can also impact hiring and supervision of staff. A team-oriented manager should want to hire team-oriented staff in order for them to fit the culture of the agency that is being created. With a number of 9,9 managers, it may become quite easy to hire the same types of people as well as supervise everyone in the same manner because they have been labeled as a “people person” and team oriented. This type of manager likes to blend into the team in order to achieve the goals set by the entire group. In order to do this, the manager would need to be surrounded by people who were able to work with a group without close supervision and function with a large amount of freedom and creativity (Blake & McCanse, 1991), however, no matter how many 9,9 management styles appear in an organization, supervisors should use caution in administering the same management techniques for any two people on staff. A team
orientation does not license the manager to treat the team the same. The team management system can only work when people are treated as individuals. In addition, the 9,9 management style can also have an impact on how organizations are structured. This type of manager is very team oriented and works to collapse a hierarchy. Thus, a 9,9 manager would work best in a flat organization, or would strive to compress the levels within a hierarchical setting. If the findings in this study are any indication, parks and recreation is a field of team-oriented managers who are seeking team oriented managers.

A second conclusion that can be drawn from the data focuses on popular literature and training. In the past several years there has been a surge in creating stronger leaders rather than stronger managers. In doing so a plethora of books and educational training sessions have helped people understand how today’s ideal manager should behave. This study asked managers to rank their own behavior rather than asking their subordinates to rank them. There would most likely be some discrepancies between the perceptions of the manager and the staff members. With the structure of this study, it was unknown whether the managers actually do have the characteristics of the contemporary management theories or if they simply believe they do. These contemporary management theories align with the Blake Mouton 9,9 (high people and high productivity) management style, and the contemporary management styles were garnered from such current management authorities as Covey, Drucker, Deming, and Peters. The question is raised whether people in parks and recreation are homogenous or if they perceive themselves as behaving in a certain manner simply because they have been sensitized to the current literature on what makes a great leader.

A third reason for the non-significant results and a preponderance of 9,9 management styles could be that certain management styles automatically deselect themselves causing a non-response bias. Sixty-five percent (65%) of those in the initial sampling frame did not return the postcard in order to be included in the study. These individuals may have fallen into the under represented categories because of the characteristics prevalent in those categories. Furthermore, there were three management style categories in which there were extremely low responses. The 9,1, Authority-Compliance Management Style, and the Opportunistic management style had no respondents. Characteristics of the people in the 9,1 group includes high concern for productivity and low concern for people. Little attention is given to conflict, creativity or commitment, and this person is seen as a task master who implements a stringent supervisor/subordinate relationship where nothing matters but production and profit. The Opportunistic manager is extremely self-centered and always searching for relationships that advance their own careers (Blake & McCanse, 1991). The 9,1 group of managers would probably work best in a factory model with a distinct hierarchical operation and a focus on production. The Opportunistic managers, although they do exist, are probably not people who would be willing to stay in a flat organization where promotions and climbing the corporate ladder are very limited.

The third low response category, which had only one person, is the 1,1 (low productivity, low people) management style. This person is labeled as the impoverished manager, and has low concern for both people and production. This person puts people on jobs and leaves them alone, takes no responsibility for mistakes, and lets people create their own morale. They see themselves as a messenger to deliver orders from the top to people below without any explanation (Blake & McCance, 1991). The structure and culture of public parks and recreation may exclude the 1,1 manager for three reasons. First, there is a high level of government and public accountability. Parks and recreation produces services that are ever changing, and the field is not producing standardized products that can remain unmonitored and unchanged. There
are public expectations that must be met, and a detached manager would be unable to do the job to meet public standards if they were removed from the people and the product. A second reason for a low number of 1,1 managers is that parks and recreation is increasingly becoming entrepreneurial, and managers are incapable of ignoring their operations in hopes they will generate revenue and minimize expenditures. It takes involvement of managers and employees to grow and develop. Creativity, strategy, and direction for the future are instrumental in moving a public agency from a traditionally tax supported operation to one that is entrepreneurial in nature and able to redistribute resources among the different areas within the agency. Lastly, the 1,1 manager would most likely be in a hierarchical environment. Many parks and recreation agencies tend to be smaller and flatter than businesses, and a flat organization would eliminate the behavior demonstrated by a 1,1 manager. Furthermore, this type of manager would not be able to operate in such a way in a small organization. This person simply likes to carry orders from the top down, and operate as a detached middle person. As such a 1,1 manager may be a result of the size of the organization, and there are very few public parks and recreation agencies that would be large enough to facilitate such behavior.

The fourth reason for finding non-significant differences may be due to the low number of respondents in the study. Because there were very few managers in four of the five management styles, power could be an issue. Further support for this conclusion is that differences were found between the 5,5 (moderate productivity and people) and 9,9 (high productivity, high people) management styles. These were the two styles that had the highest number of respondents. Moreover, the characteristics of these two management styles are more closely related than any of the others. One would expect that the more different the characteristics of the managers, the more differently they utilize rewards. It is possible that if the other styles included more people, differences may have appeared.

Lastly, both of the states selected for the study have traditionally had strong public parks and recreation departments. These state associations have some of the largest memberships in the United States, and have been recognized repeatedly for their quality departments by receiving the prestigious National Gold Medal Awards for public parks and recreation, special recreation associations, and state parks. Because of the strength of the states, it may be suggested that strong departments are able to hire quality supervisors that are equally dedicated to the staff they supervise and the product they deliver. Further research should expand this study to examine any regional differences that may exist as well as any differences that could be attributed to the quality of an organization.

Further Research

There are several follow up studies that can be done in order to gain further knowledge regarding motivation and reward use. First, because this study relied on managers to disclose their own management styles, a study should be done that examines if the way managers perceive their own behavior is similar to how the employees perceive the manager’s behavior. There may be some differences that could impact how rewards are used. Second, further study should compare how managers perceive they use rewards to motivate their staff and how the staff member perceives their manager uses these rewards. Third, further study should examine if the types of employees the manager supervises influences management styles. The types of employees could include hourly clerical and support staff, salary professional staff, and hourly laborers. Because this study produced no statistically significant findings, it is suggested that numerous studies be conducted to further extend the knowledge on both rewards and
management styles in public parks and recreation, as this is an area that has been ignored in the past.
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