

2012

Weiser Carrots and Sticks: Motivation Beyond Money at the Shakedown Café

Julian A. Martinez

Claremont McKenna College

Recommended Citation

Martinez, Julian A., "Weiser Carrots and Sticks: Motivation Beyond Money at the Shakedown Café" (2012). *CMC Senior Theses*. Paper 411.

http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/411

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you by Scholarship@Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in this collection by an authorized administrator. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

CLAREMONT McKENNA COLLEGE

**WEISER CARROTS AND STICKS:
MOTIVATION BEYOND MONEY AT THE SHAKEDOWN CAFÉ**

SUBMITTED TO

PROFESSOR JEFFERY LEWIS
AND
PROFESSOR RONALD RIGGIO

AND

DEAN GREGORY HESS

BY

JULIAN A. MARTINEZ

FOR

SENIOR THESIS

SPRING 2012
APRIL 23, 2012

Abstract

It is generally assumed that monetary incentivization is the most effective means of motivating organizationally-beneficial behaviors. Individuals, under this line of thought, pursue their own objective self-interest above all else. However, evidence is being uncovered that indicates that human motivation may be a much more complicated facet of the human psyche. The purpose of this study is to examine the deeper underpinnings that drive people work that might lie beyond financial rewards. In order to do this, the Shakedown Café, a student-run restaurant on Pitzer College's campus, will be examined. This specific organization is of particular interest because it does not have the ability to reward employees in the manner that most businesses are able to employ. In looking at the Shakedown, the author's direct experiences while working in the restaurant, observations, a variety of intra-organizational correspondences, and modern organizational behavior theories will be utilized. The findings of this research indicate that the human drives to learn, bond with others, and defend oneself and one's surroundings are all just as important aspects of motivation as is the drive to acquire money. Within the organization of interest, these drives manifest themselves through organizational purpose, group learning, and shared leadership. From this example of the Shakedown Café, it is suggested that proliferation of financial rewards in today's organizations may well be an outdated model of motivating which could be prohibiting organizations and the people within them from reaching their full potentials.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Professor Jeff Lewis for not only getting me on the right path with this thesis, but also for giving me the opportunity in classes to apply what I experienced at work with theories I was learning about in school. It was through the reflections I was able to do in classes like the Nature of Work that I began to appreciate the complexities that lay at the heart of the Shakedown.

Thank you also to Professor Ron Riggio for igniting my interest in studying organizations. It was your Organizational Psychology class that got me interested in this field originally.

To all of the people with whom I have worked at the Shakedown, thanks. The time I have spent with you all will be what I will probably miss most when I look back at my time at the 5C's.

To the five founding members of the Shakedown: your vision has inspired so many people. I don't know what I would have done in college without the Shakedown and your efforts to bring it to life.

And last, thank you to my family. Dad, Mom, Lucas, Olivia, and Adrian. I do not often express to you guys the love and gratitude I have for you with words. I prefer to express it with cooking. And I look forward to cooking for no one more than I do for you guys.

For Kris Brown.

Thanks for getting me into this mess.

Table of Contents

Author's Note.....	vii
PART I:	
THE ROOTS: The Organizational History and Values of the Shakedown Café.....	4
Chapter 1—A Seed is Planted.....	5
Chapter 2—The Anatomy of the Shakedown.....	8
Chapter 3—Unearthing the Shakedown Paradox.....	15
PART II:	
GROWTH: Understanding Continued Development at the Shakedown Café.....	19
Chapter 4—Foundation.....	20
<i>The Culture of Food in the Twenty First Century</i>	24
<i>Inspired By “Why”</i>	25
<i>Ensuring the Future</i>	29
Chapter 5—Employment.....	34
<i>The Drive to Acquire</i>	36
<i>The Drive to Bond</i>	39
<i>The Drive to Learn</i>	44
<i>The Drive to Defend</i>	51
<i>The Four Drives at the Shakedown</i>	55
Chapter 6—Enrollment.....	59
<i>Organizational Learning and Intelligence</i>	60
<i>Shakedown Smart?</i>	88
<i>Enrolling to Learn</i>	90
Chapter 7—Devotion.....	92
<i>Shared Leadership Defined</i>	95
<i>Characteristics of a Shared System of Leadership</i>	98
<i>The Cognitive Underpinnings of Shared Leadership</i>	105
<i>Shared Leadership at the Shakedown</i>	109
<i>Shared Motivation</i>	115
PART III:	
THE FRUITS OF OUR LABOR:	
How Lessons Learned from the Shakedown Enhance our Understanding of Organizations.....	118

Chapter 8—Motivation Beyond Money.....	119
<i>Carrots and Sticks? Or Carrot Sticks?</i>	121
<i>The Morality of Incentives</i>	123
<i>Are Rewards Demotivating?</i>	126
<i>The Jackass and the Carrot</i>	133
<i>Rewards and Motivation at the Shakedown Café</i>	135
<i>Deep Motivation at Work in the Modern Organization</i>	139
APPENDIX A: SHAKEDOWN JOB DESCRIPTIONS.....	141
APPENDIX B: SAMPLE SHAKEDOWN MEETING MINUTES, 1/27/2012.....	146
REFERENCES.....	148

Author's Note

I have never been a particularly academic person. Yes, I have always received good grades in classes and have worked diligently at my studies. But my relative successes in classes have been due much more to my general aversion to mediocrity than to any inherent pleasure I derive from going to classes and getting good grades. Theoretical ideas and abstract concepts, in and of themselves, do very little for me. I much prefer to simply delve into the practical side of things and see what I can learn. Nonetheless, four years ago I found myself enrolled as a freshman at Claremont McKenna College (CMC).

One afternoon during the first week of college, I overheard a runner on my cross-country team—a quirky guy named Kris with a K—mention this restaurant that he worked at on campus. He called it the Shakedown. It was actually not even on CMC's campus, but instead on that of Pitzer College, which is located across the street. I had worked at a restaurant during high school and had flirted with the idea of going to culinary school, so I asked Kris about it. He described the Shakedown—how they made everything from scratch; how students cooked, organized, and ran the whole restaurant; how they used all local produce; and how he was the only CMC student working there. From what Kris was saying, I realized that there were other things I could do at college other than go to class and study. I ate at the Shakedown a few weeks later with some of my friends from my school. There, colorful tapestries served as tablecloths and diners sat on hand-me-down couches. The food came out sporadically, with some of us finishing our meals before others had even been served. My friends thought the restaurant was strange, hippy, and dingy. But I immediately wanted in.

I began working at the Shakedown a few months later, in the spring of my freshman year. Right away I felt the need to do whatever I could to help the restaurant. I came to the manager meetings and spoke up a few times. This act of voicing my opinion, if you know me, is pretty rare. It takes a lot to get me to express my feelings to a group of people who I do not know well. Especially when I am the new guy from the other school in a room full of experienced upperclassmen. But for some reason, I felt a need to chime in at these meetings. By the next semester, I was a shift manager. I was hooked in for the long haul.

Three years later, I am about to leave the Shakedown, that Kris fellow has become one of my best friends, and I am the head chef of the restaurant. I cannot imagine my overall college experience without the Shakedown. The schoolwork I have found most interesting is that which I can relate, somehow, to my experiences at the restaurant. I picked my major, Organizational Studies, because the material I learned in those classes actually made applicable sense to my experiences at work. In these classes I was not accumulating knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Nor was I studying in order to enhance my resume so that I could eventually get a job. No, I already had a job that I loved. All I wanted to learn about was that which would make me a more effective manager of the Shakedown or help me better understand the business.

The following analysis ties together my unbelievably rewarding time at the Shakedown Café with some of the most interesting organizational theories to which I have been exposed. In part, I am trying to make sense of my time at the restaurant. I am trying to understand why I did what I did and why the organization hooked me to the degree that it did. But, more importantly, this paper is intended to explore human

tendencies in general. There are many dogmas that seem to pervade business organizations that simply don't apply at the Shakedown. There is no "boss"; direct competitors are also collaborators; and most notably, the lure of money does not seem to be nearly as powerful as all of the finance majors that surround me often proclaim. I personally volunteered my time at the Shakedown one semester. If needed, I would have done so for all four of my four years there. I am sure at least several of my coworkers would have done the same. I want to know why.

“Only after the last tree has been cut down, only after the last river has been poisoned, only after the last fish has been caught. Only then will you find that money cannot be eaten.”

--Cree Prophecy—As quoted from the *Shakedown Manifesto*

WEISER CARROTS AND STICKS

Motivation Beyond Money

At the Shakedown Café

Julian A. Martinez

Claremont McKenna College

Organizational Studies

PART I—THE ROOTS

The Organizational History and Values of the Shakedown Café

Chapter One:

A Seed is Planted

The Shakedown Café—founded in 2007 by five Pitzer College students—was established as a means to reconnect members of the Claremont Colleges back to their food. To do this, the restaurant sources its food almost entirely from organic purveyors and buys produce and meat from local farms. When the Shakedown was founded, these values were just re-emerging as highly important to much of the general public, with the publication of books such as *The Omnivore's Dilemma*. Since then, locally-sourced, responsibly-produced food has continued to gain popularity. Today, many chefs and restaurant owners are similarly dedicated (or at least purport to be) to the sustainable food movement. In fact, it is practically heresy for a new trendy restaurant *not* to denote from where its arugula or almonds come. Hence, the Shakedown Café's (from here on out referred to as simply "the Shakedown") values regarding food sources are no longer highly alternative. What is alternative, however, is the *degree* to which the restaurant is committed to sustainability, as well as the manner in which the restaurant is run.

The Shakedown is, always was, and hopefully always will be run entirely by students. Creating the menu and recipes, ordering the food, organizing the staff, advertising for events, cooking the actual food—it is all done by undergraduate students from the Claremont Colleges. For the vast majority of these students, the Shakedown marks the first restaurant work that employees experience they have had. Also, importantly, it marks the first formal business leadership positions that almost all of the managers have ever held. It is this general inexperience—naïveté, if you will—that

imbues the organization as a whole with a great willingness to experiment. Nobody at the restaurant can decree that he or she has all the answers, as it is blatantly clear that everyone is ultimately an amateur. It is partly because of this fact that the restaurant's organizational hierarchy has always been a relatively flat one—at least as compared to that of the typical business of hospitality. There is a freedom to experiment, an acceptance of failure, and an openness to new ideas that distinguishes the structure of the Shakedown from that of the highly specialized and hierarchical structure inherent to the French Brigade system of management that is used by the majority of restaurants today (Escoffier On Line 2012).

Furthermore, perhaps because of the lack of collective business acumen available to the Shakedown's leadership group, the restaurant has always been distinguished by incredibly high, potentially unattainable ideals. The founders set out to create an "opportunity to embody a socially just food system and to promote community food security by supporting small-scale, organic, local farmers who nourish [the] environment in the same sustainable manner that [the] environment nourishes us" (Beebe et al 2008). The restaurant industry is a notoriously difficult one in which to succeed, with a failure rate of 70% within the first five years of opening (Sidney 2012). It takes a set of very wide eyes to believe that a group of inexperienced college students can not only succeed in this industry, but to do so while upholding a set of values that is uncommonly idealistic. With yearly leadership turnover, which is an inevitable part of college organizations, this optimism has been continually renewed. The embrace of idealism and the lack of prior experience that characterize the organization make it a particularly strong candidate for many of the tenets of the learning organization. Coined by Peter

Senge, this type of organization allows people to “continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together.” The Shakedown was not founded as a means to make money or to completely sustain a great number of students nutritionally. Rather, it was created as a means of teaching students of the Claremont Colleges—not only about cooking, but also about working with others, developing strategy, organizing groups, connecting with the community, devoting oneself to a cause, discovering beliefs that different cultures value, respecting the environment, and embodying a vision. It is this desire to learn that has allowed the Shakedown, although it is most definitely under a particularly unusual set of circumstances, to be a part of the 30% of restaurants that outlive five years of existence. And it will be this desire that will allow the restaurant to continually grow and evolve in the future.

Chapter Two:

The Anatomy of the Shakedown

One of the Shakedown's defining characteristics—its completely student-run nature—makes it a particularly interesting organization to study. Although the organization was founded on an ideological belief in the importance of equality and personal equity in running a business, the fact that even the most dedicated leaders at the Shakedown can only work part-time naturally flattens the organizational structure of the business. As students, Shakedown employees must juggle work with academics, social engagements, athletic commitments, and other extracurricular activities. As the head chef, there have been weeks that I have worked 30-35 hours for the café. For a typical restaurant, this time commitment would be entirely inadequate for even a basic line cook. Yet dedicating that much time to the Shakedown completely wiped the energy out of me. Thus, this organization has always had a solid core of highly dedicated workers who very quickly learn the power of delegation, rather than the typical one or two chefs and general managers who make most of the decisions and hold the majority of the responsibilities.

After the founders of the Shakedown graduated in the Spring of 2008, they created a “Manifesto.” That is, they all got together and wrote out their combined philosophies, experiences, advice, and thoughts for future managers to refer to. In this document the founders outline eight leadership roles that they felt were necessary to the success of the organization. Specifically, they describe the original leadership jobs as follows:

- 1) *“Administrative”*: Duties include communicating with Pitzer College officials,

- securing funding, staffing, training, staff scheduling, leading management meetings, organizing the office, and setting up catering events.*
- 2) *“Head Chefs”: Duties include creating the menu, ensuring constant quality control, training all employees in cooking and plating, oversight of catering, ingredient inventory, food ordering, and quality checks of food.*
 - 3) *“Farmers Market Liaison”: Duties include building relationships with farmers, food pick-ups from Claremont farmers market, and payment of farmers.*
 - 4) *“Kitchen Manager”: Duties include ensuring California Health Code is followed, maximizing kitchen organization, assisting in inventories, keeping kitchen clean, and training others how to keep kitchen organized.*
 - 5) *“Advertising”: Duties include weekly emails to students of the Claremont Colleges and Pitzer, posting of fliers on campus, advertising events the restaurant hosts, and managing all publicity.*
 - 6) *“Events”: Duties include booking all events that the Shakedown hosts, working with student clubs to host events, oversight of all events, ensuring all logistics regarding events are addressed.*
 - 7) *“Aesthetics”: Duties include oversight and upkeep of the physical menu [written on a large chalkboard posted in the dining room], dining room furniture, tables, chairs, wall hangings, and decorations.*
 - 8) *“Books”: Duties include processing of invoices, staff money reimbursements, overseeing petty cash system, calculating weekly sales reports, and reporting weekly financial statistics and compilations to the management team.*

This leadership system originally consisted of the five founding managers, who were the essential core of the Shakedown, plus approximately additional eight employees who assisted in performing the duties. Committees (Administrative, Aesthetics, Head Chefs, etc.) met in small groups and would make decisions and do work necessary for their duties. On a weekly basis, all managers came together for a meeting. These meetings served as “a space for updates, notif[ications] about new systems, reminding [sic] people of the importance of certain duties that were not done very well, explaining [sic] new menu items, quick notes about plans for [the upcoming] week, and urgent

Shakedown issues relevant to everyone” (Beebe et al 2008). According to the Shakedown Manifesto, these meetings were brief. Decision-making was primarily conducted outside of these meetings, as the leadership committees themselves met throughout the week to discuss the particulars specific to their own tasks. Importantly, the Shakedown was open to anyone’s help in managing the restaurant. Thus, after the founders graduated, there was an ample supply of younger workers who were interested in taking on more responsibility.

This leadership system persisted, more or less, for the next several years. As more and more people became interested in what the Shakedown was doing and began expressing an interest in assisting with the eight critical management jobs, however, the structure and definition of the leadership system slowly began to decay. The commitment to a reduced hierarchy meant that anyone could volunteer to do essentially any job. Thus, by the spring of 2010, the eight defined roles/committees had by and large disintegrated. Meetings were no longer meant as check-ins with different groups, but rather were where various jobs were assigned. In practice, this meant that people would volunteer to do very specific tasks, as they were needed and as they arose. It was unclear prior to the meetings what would be discussed and what needed to get done. A lack of focus often characterized the meetings, as everything that the restaurant needed to do had to be addressed in a short time. Yet nobody knew who exactly they should be addressing. Certain people were indeed responsible for certain jobs, but those jobs were somewhat incoherent. For example, I was in charge of the Shakedown’s website, was part of the committee that made the menu, did inventory (sometimes), and organized catering (again, sometimes). I ended up with these duties because the other leaders of the Shakedown

thought that I could do them and because I thought they would be enjoyable—not because it made sense to have a single person work on all of these different tasks. With this system, there was essentially zero accountability, as nobody was actually aware of what anyone else was really supposed to be doing. The simplicity and rationality of the leadership system that the Shakedown was founded upon had essentially disappeared.

In the fall of 2010, the leadership team was somewhat divided in terms of satisfaction with how things were going and where the organization was headed. Some felt that the system was working. But others felt that it was mightily flawed. The reasons for this divide will be investigated later on in this paper. Nonetheless, the Shakedown went on with marginal success for the remainder of the 2010/2011 academic school year. The food was not bad, but it was quite inconsistent. Although the restaurant's revenues were similar to what they had been soon after its founding, the food that the restaurant was purchasing was often not of the local and organic variety that the restaurant boasted; it was when doing so fit into the manner by which food was ordered, but it was not completely imperative. Overall, the restaurant was not faltering, exactly, but it certainly was not growing and developing further as time progressed.

The spring semester of 2011 marked the graduation of the last Shakedown employees who had worked with the organization's founding members. Thus, the restaurant was at a critical point. It could easily have deteriorated further, tumbling further into a state of confusion and unaccountability. Or its leadership team could resolve to make a change that would set the organization back on the right path. I believe the latter occurred. The following email message seems to have initiated the motivation to change direction at the Shakedown. I myself sent this message, due to the urging of

Irene Farnsworth ('11), a graduating manager who was concerned about the upcoming leadership at the restaurant:

Email correspondence from Julian Martinez to a group of 15 Shakedown employees (J. Martinez, personal communication, April 8, 2011)—

Dear dedicated Shakedowners...

So another year is winding down. And for us, that means that the last group of seniors who worked with the founders will be leaving. Because of that, next year will be really important, in terms of the longevity of the restaurant.

Personally, I think we have all pieces in place to make major strides next fall. However, doing that will take a little more work than normal. We're emailing you because we've seen your dedication to the Shake in the past and feel that you can really help us do some of this extra work. So here's what I'm thinking:

This semester, accountability has been [very low] and roles have been pretty ambiguous. One way to fix this is to specifically outline each individual's job and [the] tasks that are expected of him or her. I propose a system in which there are essentially 7 leadership jobs that need to be covered. Those would be:

- 1) Menu/ Head chef*
- 2) Finances*
- 3) Events coordinator/catering/advertising*
- 4) Staff coordinator*
- 5) Ordering and sourcing (sorcerer????)*
- 6) Dining room and kitchen manager*
- 7) Advertising and marketing*

I envision each task having one person who is very experienced here and takes the lead of the role, and another person (underclassman) who is an assistant/backup/helper of that task leader. This way, everyone will know what they are expected to do, we will know who is doing a great job (and who needs to step it up), we will have better consistency, and the future will be set up for success, since the "backups" will have experience in leadership roles.

[...] If you look at the Shakedown Manifesto that the founders wrote up, it outlines a similar organizational setup. However, I'd like to make it more refined and definite [...] But in general, I do think it's important that we don't open things up to everyone, since that leads to [what happened last semester]. I know we want to be inclusive, but we also need to give the people who are truly dedicated a chance to do good work.

So come to the meeting if you are interested in planning for next year. However, realize that coming to this meeting and offering to help is a sign that you are truly interested in doing more work for the Shakedown. If you do not really feel like doing extra planning during the summer and working about 5-10

extra hours per week next year (in addition to your shifts), please don't offer to take on more responsibility. Also, if you can't make the meeting, or [you're] abroad, please email me to tell me whether or not you are indeed interested in taking a leadership role next year. If you're abroad, we'll keep you in the loop.

Thanks! And sorry for writing so much, but I really want next year to be the best the Shake has ever had.

The next week, a meeting was indeed held with the eleven of the restaurant's underclass employees. A great deal of enthusiasm was generated, with an overall sense of optimism shared by most present. By the Fall of 2011, a semi-formal organizational structure was established, written out, and distributed to all managers (see Appendix A). This is essentially how the organization stands today. Some people cross their job descriptions to engage in other managers' technical duties, and some managing roles are made up of multiple people. But for the most part, this is what the current leadership of the organization turns to when evaluating its management team and examining what can be improved.

In many ways, the current organizational structure is remarkably similar to what it was at the end of 2008, when the founders graduated. The jobs that need to be done are the same as ever because the Shakedown still serves the same purpose that it did five years ago—to serve as a campus center of community, nourishment, and connection. The manner in which these jobs are broken up is also quite similar to the way it was when founded. However, what seems to be different is the number of managers who are actively engaged in the undertaking of these duties. Whereas the founders describe a system of committees that emerged after they left the organization, made up of a total of 13 managers, the current structure relies on 7-8 people to satisfy its leadership needs. This, in general, is due to an increase in efficiency overall at the restaurant and an

increase in dedication by the organization's core. That improvement manifested itself in an approximate doubling in revenues and profits in the Fall of 2011. Why did this happen? What caused this newfound dedication and motivation? Why did the organization return to a path similar to the one the five founders envisioned right when the last peers of the founders had moved on?

Chapter Three:

Unearthing the Shakedown Paradox

I have done a great deal of thinking about the Shakedown over the past several years, examining my own experiences as well as the actions of the organization as a whole. In the spring of 2011, I was a part of an outside research group that conducted a case study on the restaurant. Essentially, this study examined the organization from a theoretical perspective and uncovered the major problems that faced the business at the time. The group then suggested solutions to those issues, grounded in organizational theory and behavior. At the time of the study, it was found that the three primary issues hampering the Shakedown were poor communication amongst the employees and managers, a lack of a clear and unifying organizational identity, and a general shortage in motivation due to an inadequate reward structure. This last problem seemed to be the most significant, and so the research group focused much of its attention on it. Ultimately, the recommended solutions, which were based primarily on the Expectancy Theory of Motivation (McShane and von Glinow 2010, p. 143-145), were as follows:

- 1) Increase the number of training hours (improve effort-to-performance)*
- 2) Increase authority power of managers (improve performance-to-outcome)*
- 3) Make clear the path to becoming manager (improve performance-to-outcome)*
- 4) Offer employee parties or incentives for good work (improve outcome valence)*

Our recommendations centered around giving employees the tools to do good work, and then incentivizing the employees to use those tools to better the organization. The Expectancy Theory of Motivation is grounded in the belief that human behavior is highly rational—that people are motivated by consequences that they can foresee and evaluate. However, what has become readily apparent to me in my current research is that humans are not always motivated by a completely rational mental framework. When I consider my experience at the restaurant, I did not start working there because I wanted money (I began as a volunteer); I did not start going to manager meetings because I necessarily wanted to become an all-mighty manager; I didn't spend a summer writing recipes so I could exert some overarching power as head chef. No, I did all of this because I felt it was necessary. *Necessary* is the operative word here. Why did I feel that it *needed* to get done? And why are there numerous others—not all of the restaurant's employees, but quite a few—who feel this same need? The old metaphor of the donkey who is motivated by the dangling carrot attached to a stick is a much too simple explanation. Something much more profound is clearly at play at the Shakedown. From its founding in 2007 to its current leadership structure to its future succession planning, this something seems to have been at play. Using the Shakedown as a case in point, we can no longer assume that monetary or other tangible rewards will induce full commitment, dedication, or effort. Rather, it is purpose, natural human tendencies, dialogue, and shared leadership opportunities that drive people to act in the best interests of organizational entities.

This paper will aim to answer four primary questions based on motivation at the Shakedown Café. First, what exactly impelled the five founders to sacrifice grades,

parties, and free-time to open the restaurant? To answer this question, I will explore the theoretical underpinnings of organizational purpose, and how those factors impact how individuals behave and feel. I will also look here at why the founders, as well as the organization's current leaders, exert effort to plan for the future.

Second, what factors influence students at Pitzer and the Claremont Colleges to work as regular employees at the Shakedown? There are many jobs that seem to be rationally much more appealing, which allow students to simply sit and catch up on homework or listen to music. These jobs offer the same work-study wages and demand no more time. Yet the Shakedown manages to attract approximately 35 students each semester. What factors cause this? To answer this question, I will examine Lawrence and Nohria's (2002) Four Drive Theory of Motivation, which highlights four fundamental emotions that influence how we act. Only one of these emotions relates to monetary reward.

Third, what persuades employees at the Shakedown to come to the weekly manager meetings? These are, admittedly, somewhat intimidating for first-timers. But the meetings have been the definitive first step for virtually every manager's rise up through the organization. I will look at organizational dialogue and how that influences individual perceptions, feelings, and behaviors in order to answer this question.

Fourth, what causes a person who attends meetings and who does care about the Shakedown to become fully devoted? By fully invested, I mean working 25-35 hours in a given week, sacrificing schoolwork, sleep, time with friends, and sometimes even temporary sanity. There have been only a handful of employees since the founders who have been motivated to this level. But nonetheless, it is very important to look at people

who are this committed, as their influence has shaped the organization more than that of anyone else. In order to examine this higher level of motivation, I will look at the concept of shared leadership. This is a relatively new model of leadership and influence that has been attractive to many organizational scholars in recent years.

After these four essential questions have been answered, the implications of the findings will be postulated. Specifically, what does the future have in store for the Shakedown Café? How can the business continue to develop highly motivated workers? How does the Shakedown serve as a model for organizations in the world at large, in terms of motivation? And what does that fact that the Shakedown can successfully operate without the ability to financially reward employees tell us about the use of financial incentives in general? Does money really motivate people to work in organizationally beneficial ways? Or is this long-lived system of influence a fundamental change? Addressing these important ideas will be the goal of Part III.

Although the Shakedown Café is a small, seemingly simple organization, it has a wealth of information to lend. It is an especially unique organization, so the phenomena that occur within it must be taken with a grain of salt when extending any findings to the larger world of work. However, it is also its uniqueness that allows it to be such an interesting case study which calls into question some of the current beliefs and practices of organizations in general. Hopefully, through looking at this business in an in-depth, objective (at least to as much of a degree as is possible) manner, I will be able to glean information that will not only be useful in understanding my experiences there, but also in better understanding the human experience in general, as it applies to organizational life.

PART II:

GROWTH

***Understanding Continued
Development at the Shakedown Café***

Chapter Four: Foundation

On March 25th, 2007, the Shakedown Café opened its doors to the communities of Pitzer and the Claremont Colleges. Prior to that point, the restaurant's location in the Gold Student Center (GSC) had housed three unsuccessful on-campus eateries since the building's opening in 1995. According to former Pitzer Associate Dean of Student Affairs Chris Freeburg, the site of the Shakedown had been repeatedly condemned to failure because of poor management systems, inconsistency, low standards of food quality, a remote location, and deficiency in funding from the college (Towler 2008, p. 109). Full-time professional managers had repeatedly failed to make this place work. The sight of an abandoned kitchen left after the folding of the Mandarin Café (a Chinese eatery that never managed to garner a major following) therefore was not particularly promising for any restaurant endeavor. Yet a group of five Pitzer juniors—Alden Towler, Dane Pollock, Gabe Guerrero, Josh Lipkowitz, and Fred Beebe—came together “in agreement that [they] *must* open a restaurant to thrill the masses and [to] appease the raging ideas flooding [their] minds that demanded action and action now!” (Towler 2008, p. 110). The venture would have to be funded by the “Five Principals,” as these students were known, and would take an incredible amount of effort and time if it were to be a success. Going into their final three semesters of college, why did these five students feel the need to make a major change in their lives? What motivated them to set aside their free time, studies, and other interests for a venture that—judging from the previous businesses in this potential location—would fail? And even if it were to be a success,

what did the Shakedown have to offer the founders, who would inevitably leave before the place could ever be called a true “success?”

It turns out that the answers to these questions regarding the founders’ motivations differ considerably, depending on which of the “Five Principals” is examined as well as to which level of motivation one looks. The original idea for the restaurant—which was formulated by Gabe, Dane, and Alden while camping on a road trip—was a broad fantasy to replace the Mandarin Café (which at the time was still in business) with an organic restaurant that would serve as a great community space for college students. The idea brewed for several months during the fall of 2006 while the three of them were abroad in various countries. In their international experiences, each of them learned “from real-life experience the central role [that] food plays in culture” (Towler 2008, p. 108). Upon arriving back at Pitzer Gabe, Dane, and Alden spread the concept of this restaurant to Fred Beebe and Fred’s friend, Josh Lipkowitz. Both of these students were quickly convinced that this venture would be worth pursuing. Overall, the idea of the Shakedown (although not yet named as such at that point) was appealing to each of the five founders in very different ways. For Alden Towler, it was about the impact that conventionally-produced food has on the environment, society, and one’s own health. He felt a strong connection to and passion for the ever growing sustainable food movement and he wanted to play a meaningful part in it. “I am deeply fascinated,” he writes, “by the matrix of connections that food ties between so many aspects of life. Almost any subject can be viewed through the lens of food and given a new perspective. Nutrition, politics, gastronomy, culture, ecology, business, and the list goes on. In many ways, we create ourselves and the world around us through the food we eat. We come to literally

embody what we eat and our purchasing power has an influence on what farmers grow - reforming the earth” (A. Towler, personal communication, April 2, 2012). For Gabe Guerrerro, who had been a manager of the Mandarin Café, the idea of the Shakedown was appealing because of the potential the space itself had to be transformed into a major campus center for social interaction. A passionate musician, Gabe felt the space’s environment could be a cradle of artistic expression for the many creative students at the college. Dane Pollack approached the Shakedown because of his life-long experiences and connections with food. He was a creative, experimental, and curious cook who grew up in an “old school” family who valued the social and communal powers of cooking and eating great food. Fred Beebe, who had held many leadership positions within Pitzer’s student government prior to cofounding the Shakedown, seems to have been inspired by the entrepreneurial aspect of the work. He had connections to the administration of the college and clearly wanted to lead other students in a significant and novel venture. As he writes in the *Shakedown Manifesto*:

“I was attracted to the Shakedown for the business. What I saw when I first looking at the empty restaurant space in the Gold Student Center was a business opportunity like no other. Watching the construction of the new dorms from out of the Shakedown windows, we quickly realized that we were sitting on a goldmine. Soon there would be hundreds of hungry, young students who would love a good smoothie, or a bomb burrito, or a cup of tea before they get back to studying (or whatever it is they’re doing). They would be willing to pay good money for it, and if we didn’t capitalize on the opportunity, the administration would just contract Bon Appétit to start up a burger and fries joint that would fatten our fellow students up and send our money to corporate headquarters, instead of recycling it within our community and putting it towards things we believe in” (Beebe et al 2008, p. 12).

Josh Lipkowitz was an outsider, of sorts, at the outset. The other four founders were close friends and knew how each other worked. That social power in and of itself was an

additional draw to the restaurant's concept for the four of them. Josh, however, simply "came to the table with plentiful restaurant experience and more fiery passion than [Towler] knew could exist in a person" (Towler 2008, p. 112). It seems to have been the connecting power that restaurants and food has that attracted Josh; to cook delicious, ethically-produced, and demonstrative food for others was appealing in and of itself for Lipkowitz. "The Shakedown," he writes, works to reconnect people with their food, with the land that created that food, and with the farmers who worked the land and harvested the food. We believe that if we can form these connections once more, these connections that have been within us for thousands of years only to be taken away from us as of late, that we can change the way people eat, live, and treat each other" (Beebe et al 2008). From all of these different perspectives and appeals comes the original vision that the founders elucidated from the beginning. It reads as follows:

"The Shakedown Café is a student founded and managed restaurant and community space sustainably envisioned to offer organic pan-world gourmet cuisine while promoting environmental and social justice in a venue of art, music, and the gathering of pleasure, thought, and creative energy" (Towler 2008).

Clearly, each of the founders' interests and goals influenced this vision. From its birth, the Shakedown was centered around the collaboration of multiple individuals' ideas and passions, rather than around the imagination of one person. It was also based on many contextual factors—the restaurant was not born simply from the minds of the five founders; rather, it emerged at a critical point in time during the cultural movement towards the global production and promotion of sustainable food. These factors, which facilitated the birth of the organization, are discussed below.

The Culture of Food in the Twenty-First Century

The industrialization of the food and agricultural industries has been on the rise since the turn of the twentieth century. As time has progressed, fewer and fewer people have become farmers, fewer and fewer varieties of crops have been grown, fewer and fewer companies have been involved in bringing food to consumers, more and more agricultural inputs have been deployed, more and more money has been made from post-agricultural production of food, and more and more pounds have been piled onto peoples' bodies all across the developed world. When one studies this system carefully, it becomes abundantly clear that it is one of the most irrational, backwards, and unethical industries in the world. And yet food is one of the most basic of needs for humans. The current state of the system that brings vital need to the table infuriates and/or depresses many who have had extensive exposure to it. But for most people, the nightmare that is our food system goes unnoticed or ignored.

Since the early 1970's, when chef Alice Waters founded the Chez Panisse restaurant in Berkeley, California, the sustainability and ethicality of commercial food production has been on the forefront of conscious Americans' minds. The movement picked up serious steam upon the release of Michael Pollan's *The Omnivore's Dilemma* in 2006. In reading Shakedown co-founder Alden Towler's senior thesis, it is clear that the broad leadership of the movement's figureheads was a major driving force behind the founding of the Pitzer café. The sheer number of quotations from Pollan, food justice advocate Vandana Shiva, and health champion Michio Kushi to which Towler makes reference speaks to the level to which he was influenced by these figures. Towler, as

well as the four other founders, saw something fundamentally backwards with the approach that people in general were taking to the idea of food. The founding of the Shakedown was part of a much larger movement that rejects not just genetically-engineered foods or produce transported from across the globe, but also the idea that food is a commodity that should be made at the lowest price possible for the producer and evaluated principally by its objective monetary value. The founders felt that food was not being appreciated for all of its inherent goodness—not for its ability to foster community and culture; not for the sensual pleasures with which it can inundate our taste buds when made well; not the nourishment it gives us which allows for to feel good and be productive in our busy lives; not the central role it plays in so many human relationships; not the powers it to for foster creative expression in individuals; and not the health benefits it bestows on us. Instead, food production had been reduced to a highly capitalistic industry that almost completely disregards the wisdom of history, reveres science above all else, compulsively processes every natural edible gift of nature, and emphasizes speed and efficiency over quality and social connection. Although the Shakedown is a unique place, it must be remembered that it emerged as part of a much larger wave of change that is continuing to build today.

Inspired by “Why”

When I first began working at the Shakedown, I knew I loved to be in the kitchen and make food for people. But that was about the extent to which I connected to the Shakedown, overall. Therefore after working a few weeks of volunteering I became a bit perplexed by many of the organization’s behaviors and norms. At the end of one

particular night, I remember that we had already taken the compost to the compost pile outside (a relatively far walk when one is ready to go to bed). But then we realized there was some more compost to be taken out—not a lot, just some scraps. My manager insisted that I take that second compost bucket back outside. As a new worker, I could not grasp why this was necessary. Realistically, how much benefit could that small amount of compost really do? Nonetheless, I begrudgingly walked the second bucket outside. In addition to this initial uncertainty I was feeling regarding the practicality of the every last bit of organic matter, I also questioned some of the other organizational practices I observed during the first months of work at the restaurant. I couldn't figure out why we did not over-prepare for service, instead of always working with the risk of running out of menu items; why we didn't simply purchase pre-made candied walnuts rather than burning the majority of our batches; or why the upperclass leaders urged everyone to try different jobs in the kitchen instead of letting us “master” certain tasks. I felt, as a relatively clueless freshman employee, that the Shakedown could use some management work. But then I learned. Slowly I figured out that there was a method to what I thought at the time was absolute madness. Slowly, I grasped why the Shakedown did what it did.

Simon Sinek, author of *Start With Why* argues that great leaders, who truly make meaningful and lasting change, always begin with the question of *why* (Sinek 2009). In other words, their primary reason in leading an endeavor is based on a purpose in which they firmly believe. Only after the *why* is established does the leader consider *how* that purpose will make a difference in the world. Last, the leader considers *what* action to take to satisfy their purpose. Steve Jobs did not set out to simply lead a great computer

company, which would be a *what*; rather, as manifested by Apple's expansion into many other computer engineering fields, he was interested in challenging the status quo of the technology industry. Gandhi did not set out with the mission to lead a non-violent movement; rather, he was inspired to fight for the civil rights of his people. Henry Ford did not set out to pioneer the assembly line technique of mass production; rather, he wanted to make car transportation accessible to the masses. Likewise, the founders of the Shakedown did not decide to open the café to be campus celebrities, because the space was unoccupied, because they had a really good pad Thai recipe, or to prove the people who doubted them wrong. No, the Shakedown was founded from each of the founders deepest passions. Alden was fed up with the unjust food industry; Dane missed the great meal he shared with his family; Fred wished to further lead a venture and connect the Pitzer student body, making a cohesive whole; Gabe wanted to furnish the community with a place that fostered creativity; an Josh wanted to bring people together through food. "The why for every individual or organization comes from the past," writes Sinek. "It is born out of the upbringing and life experience of an individual or small group" (Sinek 2009, p. 214).

As I grew at the Shakedown, I realized that the restaurant uses organic canola oil because non-organic implies that the oil is a genetically engineered product, whose negative implications has filled its share of entire books. I figured out that we ask customers names when they order food not because it facilitates order pick-up, but rather because it facilitates community-building. I learned that local produce is not primarily important for its low food miles, but instead because with local foods people can get to know their farmers on a personal basis and be trust that they produce food in a truly

sustainable and responsible manner. I discovered that the errors that occur in the kitchen are not anyone's fault; they are an inevitable part of the learning process—a result of the freedom we give people to try new things so that they can continually grow. And I learned that we take out *all* of the compost not because of the practicality of it—even though that is good in and of itself—but because of the no-waste, cyclical ideal that it supports. All of the *hows* and *whats* of the restaurant are in place for a reason. And all those little reasons culminate to express the Shakedown's ultimate *why*. Writes co-founder Dane Pollack: "The reasons why the Shakedown does its thing are intimately entwined with how it does its thing, and as a manager you are responsible for engaging the Shakedown philosophy. This means discussing with both managers and employees, collectively and individually, why certain things are done or not done. In no way are the tenets of the Shakedown immutable, they always need to be kept in view because they always need to be reviewed, as the Shakedown evolves it learns" (Beebe et al 2008). Even though the founders' passion was only physically present at the restaurant for two and a half semesters, their purpose still rings clear. The way things are done, the type of food we serve, and the nature of our events are a bit different than they were in 2007. But the general reason why we come to work remains the same. The vision that the founders had was based on a passionate commitment to a cause. By communicating that vision, workers and new managers bought into what the Shakedown was all about. Not because they liked to cook (for the most part), but because they aligned with the Shakedown's *why*.

Ensuring the Future

Once we understand that the Shakedown was founded upon a very meaningful purpose which the founders felt was of critical importance, grasping why they felt committed to seeing its continued growth after their departure becomes rather easy. Towler writes that in the spring and fall semesters of 2008, “the place *completely* relied on the Five Principals, there was no way for the grand, unorganized mess that was [the] kitchen to function without those who had created and understood that mess” (Towler 2008, p. 118). Because of this, by the spring of 2008, there was not in fact an organizational structure that could sustain itself. The founders had done much work, but they had yet to create an entity with a life of its own. If the restaurant was there just for the purpose of the founders, they could have easily justified letting the organization fizzle out. But it is clear that this was not the case. Peter Drucker wrote, “A leader, any leader, must be for the benefit of others and not for oneself” (Cohen 2010, p. 166). Truly effective leadership is not about how well an organization does when the leaders are present. Instead, it is about whether or not the group thrives after the leaders leave. This can only happen when the leaders are in fact selfless and do indeed believe in the cause of the organization.

The founders of the Shakedown were, in retrospect, undoubtedly great leaders. Clearly they were not in this for their own benefits. “I realized that the Shake was very impressive,” writes Towler in retrospect. “But only if it survived, only if it worked [...] Creating a model with replaceable parts was our key in creating a living legacy, a project to be proud of and for others to respect” (A. Towler, personal communication, April 2, 2012). Their commitment to the organization’s purpose made it imperative that they

ensure the successful future of the restaurant. “Handing the ShakeDown [*sic*] down to the next generation—” writes Towler, “this *had* to happen” (Towler 2008, p. 120). The founders realized that their vision was important no matter if they were present to witness it or not. They had to make sure their *why* could persist without them. With their graduations looming, the founders created a structure and a list of vital tasks (as outlined in Chapter Two) that the incoming leaders of the Shakedown would need to share amongst themselves. The founders did this by showing the underclassmen what they themselves did on a daily basis. This proved difficult, as the founders simply were able to work as a relatively confined unit, doing whatever needed to be done to ensure the restaurant’s success. Each of them had a very holistic understanding of the place (Towler 2008, p. 122). It had to go from a group of five guys on a mission to an actual organization. Essentially, the leaders needed to transform the incoming leaders, and thus the organization.

This transformation involved not only empowering the incoming managers with duties and roles, but also making sure that they all were on board with the vision. McShane and von Glinow describe transformational leadership as consisting of four fundamental elements: leaders developing a vision, leaders communicating that vision, leaders modeling the vision, and leaders then building commitment to the vision. By the spring of 2008, the founders had indeed developed, communicated, and modeled the vision. But the Shakedown would never have persisted if the subsequent leaders did not feel personally committed to the values of the organization. Transformational leaders build strong commitment through their words, symbols, stories, and personalities, which culminates to build “a contagious enthusiasm that energizes people to adopt the vision as

their own (McShane and von Glinow 2010, p. 374). Leaders also build greater organizational commitment by involving followers in the process of shaping the organization's future practices and values that will further the overarching purpose. The founders deliberately addressed these imperatives. "It is vital that managers and staff spend time together, not in a meeting or work environment, to talk about their experiences, ideas for the present and future; make time to talk about food ethics and sustainability, the importance of building community, facilitating creativity, and one another's personal and emotional lives" (Towler 2008, p. 123). By building this commitment, the organization's prolonged survival would be ensured. After all, the "Five Principals" did not know anything about running a restaurant when first going into the endeavor; they were simply committed to a vision and did whatever was necessary to see that through. If incoming leaders believed strongly in the values of the Shakedown, they too would not allow the entity to fail. The organization's "why" not only *motivated* the founders to ensure its success, but also *enabled* them to do so.

In discussing the fostering of a long-term outlook, Peter Senge writes, "Personally, I have come to feel that our failure [to generate lasting change in many organizations] lies not in unpersuasiveness or lack of sufficiently compelling evidence. *It may simply not be possible to convince human beings rationally to take a long-term view.* People do not focus on the long term because they *have* to, but because they *want to*" (Senge 2006, p. 196) (italics original). Nobody had to convince the founders why it was important to set up a sustaining organizational structure. They did so because they had a long-term group vision in mind that they wanted to see accomplished. Additionally, nobody has needed to convince the organization's subsequent leaders to

train their successors. Instead, it has been the vision that has made people commit themselves to the Shakedown's future success.

When I consider my own current situation at the Shakedown, I realize that it continues to be the organization's purpose that drives me to incessantly worry about the upcoming year, when I will no longer be an influential part of the restaurant and its vision. A few weeks ago, a friend of mine asked me, "Wouldn't you feel kind of good if the Shakedown failed after you left? It would prove how valuable you and your class were!" In response to this, I could only muster a caustic kind of laugh at the absurdity of this question. Seeing the Shakedown devolve, even marginally, after I left would make me break my heart. It would mean that the values that my fellow seniors and I firmly believed in and for which we fought so hard to preserve had diminished. It would mean that, although we believed in the Shakedown's cause wholeheartedly, we had not done a good enough job transferring those values to others. The Shakedown is now unquestionably a part of my being. To see any part of it lost, even after I am not a physical part of it, would be like losing a part of myself. Failing to plan for the future is possible when one is involved in an organization for his or her own benefit. But when a person is fully connected to a group institution that has a purpose that he views as more valuable than his own, the organization's future without him is just as important—if not more so—as the organization's present with him. At the Shakedown, there was a fundamental reason for its founding. It is this reason that ensures that the organization will live on and continue to grow and flourish in the years to come.

Chapter Five:

Employment

There are numerous options on college campuses all across the country for students to work part-time jobs in order to earn extra money or to gain experience. For the most part, these student jobs are funded by the Federal Work-Study Program (FWS). This kind of working opportunity has become quite prevalent; in fact, the FWS currently funds student work at approximately 3,400 postsecondary institutions (U.S. Department of Education 2012). Pitzer College is one of these institutions. There is no shortage of FWS student jobs at this school. And, luckily for many Pitzer students, most of these jobs are not exceedingly demanding. In fact, many actually allow student workers to get their schoolwork done while on the clock.

Thus, the question arises: why would students—most of whom have a steady supply of homework and projects on which to work—choose employment at the Shakedown in the first place? Work at the restaurant, in addition to food preparation, often involves washing dishes, burning hands on hot pans, deep cleaning a run down kitchen, taking out the trash, mopping the floor, etc. Restaurant work is not glamorous work and the Shakedown is no exception. In comparison to most on-campus jobs, work at the café is difficult and dirty. For example, just one floor down from the restaurant in the Gold Student Center (GSC), at least three students are employed at one time to oversee the fitness center and the building's service desk—jobs that allow students to relax, listen to music, and do their homework while in the clock. All for the same \$8.50 per hour as FWS workers at the Shakedown. Does this reflect a lack of forethought on

the part of workers at the restaurant? Does it make any sense to work there when the option to work less demanding jobs exists? Is this an example of irrational human behavior? Or is it rational in the sense that employees are getting something else, other than money, out of this working relationship? These questions will be the focus of the following section.

The Shakedown typically employs between 30 and 35 employees each semester. Currently, all new hires must be either on FWS or be volunteers. The restaurant does pay certain employees who do not qualify for work-study, but these are typically managers who have worked at the restaurant for multiple semesters and are clearly dedicated to the organization. The typical employee's work schedule consists of three 3-hour shifts per week. They also must dedicate the occasional hour or two to staff training, group meetings, or catering work. Students also often request coverage for shifts to which they cannot attend, thereby making the job relatively flexible. Ultimately, the average employee is not expected to dedicate more than ten hours of their week to their work at the Shakedown. This ten hours, however, can be draining on students who must study for midterms or who are dedicated to college athletics, student clubs, and on-campus activities.

In examining the reasons for many students' attraction to apply to work at the Shakedown over other jobs that allow them to accomplish class assignments, the research of Harvard Business School professors Paul R. Lawrence and Nitin Nohria will be particularly useful. Their theoretical work has focused on individual motivation from an organizational perspective. Specifically, they theorize that four separate human drives are responsible for all motivations that humans experience (McShane and Von Glinow

2010). The four drives are, in no hierarchical order, the drive to acquire, the drive to bond, the drive to learn, and the drive to defend. Generally, the drives bring about emotions in people. These emotions—when combined with one’s self-conception, past experiences, and the social expectations of the culture in which he or she is a part—determine the needs that direct behavior and decisions (ibid). How each of the four drives that Lawrence and Nohria highlight apply to the work of general employees at the Shakedown will be discussed below.

The Drive to Acquire

People’s natural drive to acquire has been the centerpiece of the majority of motivational strategies in traditional American business practice. Lawrence and Nohria define this drive as a desire to “seek, take control, and retain objects and personal experiences humans value” (Lawrence and Nohria 2002, p. 57). In free market society the primary means of satisfying this drive is to earn money. Importantly, however, the amount of money that most people feel is necessary to make is not based on sustenance. Rather, it is centered around competition. People do not focus on what they themselves inherently make, and whether that is a satisfactory salary on which to comfortably live. Rather, they look to what others make in relation to themselves. As such, the drive to acquire is insatiable; one can always point to someone else who acquires more than he or she does and thus psychologically feel the sense that the amount he or she acquires is insufficient. From here, we can extrapolate our understanding of the drive to acquire to the concept of relative status. As a way to illustrate this idea, Lawrence and Nohria point to a study in which participants are given the choice of living one of two lives: in one,

they earn a salary of \$90,000 and their neighbors earn \$100,000; in the other, they earn \$110,000 while their neighbors earn \$200,000. Although it seems that the utility-maximizing individual, of which many economic theories typically envisage, would clearly opt for the latter world, the studies showed otherwise. People would rather make less money and be more equal to the people around them than make more money but be further behind their “competitors”. Thus, unless in a perfectly equal world, it seems that some people will inherently feel that their lives are materially lacking, even if the entire population is well-fed, sheltered, and objectively comfortable. Lawrence and Nohria explain the emergence of these human tendencies by using evolutionary economics. That is, we are inherently competitive about material accumulation because the earliest humans necessarily had to be aggressive and needed to compete with others to secure food and shelter for their kin. Robert H. Frank, professor of economics at Cornell University’s school of management, agrees: “From an evolutionary perspective, the purpose of human motivation is not to make us more happy but to make us more likely to succeed against the competition” (Frank 1988, p. 135).

From an organizational perspective, the data back up Lawrence and Nohria’s theory of acquisition. Author Daniel Pink points to data that shows that increased salary does not boost objective motivational measures past a certain, rather low, point. “People,” he says, “have to earn a living. Salary, contract payments, some benefits, a few perks are what I call ‘baseline awards’ [...] The best use of money as a motivator is to pay people enough to take the issue of money off the table” (Pink 1999, p. 33). Once people make it past the point when money is actually sustaining them, pay is a poor motivator because a person’s relative status in a position will remain the same, in

comparison to the people around him. When we consider one's prospects of employment at the Shakedown, the ideas expressed above do indeed seem to justify work at the restaurant.

Work at the Shakedown (as well as at the majority of other college jobs) does not tend to offer much past the "baseline awards" that Pink writes of. Most students seek to acquire money from these jobs in order to help them pay for their education or as a supplementary income to help in purchasing basic goods. Nobody in these FWS jobs is "rolling in the dough," so to speak—at least not because of the on-campus job they have. All earn basically the same pay rate, at or slightly above minimum wage. Consequently, people's feelings of relative status are not being challenged.

To a certain degree, it seems that in the case of the Shakedown, Lawrence and Nohria's (2002) research might not explain any way in which the restaurant motivates employees' drives to acquire any more than another on-campus job; all FWS jobs offer the same baseline rewards. But, importantly, Lawrence and Nohria's research on the drive to acquire extends beyond the basic concept of money. There are additional aspects of acquisition, inherent in any hierarchy, to which people are also attracted. Perks, position titles, respect from others, centrality to the organization—all of these things help to make up how people interpret their relative status, in addition to wealth (Lawrence and Nohria 2002, p. 55-74). At the Shakedown, people's wages tell us nothing about the structure of the organization. But their job descriptions, prominence in management meetings, ability to walk into the kitchen and do what they please (i.e. make themselves food), and competence in specific organizational tasks all do create status in the restaurant's structure. Although I, for example, have not accumulated a relatively

substantial amount of money because of my work at the Shakedown, I have ‘accumulated’ other things that I do value greatly; I can write the title “Head Chef” on my resume, I have developed cooking and management skills, and I do feel that I have garnered the respect of my peers. For new and perspective employees of the Shakedown, what the leaders of the organization have accumulated is fairly plain to see. Further, the managers are peers to new employees in every other way. Accumulating, in the non-monetary sense, seems quite doable at the Shakedown. Consequently, freshmen employees can envision eventually having their own food on the menu or choosing the farms from which the restaurant sources. Indeed, as one freshman employee told me earlier this year, “I want to have your job in a few years.” This ability to see a substantial rise in just a few years certainly offers quite a bit in the way of the human drive to accumulate. Many on-campus jobs do not allow for employees to improve their relative status, as there is no means of growth within the organization. But whereas these students have nobody to whom to compare themselves, the new Shakedown worker has a world of opportunity to improve his or her relative status. It is this opportunity that is a major reason the Shakedown is able to appeal to employees’ drive to acquire, despite its inability to offer better monetary compensation than other on-campus jobs.

The Drive to Bond

Classical economic theory, which asserts that human behavior is almost entirely driven by self-interest, might consider the drive to acquire as a basically sufficient explanation for why people are motivated to work at the Shakedown. But there is clearly more to this story. Lawrence and Nohria (2002) point to a second innate human drive

that has helped to determine behavior for millennia. That is, people are driven “to form social relationships and develop mutual caring commitment with other humans that, in fact, is fulfilled only when the attachment is mutual” (p. 76). In other words, people have an inherent need to bond with others that is felt as necessary in and of itself.

The natural drive to bond, which is associated with love, trust, empathy, loyalty, and alliance, is evidenced by numerous examples of nearly universal human behavior. First, in a wide variety of settings, people seem to almost always form social ties. These relationships develop regardless of the presence of an ulterior motive. In fact, often a person’s connection with another is seemingly a hindrance on one’s self-interest. People often enter relationships with others who need help not because giving help will benefit themselves, but because they feel a sort of connection with those who are in need of assistance. Second, the natural drive to bond is evidenced by research that shows that humans have strong negative emotions associated with the breaking of social connections. Say psychologists Roy F. Baumeister and Mark R. Leary (1995), there is a “tendency for human beings to respond with distress and protest to the end of a relationship [which] is nearly universal, even across different cultures and across the age span” (p. 502). This occurs when a relationship was beneficial to a person’s self-interest, but also when a relationship was detrimental financially, emotionally, or even physically. Third, people who lack strong social bonds seem to suffer adverse psychological effects. Baumeister and Leary (1995) point out that people who lack strong social connections with others suffer from higher rates of behavioral problems, including car accidents, stress breakdowns, criminal action, and suicide (p. 508). As Charles Darwin said, “Everyone will admit that man is a social being. We see this in his dislike of solitude, and

in his wish for society beyond that of his own family. Solitary confinement is one of the severest punishments which can be inflicted” (Darwin 2004, p. 8). Last, the fact that social connection is part of virtually all cultures is a sign that it is something that is needed for the human psyche, rather than simply a societal construct. From all of this it seems that social bonds are to be a fundamental need that must be addressed in order for people to be truly satisfied and contented.

Like the drive to acquire, the drive to bond is grounded in human evolution. Early people who were attracted to groups and who were cooperative rather than antagonistic had a better chance of survival, due to the supportive strength of the group as a whole. People who exhibited liking behavior were more likely to indicate a willingness to help others and thereby receive aid from those others when they themselves were in need. From a genetic perspective, “the tribe that carried the bonding genes could easily outproduce and outfight the one that consisted of egocentric individuals with no solid and lasting basis of trusting each other” (Lawrence and Nohria 2002, p. 86). From all of this information, it seems clear that this drive to bond is not only applicable on a person-to-person level, but that it pertains to people’s relationships with larger groups as well. Humans have a need to seek support not only from close friends and family members, but also from their connections to organizations of people. When people do not belong to a larger group that psychologically provides a sense of support, they feel uneasy and unconfident. “Many of the strongest emotions people experience,” write Baumeister and Leary (1995), “are linked to belongingness. Evidence suggests a general conclusion that being accepted, included, or welcomed leads to a variety of positive emotions (e.g., happiness, elation, contentment, and calm), whereas being rejected, excluded, or ignored

leads to potent negative feelings (e.g., anxiety, depression, grief, jealousy, and loneliness).” (p. 508). We, as human beings, are motivated to find groups of like-minded people who we can trust at both an individual level and at the group level. This tendency is typically founded not from a desire to acquire social connections for the sake of acquiring them or from material benefits that might come about from connection to a group. Rather, we seek out these groups for the psychological protection they provide.

The Shakedown does a good job of satisfying the drive to bond. Typically, the majority of employees at the restaurant are freshmen or are upperclassmen who have been working there since their freshmen year. Henceforth, from students’ earliest days at college, when they are struggling to find bonds that will potentially last them the next four years, the Shakedown offers students an opportunity early on to identify with a group. The organization also gives students at the Claremont Colleges an immediate group identity. Being a “Shakedowner” is arguably more meaningful and telling than having a more generic on-campus job. The restaurant makes an effort to connect its employees to each other. The Shakedown organizes staff parties, provides a work atmosphere in which employees are dependent on and must trust each other, and gives workers a chance to talk with others while working. Furthermore, students who work “open shifts”—which are the shifts that serve dinner, as opposed to prep shifts—are able to interact with the customers, who are almost always peers, and serve them food of which they can be proud. Not many FWS jobs give students so many chances to bond and connect with their fellow students on a regular basis. The Shakedown has a particular bonded character—represented by organizational artifacts such as its blackboard menu, jargon used on shift, a wooden board above the cash register that

appears to be made out of human hair (according to manager Rmax Goodwin ('12)), comically named refrigerators, a definitively funky dining area, and the common sporting of unconventional headwear—that outsiders see and to which they are (in some cases) attracted. Although this job is not the simplest way to collect work-study money for students at the Claremont Colleges, it gives many a chance to be a part of something that is very unique, unlike anything that most colleges have available. The appeal of the restaurant in this regard has attracted many volunteer workers, who apparently just want to be a part of the Shakedown's organizational culture and experience what it is like in that kitchen.



Figure 1:

An example of some organizational artifacts of the Shakedown. The “human hair” sign, the chalkboard menu, and the unique headwear may not necessarily be signs of a fine dining establishment, but they do serve to lend a certain personality to the organization as well as a particular attitude amongst its members.

The Drive to Learn

Although many people consider schooling and education to be a means of satisfying individuals' need to acquire (as it allows them to get employment) as well as a way for societies to collectively grow, there seems to be a deeper and more fundamental reason why some form of education and teaching have been integral parts the earliest civilizations (Gray 2008). That is, as Lawrence and Nohria (2002) posit, humans naturally have a drive to learn and to obtain knowledge. There is a natural urge for people to "satisfy curiosity, to know, to comprehend, to believe, to appreciate, to develop understanding or representations of their environment and of themselves through a reflective process" (p. 107). Although, in today's economy, increased knowledge leads to much greater prospects of acquisition, there seems to be a lot more that is driving us to maximize our learning. The evidence of this, outlined below, is convincing. It also gives us a better understanding of humankind as a whole, and why certain establishments and ideas have emerged in societies across time and geographical location.

Why has every known major society of people adhered to a religion or belief system (Ferraro 2008, p. 344)? Why has communicative art been cherished since the Stone Age? Why do children almost universally express an immoderate sense of curiosity? And why do people spend every morning working on the *New York Times* crossword and Sudoku puzzles? Are these acquisition-based pursuits? Almost certainly not. Are they designed to satisfy the need to bond? Possibly to a certain degree, as people do gather around religion and sometimes do crosswords together; however there clearly seems to be a deeper purpose to spirituality, faith, artistic pursuits, and problem-solving challenges. That is, religion, art, natural curiosity, and intellectual thought seem

to go hand-in-hand with human activity because we simply need to satisfy our urge to reason through problems and to answer questions.

Many of history's great thinkers—from Aristotle to Cicero to Kant to Bentham to St. Augustine—have stated that the human instinct of curiosity is innate and separate from any utilitarian or serviceable goals. Psychologist George Loewenstein classifies this curiosity as “a form of cognitively-induced deprivation that arises from the perception of a gap in knowledge or understanding” (Loewenstein 1994, p. 75). Loewenstein's ultimate concept, which he calls the *information gap theory*, is essentially that when humans encounter information to which they have not previously been exposed, a mental information gap is formed. The feeling of this cognitive hole, which is experienced as an emotion, is unpleasant for virtually all people. Consequently, humans do what they can to fill in the information gap by acquiring information. The unpleasantness of the information gap is the motivator to seek new insights and knowledge that match up with the newly observed information (ibid). Religions are established, in part, to answer questions that are (at the time that the religions emerge) unknowable, such as why it rains or what happens after death. Additionally, many forms of historic art emerged in order to answer these questions for others in society, so that they did not need to struggle with the same information gap. This approach to answering life's questions, when performed collectively, allows people to make sense of the world and of the self. The collective aspect of this is indeed important; for if a society were to be made up of many individuals who promoted different ideas about why it rains, new information gaps would constantly emerge, as flaws in people's prior way of thinking would always be uncovered. This would essentially stagnate society's intellectual progress, as questions that are (at the

time) unanswerable would continually be asked, thereby prohibiting attention and resources to shift to more realistic questions and answers. From this, the human tendency to cluster around like-minded others makes sense, in regards to religious thought. It also makes sense that religion has been at the heart of so many wars and conflicts, as opposing religious ideas bring about high levels of cognitive dissonance and discomfort. The point of all this is that the drive to learn is a fundamental desire of man that stems from the mind's need to reduce curiosity and make sense of the experiences people have and observations they make.

What are the general implications of this drive to learn? Briefly, the human attraction to growth, personal competence, achievement, mastery, creativity, and efficacy all are derived from the desire to continually expand the individual and collective base of knowledge (Lawrence and Nohria 2002). In considering this from an organizational frame of mind, Richard Hackman and Greg Oldham's (1976) model of intrinsic job motivation is very illustrative in regards to which general job characteristics tend to attract the human drive to learn. Specifically, a job's skill variety, task identity, task significance, level of autonomy, and ability to give useful job feedback lead to specific positive emotions (see figure 3), which in turn improve motivation, satisfaction, and performance (McShane and von Glinow 2010, p. 194-195). All of these core job characteristics are implemented to satisfy employees' drive not to get higher salaries, but to learn and to expose themselves to new information and experiences. It is not thereby surprising that there is a tendency for jobs on assembly lines and in menial labor outfits to have high turnover rates and/or low appeal; when every task, day-in and day-out is

identical, no information gaps emerge and, as such, a fundamental psychological need is not adequately addressed.

Figure 3

Hackman-Oldham Job Characteristics Model of Work Motivation

Source:

(<http://www.mcgraw-hillanswers.com/job-characteristics-approach-task-design>)

Organizations develop ways to satisfy new members, allowing them to quickly step in and begin uncovering and filling in cognitive gaps. “As new members join an organization, they are gradually socialized and indoctrinated with the collective knowledge of the ongoing organization [...] Representational schemes carried in the minds of organizational members are, along with existing bonded relationships, a primary source of the glue and inertia found in organizations” (Lawrence and Nohria 2002, p. 118-119). From here, we can postulate that groups of people almost always develop ways of doing certain things that are not necessarily the 100% most effective means of doing so, but are done nonetheless because that is how the information gap was originally answered. These group habits allow people in organizations to cognitively disengage from questions and activities that have already been addressed and instead focus their curiosity on new ideas, no matter if the original answers to questions were the “right” ones. In consequence, when new employees come into an organization, they quickly adopt the habits and ways of believing to which the organization as a whole generally adheres. As Peter Senge writes, “new insights [from new employees/organizational members] fail to get put into practice because they conflict with deeply held internal

images of how the world works, images that limit us to familiar ways of thinking and acting” (Senge 2006, p. 163). Senge views it as a negative, as he says it limits ingenuity. On the flip side of the coin, though, these mental models allow people to focus on new information gaps, rather than ones that people in the organization have already looked at. Therefore these mental models can be seen as limits to, as well as agents of, innovation.

In examining the Shakedown Café, it now becomes clear that the restaurant is, in multiple ways, very attractive for employment when it comes to students’ drive to learn. At the most basic level, people want to learn how to cook. Many people who come to work at the Shakedown have little professional kitchen experience. During new employee training sessions, the elementary cooking terms *sauté*, *caramelize*, *mince*, *marinate*, and *reduce* are, if not foreign, at least hazy concepts to most. Exactly how a set of raw ingredients is transformed into a burrito or a Secret Stash sandwich is something that certainly could create quite a large information gap. The countless chemical and physical reactions involved in any cooking process are theoretically quite complicated and difficult to comprehend without any instruction or prior knowledge. Because of this, people need to rely on organizational practices in cooking, set out by more experienced workers (who have themselves been indoctrinated to follow a certain manner of cooking). Additionally, people know that the knowledge that they obtain through their work at the Shakedown will be very valuable once they can no longer rely upon leave the comforts the dining halls of the Claremont Colleges to nourish them. I know of a number of past and present employees who chose to work at the restaurant purely for this reason of learning basic cooking techniques and principles.

The Shakedown additionally satisfies the human drive to learn by offering employees a highly diverse set of tasks in which to participate. Most traditional restaurants rely on the French Brigade system of professional kitchen management. Under this system, tasks are strictly defined and specialized. One employee works the sauté station, one works the *garde manger*, one works as expediter, one is the saucier, et cetera. Each employee learns to specialize in his or her station's specific tasks, creating a highly efficient machine of human capital. At the Shakedown, however, there are no specifically assigned job designations in the kitchen. On any given shift, a worker might work at the cash register, wash dishes, plate the hot meals, prepare salads, or help serve customers. Shift managers are told to urge their new employees to try all aspects of work at the restaurant, going out of their comfort zones whenever they can. As one email, sent to the staff at the beginning of a semester reads, "In the first few weeks, don't be afraid to mess up in the kitchen. Just because you don't know how to make every dish doesn't mean you should forever be a washer of dishes.....step up and take on something you're not quite comfortable with. That's the only way we'll really rock it this semester." Employees at the restaurant must continually learn how new aspects of the restaurant function and operate. People's curiosity is continually satisfied as they understand a new aspects of the restaurant, only to be re-piqued when a new information gap emerges in some other part of the Shakedown.

Last, the café satisfies the drive to learn by relying on traditional mental models to dictate many actions within the organization. For example, until last year shifts at the restaurant were always scheduled as 12pm-3pm, 3pm-6pm, 6pm-9pm, and 9pm-closing. These times did not work well in terms of the class schedule at the Claremont Colleges

and also entailed changing shifts right when the restaurant opened (at 6pm). Additionally, receipts and invoices are to be placed in a very small metal box located in the kitchen, even though the box lends itself to a terrible system of organization of receipts and invoices; cooking on shift, until the fall of 2011, was done exclusively on portable camp stoves, even though there was a large griddle in the kitchen that was never used; an innumerable amount of small glass jars and plastic yogurt containers are always washed and saved, even though they have proven to be of little use in the kitchen; and the food prep task list has looked the same for years, even though there might be better or more efficient ways of outlining tasks for the day. All of this allows employees to focus on learning new, interesting and useful skills, rather than constantly getting bogged down in the introductions to new organizational procedures. This aspect of the Shakedown is common to many organizations, as practices often are normalized that, when people look back at in the future, seem illogical or purposeless.

It is important to note that the use of mental models is not completely necessary for all on-campus jobs; some work is simply not complicated enough to necessitate indoctrinated procedures that allow employees to move their curiosity on to more complicated tasks. Although they are necessary and respectable, not all on-campus jobs involve the coordination and interdependencies of dozens of people. Nor do they require employees to continually learn new things. Ultimately, it seems that these other jobs do not need to satisfy the need to learn because the job demands are flexible enough to allow students to supply their own learning material (i.e. homework). The Shakedown is able to overcome the seeming disadvantage it faces, in comparison to other FWS jobs, of not

permitting students the opportunity to do homework while at work by satisfying the drive to learn in different, meaningful ways.

Drive to Defend

In his book in which he termed the phrase “fight or flight,” physiologist Walter Bradford Cannon wrote the following:

“These changes—the more rapid pulse, the deeper breathing, the increase of sugar in the blood, the secretion from the adrenal glands—were very diverse and seemed unrelated. Then, one wakeful night, after a considerable collection of these changes had been disclosed, the idea flashed through my mind that they could be nicely integrated if conceived as bodily preparations for supreme effort in flight or in fighting” (Cannon 1945).

This physiological reaction is the basis for what Lawrence and Nohria (2002) call the drive to defend. This drive is potentially the most fundamental of all drives: for if we were not interested in defending our possessions (generated from the drive to acquire), loved ones (generated from the drive to bond), and self-concept/knowledge (generated from the drive to learn), there would be little reason to pursue those other drives. Whereas we *actively* seek to acquire, bond, and learn, our desire to defend is purely *reactional*. Therefore, people’s motivation to defend that which they consider “theirs” is a reaction to the threats present in a given environment. In terms of acquired goods, people are highly concerned about their territory and are choosy about how they spend our money; in terms of social bonds, humans are inclined not only to defend their own selves and their families, but also their friends, neighbors, peers, fellow citizens, and in some cases, fellow world inhabitants; and in terms of learning, people are protective of their ideas—as seen through patent laws—as well as their ideas about how the world does

and should work. Indeed, it seems that people naturally are attracted to groups because of the protection they provide them. An individual in an ancient tribe would be much more able to defend himself and his family with the support of an entire group; when one bonded with others, he would be outfitted with a group of people that would defend him; and group life, as noted in the previous section, tends to reinforce ideas people have about religion, natural phenomena, and politics. From an organizational perspective, then, it does seem that people would be attracted to the protections and supports that institutions and groups provide because of the drive to defend.

The sustainable food movement is a manifestation of the drive to defend. First and foremost, there is the desire to defend the world's environment. Lawrence and Nohria (2002) note that over the course of human existence there has been a general, albeit gradual, increase in the size of collectives to which humans identify. Prehistorically, man attached himself to just a small group of hunters; tribal cultures then emerged, followed by small villages; eventually, nation states became a primary means of individual identification; today, people are increasingly relating to the world at large (p. 144). As a result of this, citizens and governments of the world are beginning to realize that they must cooperate with all in the fight to in restore the environment. Great efforts to reduce carbon emissions and to enforce environmental policies on individual countries will do nothing if there are other nations that are abusing the earth. Americans and other people of developed countries are thus embracing citizens of the developing world as partners in the battle to produce food sustainably. As such, the drive to defend is leading first-world citizens to travel to foreign countries and serve them, encouraging our bonding drive to further collectivize with the world at large.

The drive to defend motivates action to participate in the food justice movement in a second way, which is grounded in the human drive to learn. People tend to inherently think of food as something natural, wholesome, nourishing, comforting, and pure. The image of the small farm is romanticized in this country. People like to think that their food was produced in a safe, non-degrading, and honest way. Yet, when they learn of the flaws of the food industry and the ways in which food producers take advantage of the environment, animals, farm workers, and the system to which they are a part, their worldview is threatened. That quintessential conceptualization of the agrarian countryside that is so often evoked in America is understood by conscious consumers to simply be a product of advertising and age-old ideals. Some people deny what is going on in the industrial food system, others accept it, and others still try to fight against the agricultural and food production industries. These are all common defense strategies when one's learned knowledge is threatened.

A third manner in which people who are attracted to food justice are urged to participate in the movement is to defend their money. One major problem that people point to in criticizing the industrial food system is the massive subsidies that are given to produce corn, soybeans, wheat, and rice. These subsidies are used to keep prices of factory farmed meat, processed goods, dairy products, and oils as low as possible. The farmers do not make the money, though. Rather, it is a few American corporations who are reaping the enormous benefits of the American taxpayers' money (Patel 2007). People who are involved in or supportive of the food justice movement are repelled by this apparent injustice. Environmentally-aware upper and middleclass citizens, who do not support the companies that take advantage of the subsidy system, rarely buy food

from such corporations. Yet these citizens must pay large sums of money in the form of taxes, helping to keep these companies afloat. Additionally, lower income people interested in food justice do not have the option to *not* support this system of production; they *must* buy products from these large corporations, resultantly putting their families at risk of becoming obese or developing other health problems. As such, these lower income citizens are forced to support the very producers that are doing them great harm. In both the case of the rich and the poor, people who engage in the food movement feel that their money is being stolen from them, thus activating the inclination to actively defend what was acquired.

Pitzer College naturally attracts students who are high in the need to defend the environment, look after the marginalized populations of the world, and their view of how the world should work. The Shakedown, then, definitely has a wide base of students who could potentially be interested in employment at the restaurant. Attacking the issues inherent in the struggle to improve the food industry can seem to many to be insurmountable. But being a part of the Shakedown allows students to feel that they are in fact making a meaningful difference in the movement. In its support of local organic farmers and in serving almost all scratch food (meaning food that is cooked using the fewest premade ingredients possible), employees can feel as if they are actively resisting the industrial food system every time they serve a dish or make a recipe. Although, admittedly, this feeling is likely not conscious for employees all the time at work, it is something that likely plays a role for students when considering working there. Employees can feel that they are part of a like-minded group, in which their ideas about the food industry can be discussed openly and will be supported.

Lawrence and Nohria (2002) also note that the drive to defend at an organizational level tends to create an “us against them” mentality (p.143). At the Shakedown, this way of thinking has become prominent by way of students uniting against the faculty, in a certain way. The organization prides itself on being almost entirely run by students. New employees of the restaurant are certainly attracted to this sense of independence. This feeling of organizational self-reliance satisfies people’s drive to defend, as students do not feel that they need the help of the school or its staff to stay in business (although, in reality, that feeling is somewhat artificial—the school provides much of the infrastructure that the Shakedown is built upon, and does aid in many tasks). By opposing the current food industry and by existing as a peer-run business, the Shakedown satisfies employees’ need to defend their values and important principles.

The Four Drives at the Shakedown

The most satisfying jobs are clearly those that meet all of our drives, rather than only two or three. The Four Drive theory of motivation states that it is critically important for organizations, if they are to effectively motivate employees, to keep the drives to acquire, bond, learn and defend in balance, not focusing too much or too little on any single factor (Lawrence and Nohria 2002, p. 225). The theory also emphasizes the importance of applying the tenets of this conceptualization of motivation to every level of the organization. Above, I have only focused on typical on-shift employees at the restaurant. However, there are many other subgroups that I could have looked at. The leaders, the several Pitzer administrators who help, and the alumni all are motivated

to aid the organization by the four basic drives. Also, interestingly, the theory applies to customers' motivations to support the restaurant. When buying from the Shakedown—or any business for that matter—people look for a balanced mix of quality (drive to acquire), service (drive to bond), novelty (drive to learn), and reliability (drive to defend) (Lawrence and Nohria 2002, p. 227). This is telling in regards to the reasons that restaurant has seen an approximate doubling of revenues and profits in the past year. Whereas in years past the menu would be overhauled on a regular basis, this year two well-researched and recipe-tested menus were used that included permanent items that were flexible enough to accommodate seasonality. Therefore, employees actually learned how to make the food and the food became consistent and reliable; this in turn improved overall quality, meeting the drive to acquire something that is “worth it”. In addition to this, the restaurant offers weekly specials to satisfy some regular customers desire for novelty products. And in terms of satisfying the drive to defend, the Shakedown has recommitted itself to connecting directly back to its farmers (in the 2010/2011 the restaurant utilized a, middle-man, of sorts, to source most food), posting in-depth descriptions of its sources, and even hosting a series of talks in the restaurant in which the restaurant's various purveyors spoke to students.

At the Shakedown, there does indeed seem to be an unbalanced focus on some drives over others. The drives to bond and to learn are certainly satisfied through work there. But the drives to defend and acquire could indeed be improved. In terms of defending, employees can often feel that their individual actions as cooks at the restaurant are not making any difference in the food movement. Like any restaurant, there are busy and slow hours of operation. Looking out at an empty dining room can indeed dishearten

a person's sense that he or she is making a positive difference. Additionally, although the Shakedown minimizes food waste as much as possible, the fact of the matter is that virtually all restaurants waste food. Employees' desires to defend the environment and promote food justice can feel wasted in these cases. In terms of the drive to acquire, the primary problem at the restaurant is that the level of performance of the Shakedown ultimately makes no financial difference to employees. Whether or not the restaurant profits, employees are still going to make \$8.50 per hour. In fact, when the restaurant is doing well, work becomes more difficult for employees. There are no financial benefits to organizational success for the individual. Additionally, virtually all 5C students' baseline rewards are in fact satisfied by the college environment itself; very few students truly *need* on-campus work for acquisition purposes.

The four drives, when looked at as a whole, do explain to a fairly high degree why a student at the Claremont Colleges would choose to work at a more demanding, more taxing, and less productive (in terms of getting homework done) job than at one in which she could catch up on homework and relax. People are attracted to the Shakedown employment because it offers non-financial acquisitions, allows for strong bonds to be formed with coworkers and customers, gives employees the opportunity to learn a great deal about a wide variety of valuable topics, and is compatible with what many students at the college strive to defend. These important factors allow the restaurant to continually attract incoming freshmen and to develop new talent, which is critical at a student organization that naturally has a very high rate of turnover.

Chapter Six:

Enrollment

Thus far, I have explored why the Shakedown was founded and why it has been able to attract a new batches of employees semester after semester. Next, I turn to why a person would want to further commit him or herself to the organization, even though doing so generally leads to no direct economic gain. This increased level of commitment, which Peter Senge (2006) calls *enrollment*, entails not just participating in an organization, but having the desire to meaningfully help an organization realize a vision. Enrolled people truly do want the vision to become reality, and wish to have some responsibility or sense of influence in the outcome of the vision (p. 203-207). At the Shakedown, enrolled employees not only dutifully come to their shifts, but they also take up extra responsibilities such as planning events, managing shifts, advertising for the restaurant, helping with catering, urging their friends to eat at the restaurant, etc. These employees have historically been referred to as “managers” within the organization. The question is, why do people enroll? What factors transform people from being relatively replaceable parts of the organization to being involved members, whose exact contributions could not be replicated by anyone else?

According to Argentinean business scholar Ernesto Gore, “Organizations are made of conversations” (Perkins 2003, p. 17). That is, people’s coordinated thoughts, efforts, intentions, and desires are all based on the conversations that they have together. Organizations cannot exist without conversations. At the Shakedown, conversations occur all the time—on shift, through email messages, on the phone, informally as friends,

and, most importantly, in the weekly manager meetings. These meetings, which have been held on Fridays at noon for the past four years, expose to newly enrolled employees the gears that drive the Shakedown; that is, when employees enroll by attending meetings, they get to finally hear the conversations that lead to many of the phenomena that are inevitably manifested on shift, and how they arise. Although regular employees are exposed to the organization's practices and to some core values by conversing on shift and with fellow employees, it is not until they attend the manager meetings that they fully realize from where those values stem and why these practices are put into place. It is from the Friday meetings that much of the other conversations that take place at the Shakedown originate. Through my experience in the organization, I feel that these meetings serve as a microcosm of the organization as a whole. It is also from the Friday meetings that deeper employee motivation, curiosity, and initiative is born. I argue that it is the conversations that occur in these meetings that foster that serves as a stepping stone for the development of the deepened commitment that is instilled in enrolled employees.

Organizational Learning and Intelligence

In December 2011, the owners of a very popular gastropub in Claremont—the Back Abbey—opened a second restaurant in town. The new venture, called Union on Yale, had much hype and high expectations amongst locals. My friends and I got a coveted reservation to the restaurant on its opening night. Unfortunately, the dining experience did not turn out well. We were not served food until two hours after our reservation, at which point each diner's meal came out one at a time. Additionally, the restaurant ran out of many of the foods that we had ordered. We left the restaurant three

and a half hours after we arrived, disappointed and still a bit hungry. “Well,” one of my friends said, “they won’t be in business for long.”

However, Union on Yale is indeed still in business. And according to many, it is one of the best restaurants in Claremont, worthy of taking a first date or of bringing an out-of-town guest. It seems, as of now, that the business will not be doomed to the fate of many new restaurants, which is failure and loss of much invested capital. The key to Union on Yale’s turnaround, I argue (although I cannot be certain, as I have not studied the specific restaurant directly), is that the business learned from its mistakes and was able to change. Many restaurants open with chefs and managers who assume they have all the answers and that their personal recipes are the best. Those ones will inevitably go out of business. The ones that adapt and attempt to understand the origins of their problems, conversely, will be more likely to succeed in the long-run. Union on Yale had serious issues that would preclude it from being successful. But those problems are no longer present. This ability to learn is a critically important part of any business. To paraphrase Harvard Graduate School professor David Perkins, it is this ability that leads to high levels of organizational intelligence. The processes upon which a business is founded determine the types of interactions that occur within it. Depending on the nature of these interactions (i.e. conversations), the organization will either be equipped to continually evolve from its problems or will perpetually flounder in its complications (Perkins 2003). Ultimately, the idea that conversation is important to organizations is not particularly profound. The concept that the way an organization converses determines its ability to grow is slightly more perspicacious. However, neither one of these ideas tells us anything about employee motivation at the Shakedown. To do that, we must first

examine the key characteristics of the learning organization and how those traits are typically manifested in groups. In order to narrow our scope in answering the above questions, I will focus mainly on the Friday manager meetings, mentioned earlier in this section. I feel that these serve as an accurate microcosm of the organization as a whole, attending them is the fundamental first step in becoming a manager at the Shakedown Café for many employees, and much of the behavior exhibited in the organization is a direct result of topics discussed at these meetings.

Progressive Interactions:

Perkins (2002) highlights two types of conversations that organizations tend to foster—progressive interactions and regressive interactions. The former allows for the exchange of information and the passing of ideas that brings about shrewd decisions, insightful solutions, and prescient strategies. All of these practices foster cohesion, excitement, and passion for people participating in the communication. The latter, regressive interaction, tends to foster “narrow, confused, and cautious” exchanges of information that in turn lead to dissatisfaction, confusion, conflict, and a lack of a united vision (Perkins 2003, p. 20-21). Progressive interactions induce continual learning for individual members of an organization, as well as for the group as a whole. Regressive interactions are rarely about to do this. As people interact to solve new problems, they make new discoveries. These new discoveries lead to new questions, which lead again to new problems and back to new discoveries (Bennett and Brown 1995, p. 183). This phenomenon bears a striking resemblance to the manner in which individuals deal with information gaps; indeed, just as the drive to learn prompts individuals to continually

seek new questions, it also inclines learning-based groups to interact in progressive ways. An organization that constantly asks new questions and which is never fully satisfied with its current state of being will always progress and grow. On the flip side, organizations that tend to have regressive conversations seek to solve problems by going back to what was successful in the past. People in power hold information closely, exposing only that which is absolutely necessary in order to solve the particular problem at hand. The regressive organization's conversations tend to focus defensively on problems that need to be solved *now*, rather than actively on questions that will need to be addressed in the future. Whereas the regressive organization constantly patches up torn jeans, the progressive one tries to develop an entirely new denim material that will not tear as easily. It is this difference that distinguishes innovative and successful organizations from those that operate within the comforts of the status quo, sometimes struggling to stay in business.

When we consider the Shakedown, it seems that the restaurant's Friday meetings do indeed have a structure that could support progressive conversation. Inherent to the organizational culture is the inclination for employees to always strive to continue pushing forward as a group. Conversations at the Shakedown are almost always based on doing things differently and better than they have been done in the past, rather than returning de facto to practices that were employed in the past. The organization's conversations are able to be progressive and learning-based because people working within the organization care about its mission, and put that mission above their own egos. As nobody's perspective is necessarily better or more appreciated than anyone else's, dialogues are able to attract new people to contribute their insights and experiences,

which leads to an overall increase in organizational knowledge. The intelligence that is gained through this—at both a collective and individual level—has not always been a result of immediate increased productivity, as some ideas that have been embraced have not at all panned out. However, the fact that the organization strongly encourages and lends itself to experimentation and progress has resulted in overall growth and a substantial base of knowledge about what does and does not work.

Contact Architecture and Dialogue

The reason why not only some organizations, but *most* organizations, primarily have regressive conversations is due to the contact architecture upon which many organizations are built from the outset (Perkins 2003, p. 36). In other words, the ability for a group to learn is highly dependent on how its founders set the stage for conversations to develop, the manner by which roles were initially assigned, the channels of communication that were most often used in the beginning, and the inherent power dynamics that the original organization supported. Regressive interactions tend to go hand in hand with contact architectures that resemble long boardroom tables (see figure 4). Roles are strictly defined, interactions are highly predictable, and the chain of command is firmly upheld. Group meetings that are designed under this type of architecture tend to center around imbuing the central figure of the group with enough information for him or her to make a given decision. Ideas come from different sides of the table, each fighting for consideration by the boss.

Figure 4

Typical board room table, exemplifying a contact architecture that might lead to regressive conversations.

Source: <http://venturebeat.com/2011/06/22/proposed-the-boardroom-for-the-21st-century/boardroom/>

These conversations are discussions, which are, as Senge notes, like ping-pong matches; discussions often focus on a specific subject, with participants analyzing and dissecting it from multiple angles to select the best solution (Senge 2006, p. 223). One person puts forward a specific idea, another critiques that and offers his or her own opinion, and a third critiques both of those and recommends something completely new. In discussions, ideas are not built upon. Instead, points of view are advocated for. The purpose of an individual's engagement in a discussion is to have his or her idea prevail, to be accepted by the person(s) in power. Conversely, progressive contact architectures are epitomized by a round table (see figure 5). Instead of discussions, this type of contact architecture usually leads to *dialogue*. This difference is critical. "In a dialogue [...] a group accesses a larger pool of common meaning, which cannot be accessed individually [...] The purpose of a dialogue is to go beyond any one individual's understanding," (ibid, p. 223). Others have defined dialogue, in this context, as "the art of thinking together" (Bohm 1990) or as a conversation without a center (Isaacs 1999). The *ultimate* best answer is sought in a dialogue, rather than the best answer that any one individual has proposed. Dialogue interactions consist of a flow of ideas, rather than a back-and-forth exchange of viewpoints. This difference is subtle, but it is essential in determining whether an organization will be progressive or regressive.

Figure 5:

Circular conference table. Typically, the mode of conversation that comes from this type of contact architecture is more progressive than is that which comes from a more hierarchical set up.

Source:

(http://www.woodweb.com/knowledge_base/Huge_Round_Conference_Table_Construction.html)

The Shakedown was founded on upon a very integrative organizational structure. Management roles were loosely defined and not compartmentalized. Instead of having strict the theoretical boundaries between peoples' jobs, the distinctions were scalable and transparent (Perkins 2003, p. 36). In other words, managers all knew what each other did, how that fit into the group's goals, and how they personally could step in to aid their colleagues. Once the founders graduated, they segmented roles slightly more, creating specific managerial roles and job descriptions about exactly what those roles would entail (Beebe et al 2008). Prior to the 2011/2012 school year, those roles were further defined, clarified, updated, and reinforced (see Appendix A). However, there is still quite a bit of leeway in terms of role-crossover. For instance, Maria Guererro ('12) often communicates important information to the staff, even though she is officially responsible for catering; Vivian Ponte-Fritz ('15) acquired a new Kitchen-Aid mixer, even though she is only technically responsible for actual baking tasks in the kitchen; Megan Hazen ('14), Kayla Imhoff ('13), Maria Guererro, and others have helped with marketing and advertising; and I have worked with New Frontier Family Farm to source our chickens, even though doing so is not an outlined responsibility of the head chef. These are just a handful of the many cases in which job roles remain flexible despite a relatively clear outline of individual job responsibilities. The organization is further de-

segmented during the meetings themselves. Many people give suggestions to and take constructive criticism from others about how they could improve in their performance. Further, the physical architecture of the meetings is completely equalized. The group sits on the couches and chairs in the dining room, in no particular order, forming a tight circle around a coffee table (see figure 5). Differentiating oneself, physically, from the group is not attractive, encouraged, or supported at these meetings. For example, I remember when, two years ago, one of the organization's primary leaders came to the meeting and lounged on an entire couch. By doing this, the leader was, in a way, declaring his status. After the meeting other managers grumbled amongst themselves that this behavior was not acceptable at the Shakedown.



Figure 6: Shakedown managers meeting (spring 2012). From left, around circle clockwise: Jesse Gaddy, Jake Kaplan, Mia Cetti, Maria Guererro, Chelsea McMahan, Kristin Dobbin, and Kayla Imhoff

Although the physical meeting and the role contact architecture facilitates collective decision making, the meetings themselves do not usually attract a great number of new employees, even though all staff are welcome. The first reason for this, cited by many employees, is that the thought of the “Manager Meeting” is intimidating and exclusive. Writes Kristin Dobbin (’13): “I think we need to work on maintaining an open community. Although I agree that some centralization and designations [are] needed to increase our effectiveness, there is no reason that we need to be exclusive about this. We should drop the word ‘manager’ from the managers meeting. We should be more encouraging and inclusive” (Dobbin 2012). Second, new employees do not always attend meetings because of the fact that the organization is populated entirely by students. Inevitably, this means that academic classes and extracurriculars must be worked around meetings. However, this is not always possible. Employees have been polled to see what time works best for them to meet and Friday at noon has been shown to be the best time. Nonetheless, a certain number of employees inevitably have class or other commitments that prohibit them from attending at that time. This essentially blocks any chance an employee would have in taking on a serious duty at the restaurant. Last, new employees don’t come to meetings often because there is no salient reason for them to do so. While the leaders of the organization have a settled routine, know what their roles are in the meetings, and have important information to communicate to the group, the only thing pulling new employees to the meetings is the curiosity to see how the organization works and to make their voices heard. All of this means that the contact architecture does not necessarily integrate all perspectives at the Shakedown. Rather, the conversation is

limited to those who have specific leadership roles and to those new employees who are brave and/or curious enough to take a seat in the circle.

The critical distinction that Senge makes between dialogue and discussion is that discussion is centered around making decisions, whereas dialogue is centered around the exploration of complex issues (Senge 2006, p. 230). Hence, as prudent decisions as well as deeper, open thought processes are both necessary parts of organizational communication, discussions and dialogues are both important. What separates the learning organization from a more regressive one is the relative frequency that dialogues occur in relation to discussions, as well as the frames of mind that people have when engaging in these conversations. In terms of frequency, effective learning organizations engage in discussions only when a clear decision is needed. Otherwise, organizational members engage in thought-provoking dialogues. As for organizational members' approaches to the interactions, in both dialogues and discussions, people within the learning organization may indeed have specific opinions and positions, but they are not held by those stances (Senge 2006, p. 231). When individuals converse in progressive organizations, they are seeking what is best for the organization rather than what will further their position and allow them to "win."

In meetings at the Shakedown, many important decisions are made. For instance, the tasks listed in the restaurant's meeting minutes under the "Jobs for next week" section all stem from decisions that were made at the meeting (see Appendix B for a randomly selected example of the organization's meeting minutes from January 27th, 2012). Effective discussions, writes Senge, "converge on a conclusion or course of action"

(Senge 2006, p. 230) and that is just what this aspect of the meetings do. However, the meeting minutes also list such bullet points as the following:

**“Nancy Neiman (Scripps Prof.) might make an internship for people to pick fruits and veggies from community gardens and bring them to the Shakedown. Try to not overlap with what we order from Amy’s [the farm from which the Shakedown sources much of its produce].*

**“Julian researched Premier Meat in Vernon, butchers grass-fed beef from Paso Robles. Delivers the next day. Sounds legit. However, need to find out about the slaughterhouse they use. Are cows grazing or just fed grass? So many questions! Kristin will research along with Julian and Jesse. They sell poultry, too.”*

**“Want to start a shakedown alumni association to provide oversight (non-administrative oversight), to check in on us once in a while to see how we’re doing, offer advice on improvements, and could help us get donations. Should set up a facebook group. Could be very handy, as the Shake’s vision and knowledge may get lost in the staff turnover over the years, like how we’re apparently in Pitzer’s 10-year plan...”*

These aspects of the meeting represent a distinctly different type of conversation, as compared to the necessary job tasks listed in the “Jobs for next week” section. These are the result of different organizational members bringing up ideas and putting them on the table. I remember this meeting particularly well because I came to it excited about the meat purveyor I had been researching and with whom I had been talking (noted in the second bullet point above). The process of finding a truly sustainable beef source had proven exceptionally difficult for Jesse Gaddy (’13), Jake Kaplan (’13), and I. Thus, I was ready to really push for this beef source. However, upon discussing the company with the group, some issues that I had not considered were unearthed. Upon further discussion, Kristin Dobbin (’13) brought up some ideas she had for beef sources. Slowly, I became less attached to the original meat purveyor. The group as a whole also began to engage in the conversation by offering suggestions and other possible avenues for sourcing beef. By the end of the meeting, I personally was much less attached to the

original company. I was open to the possibility of continuing our research into other purveyors and cattle ranchers. Ultimately, this dialogue was very important, as Kristin ended up finding Dey Dey's, a small family ranch located near Santa Barbara that raises very sustainable (not to mention delicious) beef. I do not think this altered course of action would have been taken if the Shakedown's meetings did not foster a sense of open-minded conversation, which detaches participants' egos from their arguments. Dialogues such as these are not rare at the Shakedown. In every meeting, different people propose new ideas and novel directions in which they believe the Shakedown could head. Conflict does occur, but this conflict practically never escalates to argument. I think this is the case because new issues are being explored communally rather than being advocated for individually during conversations at the Shakedown's meetings.

Senge (2006) notes that "Dialogue emerges from the 'leaderless' group" (p. 230). When one considers organizations, this sense of leaderlessness is very rare in the business world. However, at Shakedown meetings, there truly is no a primary leader. This aspect of leadership in the organization will be extensively discussed in the next section, but for now what is important is the fact that everyone who comes to the manager meetings has the chance to express their ideas, which are equally considered no matter who happens to be doing the proposing. Nobody has the final say in the group, nobody gets extra 'points' for having their proposition accepted, and nobody is trying to win over one particular person. Therefore, people engage in conversation that is based on bettering the organization as a whole. This dialogue leads to many new insights and ideas that might be suppressed if the meetings were more heavily weighted towards pure decision-making and task assignment. In general, the Shakedown's dialogues do further organizational

and individual learning to a great extent, and are one of the fundamental aspects of the restaurant that lead to positive progress and growth.

Collaboration:

Collaboration among group members is the key to creating a whole greater than the sum of its parts. When people can pool their knowledge, complement each others' efforts, and cooperate in order to aid each other rather than getting in each others' ways, positive results are peer-to-peer learning will inevitably occur. "True collaboration occurs when people strive together toward the same outcome in ways that directly share the work, thinking, and responsibility" (Perkins 2003, p. 155). Through effective collaboration, people are able to work faster, produce higher quality products and services, be more creative, bond with peers, and learn more than they would if working independently towards a single goal. It is important to note, however, that collaboration is not always the best answer to solve a problem. It is most effective when group members are at a similar maturity level, are committed to the organization for multiple years, when groups contain 3-4 people (ibid, p. 76), when they are united by a common mission, have mixed and complementary skills, are in non-competitive and trusting environments that are open to experimentation, are open to different ways of thinking, and are aided by a facilitator of conversation (Gauthier 1995, p. 397-98). This last characteristic is especially important, as will be shown later.

Three common problems often arise when organizations attempt to enact collaborative systems of communication (Perkins 2003). In some cases, groups lacking sufficient organizational forces wind up in a state of chaos. Perkins terms this

phenomena *Brownian Motion*. Essentially, this entails one group member saying something, another responding directly to that, another responding directly to that second comment, and so on. Conversation in this light quickly veers from its intended subject, as there is no overarching guide to the conversation to which people continually return. The conversation becomes a group stream of consciousness rather than a purposeful interaction. A second problem that group interaction often leads to is referred to as *downspiraling*. In these cases, conversations become *too* focused. That is, people get caught up on minute details, leading to pointless arguments and much wasted time (Perkins 2003, p. 50-152). This downspiraling is hugely frustrating and discourages people from even coming to meetings. Last, *groupthink* can occur when organizations attempt to implement collaborative processes. Coined by Irving Janis, this results from an overly-cohesive group that fails to critically evaluate propositions made by members, leading to rash decisions or failures to consider better alternatives (Janis 1972). The ultimate purpose of collaboration, which is to combine the minds of multiple people to produce something that a single individual could not, is completely undermined by groupthink, as this phenomenon leads to the use of only one person's ideas.

“Collaboration occurs when people strive together toward the same outcome in ways that directly share the work, thinking, and responsibility” (Perkins 2003, p. 155). In considering the Shakedown, I think collaboration is a major factor in the working environment. Although managers do indeed have tasks that are split up and specifically defined, the work all goes towards a common goal. Additionally, the ideas about how each individual role could be improved upon originate mainly from the collective. For instance, various group members comment in meetings about what kitchen appliances the

restaurant needs to kitchen manager Mia Cetti ('12), who ultimately sees that those requests are put into place.

In general at the Shakedown, it seems that problems are approached collaboratively through the process that Perkins calls *dividing up* (Perkins 2003, p. 164). That is, the problem (i.e. how to create a collective artistic space where students can eat community-based food) is divided up into smaller portions and thus shared amongst a number of employees. Perkins notes that this type of collective group interaction is most useful with complex tasks that require multiple perspectives (ibid). For problems that seek to produce simple work outcomes, Perkins notes that *initial take* (ibid) collaboration is most effective. That is, a group gets together and discusses problems, letting individuals volunteer to take on specific tasks that will solve the specific problems. This method of collaboration was primarily employed in the 2010/2011 academic year at the Shakedown. And, as will be explained in the next section, it was not a particularly effective means of initiating organizational learning and growth. When we think about the Shakedown, putting a group of inexperienced workers together in an industry that has a notoriously high rate of failure, while upholding very strict values, is indeed a complex task. Under Perkins' analysis, it seems that *dividing up* would therefore be the most effective way to collaborate. It creates a sense of responsibility and accountability to the larger group that is highly effective if people within the organization are indeed committed to the vision. However, the collaborative environment fostered by the organization is not as strong as it could be.

Several factors block the Shakedown from becoming a truly collaborative organization, in which knowledge and thinking are shared fully. First, although the

organization does not have as noticeable a hierarchy as most in this day in age, it nonetheless does have an inherent power structure that favors some managers over others. Certain jobs simply entail more responsibility than do others, thus lending themselves to more impactful decisions. For example, with my own job as head chef, I am in a position to determine much of the customer experience through creating the menu, writing the recipes, and structuring the manner by which food is prepared and served. Jake Harder ('12) similarly is given much responsibility, as he organizes and communicates important information with the staff and is the person who fires employees (a very rarely employed, but symbolically important, requirement of the job). This differential in power may or may not lead to a sense of intimidation on the part of managers whose roles require responsibilities that are not quite as fundamental to the operation of the business. Notwithstanding, it cannot be honestly said that there is absolutely no hierarchy present to the Shakedown's conversations. A second major limitation to the effectiveness of collaboration at the Shakedown is the size of the group. Perkins notes that collaborative thought works best with 3-4 people (p. 76). At 5 people, the benefit of collective thought per person begins to marginally diminish with each additional contributor. Leadership collaboration at the Shakedown has typically involved 6-8 people who interact in making the organization's principle decisions. This, according to Perkins, complicates things much more than it exposes people to new frames of mind. True collaboration thus becomes very difficult, so the transparency and intercommunication between the various roles of the restaurant inevitably lessen. This has indeed happened at the Shakedown as we have divided up the roles.

Although the Shakedown is not perfectly collaborative, interactions between employees involve a greater degree of sharing of responsibility than is typical in American business, and especially as compared to the practices common to the restaurant industry at large. Since full-time students run the organization, it seems unreasonable for only 3-4 people to take full responsibility for the business' management work. In fact, the Shakedown was founded with five members making the decisions, and in reading the information available, it seems that these members were working to full capacity. There is simply too much to do for 3-4 full-time students to take on by themselves. Limiting the amount of people would also go against a primary ideal of the organization, which is inclusiveness and the desire to teach people—even relatively inexperienced people—new things. The only conceivable way to reconcile this loss of collaboration would be to completely separate the dining room/event aspect of the Shakedown from the food aspect, creating two different organizations that conversed in separate spheres. This, however, would tear apart the organization's vision of having a unified space for both student interaction and food. For now, it seems the Shakedown must settle for a loss of collaboration in order to work towards its fundamental vision.

Facilitation of Conversation:

In order to avoid the pitfalls of collaborative group interaction, a facilitator should serve to lead organizational meetings. Conversation facilitation is a role that must be practiced and learned in order to enable progressive conversation in meetings. There are several key elements to good facilitation. First, the facilitator should not be seen as the person who is necessarily considered the primary “boss,” unless that boss is highly

skilled and of a particular temperament (Perkins 2003, p. 153). The reason for this is that it is critically important for the facilitator to be encouraging and highly approachable. Additionally, so-called bosses, or people who are in charge of much of the implementation practices in organizations, must focus their attention on the content of meetings and on listening carefully, rather than the structure of the discourse itself. Second, good facilitators “hold the context of the dialogue” (ibid). That is, they continually see to it that the conversation stays on the topic at hand. Part of this involves making sure that the conversation keeps moving forward, towards an end purpose. In other words, the facilitator keeps the conversation from “downspiraling” or heading towards “Brownian Motion.” Third, facilitators ensure that group members suspend their assumptions by staying focused on finding the best organizational solutions to the appropriate questions, rather than focusing on and advocating for their own opinions and perspectives. Fourth, effective facilitation entails ensuring that the dialogue’s participants own the process of the conversation. A great facilitator’s work goes unnoticed, as the group feels that the meeting runs itself. As Senge says, “People don’t resist change. They resist being changed” (Senge 2006, p. 138). If a conversation and the resultant decision feels initiated by the people themselves, they will embrace it. Last, the facilitator should be knowledgeable and helpful, but should not serve as a kind of maestro, who seems to have all of the answers to all of the questions. Instead of answering the meeting’s questions and dominating the conversation, the facilitator should simply chime in when necessary. For example, when a group seems to immediately come to a conclusion on a particular issue, the facilitator might play the devil’s advocate by simply posing a question from the opposite perspective, and then let the group discuss

that (ibid, p. 229). All of these characteristics will serve to promote progressive interactions in groups, avoiding the problems that can stem from collaboration that were outlined above.

For the majority of my time at the Shakedown, there has not been an official facilitator of manager meetings. Instead, meetings were organized and led by the principal leaders of the organization. This year, with a refocusing on leadership roles for employees, that aspect of the meetings has changed. Specifically, Jake Harder ('12) has led the group conversations for the entirety of the 2011/2012 year. In so doing, he has done an excellent job in fulfilling the need for a facilitator of learning-based dialogue.

According to Harder:

My first step to improving [the meetings] was to create an actual agenda and actually have a facilitator at the meetings, instead of just kind of sitting there and talking about things with no order. I think having an agenda that we stick to and someone to make sure we keep on that agenda has helped make the meetings run more efficiently and has helped us get more done at the meetings[...]

In general for the meetings, here are some of my goals:

-De brief the last week and see what needs to be worked and improved upon (generally we'll read the notes from the managers book to do this).

-Talk about next week and anything that needs to be done in advance (i.e. catering events or open mics in the Shakedown).

-Let anyone who has anything they want to discuss to do that.

-And lastly, I think that the meetings are a good time for us as a staff and friends to catch up and bond. (J. Harder, personal communication, March 18, 2012)

Jake's work at the meetings has vastly improved the group's ability to converse effectively. I remember last year the meetings would often derail. This tendency was not to the fault of anyone in particular, but rather simply due to the fact that no one was specifically focused on guiding the topic at hand. Additionally, prior to each meeting last year, I would write out a list of topics I that I wanted to bring up or have addressed.

During the meetings themselves, I was mostly concerned that those issues were touched upon. This year I no longer need to do that. Instead, I come to the meetings and tend to just listen to others and raise specific points as they emerge. I credit Jake's facilitation of the meetings with my own feeling of comfort at them. I am almost positive Jake does not know of Peter Senge's ideas about facilitators; yet he accomplishes all aspects of the effective facilitator's work. That is, he keeps the conversation moving, he allows people to maintain ownership of the conversation's outcomes, and he does not act as an "expert" of any matter; instead, he is simply a very supportive friend to the entire staff.

The presence of a very welcoming facilitator has greatly improved the comfort level of the Shakedown's manager meetings. Jake's work in organizing meetings has allowed for the emergence of progressive dialogue and thus growth in the organization at large.

Personal Mastery:

The essence of personal mastery, a term coined by Peter Senge, is an individual's ability and desire to generate creative tension—the juxtaposition between one's own vision for how his or her life should be and his or her current reality (Senge, p. 132). At the heart of personal mastery lies the drive to learn, which was outlined in the previous chapter. People with high levels of personal mastery actively and ambitiously strive to attain their ideal life, constantly questioning what they are experiencing and evaluating whether or not that is in line with their own values. In their work and in their personal lives, these people have a sense of purpose behind their vision, which "is more like a calling than a good idea" (Dawson 2012). Because of these traits, those with high levels

of personal mastery surround themselves with people, causes, and organizations that allow them to have a sense of creative tension and which also allow them to release that creative tension by seeking new and innovative answers. When one feels that an organization is furthering his or her own vision, he or she feels intimately connected to this larger order, and thus feels a great deal of commitment. In terms of organizational intelligence and progressive conversation, personal mastery plays an important role because people who constantly question how their current situation can better align with their vision will ask the right questions and will be motivated to work towards their answers. This progresses the group forward, rather than promoting the retreat to old solutions. At the heart of the learning organization is personal and group improvement. An organization that is filled with people who are high in this quality and which promotes a vision that serves a meaningful cause will continually grow, improve, and innovate (Leonardi 2007).

The contemporary food movement was initiated, in large part, because people began questioning their eating experiences and began asking how the food they were putting into their bodies was produced. When those people understood how inhumane the practices of the modern food industry are, they fought to change the way they ate, in order to live within their values. This curiosity, need to know the truth, and desire to fulfill one's image of an honest and good life spurred the creation of iconic institutions like Chez Panisse in 1971, seminal books like Michael Pollan's *The Omnivore's Dilemma* (2006), popular shows like Jamie Oliver's *Food Revolution*, and, ultimately, organizations like the Shakedown Café.

Because the Shakedown is so clearly centered around and committed to its values, employees of the restaurant who inherently seek to develop themselves through their beliefs naturally are attracted to enroll as higher-level managers. These people are inquisitive, and try to understand how the system in which they find themselves functions. They also seek to understand how they personally can better that system. Attending the Friday meetings allows employees to influence the organization as a whole, thus going much further towards securing a just food system than simply eating a vegetarian diet or shopping for oneself at the farmers market. People high in personal mastery feel a calling to their causes, and organizations allow them to impactfully answer that call by working within a larger collective that has the potential to have a much larger positive impact on the world than does one's own individual choices. By combining a group of people like this in a room, organizations such as the Shakedown are able to constantly seek new questions. Additionally, its members are able to grow together with the people around them.

Leadership at the Shakedown is highly dependent on self-motivated employees. One leads here because one feels the need to do it. All employees are peers. Thus, each employee is essentially his or her own boss. Nobody has the power to punish people who do not fulfill their responsibilities. It is purely one's own desire to grow and improve themselves and their surroundings that keeps them working on new sourcing research or creative advertising ideas, rather than studying for the next midterm. As there is no direct incentive to enroll, it is purely one's desire to further his or her life's vision that attracts people to higher-level work at the Shakedown. This desire ultimately comes from the vision and purpose of the restaurant.

Inquiring Leaders:

Perkins (2002) highlights four archetypes of leadership, when it comes to personal interactions: *Answer-centered leadership* (providing direction and clear answers to followers), *vision-centered leadership* (providing and advocating for a strong and motivational purpose), *leadership by leaving alone* (letting followers learn on their own, helping only if absolutely necessary), and *inquiry-centered leadership* (asking followers the vital questions, letting them decide, and probing why they think that is the best action) (p. 104). The author notes that the latter, inquiry-based leadership, is the most effective means for leaders to cultivate a learning environment centered around progressive discourse (ibid, p. 105). This style enables the growth of a group's collective knowledge, permits a high sense of transparency and organizational trust, and allows leaders to model what it looks like to process the information that is necessary to run the organization. Inquiring leaders are perceived as having a highly participative leadership style, are respectful of followers, believe in the power of the collective, and encourage followers to question themselves, their peers, and the leaders themselves. These leaders are most successful when there is little difference—in terms of experience and/or knowledge—between leaders and followers, when the organization is in a relatively calm state (rather than in a period of intense and unprecedented change), in organizations that have simple structures rather than complex bureaucracies, when group members' self interests are in line with the organization's (rather than based primarily on monetary transaction, which puts group members' interests at odds with the organization's interests), and in relatively flat organizational hierarchies (ibid, p. 111-113). Ultimately,

inquiry-based leadership in organizations is certainly not necessarily the *best* type of leadership to be used in all situations; however, when a group is primarily filled with followers who seek to continually develop, personally as well as collectively, towards a clear vision, this type of leadership seems to hold the potential to foster highly effective and useful interactions amongst group members.

As noted above, inquiry-based leadership interactions are most effective, and induce the highest degrees of organizational learning when there are certain characteristics present. First, when there is little difference between leaders' experience levels and that of followers, inquiry-based leadership is effective because the leaders do not have all the answers. But, importantly, they do know the organization well enough to ask the right questions. At the Shakedown, the managers with the most leadership responsibilities have little more—if any—business and/or restaurant experience than do people who are just beginning to enroll in higher-level jobs within the organization. As peers, conversations must take place on as equal a level as possible, so that the leaders can illicit leaning without seeming to be directive.

Second, inquiry-based leadership prompts progressive conversation when the organization is in a state of relative calm. The key word here is relative. That is, relative to the state in which the organization is in normally. At the Shakedown, there is a very high, yet predictable, turnover rate. Seeing as it is a student-run organization, many employees work at the Shakedown for just one semester. The most committed workers work just four years. At an organization in the outside world this would be hugely chaotic. But here, it is normal. And this state of change is quite constant. Major organizational changes rarely occur at the Shakedown because it takes much time and

effort on the part of the agents of change. Students simply do not have this much time to devote to complete organizational transformations.

The third factor that predicts success for inquiring leaders is organizational simplicity; In other words, this style of leadership works best in organizations that have uncomplicated bureaucracies and minimal hierarchies. At the Shakedown, there is very little bureaucracy. If an employee does not like a rule or an organizational practice, there is little standing in her way to change that problem. Additionally, there are at most three levels of power in the organization, and these are highly flexible.

Last, inquiry-based leaders serve as ushers to progressive dialogue in “clan” organizations in which members feel particularly united. In such organizations, “rather than strict rules and procedures, people are driven through vision, shared goals, outputs and outcomes” ([Quinn and Rorburgh](#) 1983). As mentioned throughout this paper, these feelings of unity, vision, and purpose are major strengths of this particular organization.

From all of this, it seems that the Shakedown would be a good candidate for the questioning approach upon which inquiry-based leadership relies. However, do the organization’s leaders actually lead in this way? That question is debatable, and its answers are based primarily on qualitative judgments. Therefore, I will give some examples of how I personally have been affected and influenced by this type of leadership.

The first such instance of this style of leadership that comes to mind from my own experience is an email I received during my sophomore year of college. It was from Galen Lieberworth (’11), who was at the time one of the restaurant’s most influential

members. The email basically marked the point in my Shakedown career that I realized that I was an important part of the organization.

Email correspondence from Galen Lieberworth to Kristopher Brown, Jacob Harder, and Julian Martinez:

I think you guys know more about the Shake and have great motivation to see this thing succeed. This semester I'm aiming to take on much more of a mentor role and let the steering of the ship up to people like you. I'm going to be here for training and checking up on every shift, but we really NEED people with a holistic understanding on the entire restaurant. I think you guys are well on you way to getting there.

There are a few tasks that are random and more often than not Kris or I would simply tackle ourselves and let is rest at that. But I realize it's important to have you guys in on this too. Here are the randos/problematic ones:

- * Maintenance of kitchen.*
 - o Reporting to Pitzer if problems.*
- * Time sheets. Turning in to Rachel.*
- * Linens. Washing, distributing. Collecting on a regular basis. Angelica*
- * Organization of Office.*
- * Relations with Freeberg 2-3 people. Keys.*
- * Calling and organization of meetings.*

These are connections on a few people need to have and I think you guys should make them on one level or another. Maintenance is located in the basement of McConnell. It would be good to go and introduce yourselves once school starts and having their number on hand.

(G. Lieberworth, personal communication, January 4, 2010)

This correspondence represents Galen's leadership style well. He did not tell us how he wanted these various jobs done for the next semester. Instead, he let us figure it all out through experience. Although this was incredibly frustrating and difficult for me at the time, I think this style of leadership truly got me committed to the restaurant. I

figured out many problems on my own. I felt a sense of pride, in a way, that I had done these things. I felt ownership of what I had done at the Shakedown, rather than feeling as though I was just a cog in some perpetuating organizational machine. Galen's leadership in the spring of 2010 encouraged me to work my first thirty-hour week for the restaurant. This level of sacrifice essentially *forced* me get committed, if I was not already so.

A second example of how this inquiring leadership style has impacted my overall levels of dedication and motivation at the Shakedown relates to my experiences in the fall of my junior year. I was very frustrated with the Shakedown (for reasons that will be discussed in the following section), and was on the brink of quitting work at the restaurant altogether. I asked the manager group to meet with me to discuss the problems that I was feeling, which I could not articulate very well at the time. At this meeting I remember Irene Farnsworth ('11) asking me, *Well, what would make you want to stay at the Shakedown? Why don't you make that change happen?* I thought about that for awhile, and in fact realized that I simply was not having fun in the kitchen anymore. To fix that, I started making homemade ice cream for the restaurant. And most definitely not your typical vanilla or chocolate ice creams. Instead, I made basil-pine nut ice cream with a balsamic swirl, Samuel Adams ice cream with peanuts and pretzels, carrot ice cream with marshmallow fluff, a mint-feta flavor, one infused with a bunch of bay leaves, and many more strange (sometimes good, sometimes inedible) varieties. This little job got me completely invigorated to get back into the Shakedown. Not because the initial problems I felt necessarily got fixed, but rather because I realized how singular and special this place was. It allowed me to make these ridiculous ice cream flavors and sell them to our adventurous customers. By asking me what my qualms were, the Shakedown

leaders made me think about my own experience, and what was intrinsically motivating to me. The other Shakedown managers gave me the freedom to solve that problem myself. Through this process I realized that the thing I loved most about work at the Shakedown—just looking around the kitchen and finding interesting foods to make that may or may not expand people’s horizons—was not being satisfied. I was in a rut. And I had the freedom to figure out how to get out of that rut myself.

These are just two examples of inquiry-based leadership at the Shakedown. But, importantly, they are two of the most pivotal points of my Shakedown experience overall. The freedom for employees to explore and to fix what they themselves feel needs attention will improve their own experiences at the Shakedown. As a consequence of improving one’s own experiences at the restaurant, the organization as a whole benefits. People have always been attracted to stepping up and enrolling in the organization’s cause because doing so allows them the freedom to influence their own prospects at work to a large degree. In conversations and interactions, the fact that the leaders do not have all the answers leads to new and novel ways of doing things. It also allows employees to feel like they are crafting the place themselves, in however small a way that applies. It is trendy for organizations today to espouse autonomy and humanizing work for their employees. According to William Foote Whyte, managers frequently ask, “How can we make the workers *feel* that they are participating? (emphasis in original) (Kohn 1999, p. 195). But, emphatically, this is just a means to get the most out of employees for the least input; it is still, at its core, centered around the exploitation of the worker. The Shakedown, conversely, does not just allow employees to *feel* autonomous, but it also actually *gives* them this freedom. This is fundamentally motivating and is highly

attractive to employees who are considering taking up a more demanding—and thus influential—job in the organization.

Shakedown Smart?

Progressive—rather than regressive—interactions, a dialogue-inducing contact architecture, effective collaboration, talented facilitators, high degrees of personal mastery amongst group members, and inquiring leadership all interact in group conversations, leading to substantial leaps in organizational knowledge. This constant element of learning is highly beneficial for organizations as whole units as well as for the individuals participating in those groups. For the organization, constant learning allows for continual innovation as well as an invigorating environment that keeps organizational members excited. For the individual in the group, learning organizations allow for the development of the self in many ways, which is rewarding both psychologically and in terms of one's career, as he or she will be more highly qualified in the future to do a wider variety of jobs. It is important to note, however, that while learning organizations do exist to a certain extent, the concept is an ideal that can be achieved to only varying degrees. Thus, organizations (or specific subgroups of organizations) go through phases of learning by displaying the characteristics listed above. However, the groups occasionally cease to grow and sometimes even regress (Karash 2002); very few, if any, organizations are able to literally learn, innovate, and further grow unabatedly. Nevertheless, organizations that naturally or intentionally implement, for the most part, the characteristics listed above through group interactions will be more likely to grow and develop in ways that lead to higher levels of organizational intelligence.

Conversation is clearly an integral part of any organization. And progressive conversations are an integral part of the learning organization. From personal experiences and interactions that I have had, it does seem to me that the Shakedown's Friday meetings, which epitomize many of the interactions that occur throughout the group are infused with a relatively high degree of progressive communications. This in turn leads to the general promotion of collective organizational knowledge-building behaviors and thoughts. But what does this tell us about motivation to enroll in the Shakedown's cause? And, as no organization is a perfect learning organization, what aspects of the Shakedown limit it from development? Those questions will now be explored.

Enrolling to Learn

Now that we have established that the Shakedown Café displays characteristics similar to Senge's ideal of the learning organization, we can answer the question posed at the beginning of this section. That is, *why would a typical Shakedown employee be attracted to enrolling in a management role?*

The progressive nature of employee interactions at the Shakedown encourages the general embrace of new ideas and changes. This means that the individual has the power to make substantial changes to the organization as a whole. When an employee cares deeply about what the organization stands for, he or she will want to take advantage of that special power to make change, as this will further his or her ultimate life values. Friday meetings at the Shakedown offer a window through which employees can look into in order to see potential areas in which they can influence the organization. This

possibility to make great change—to further the sustainable food movement, to help create a hub for student creativity and bonding, and to further ensure that a high degree of care goes into every meal—naturally motivates people to take on new responsibilities to make that change. The drives to bond, defend, learn, and even acquire (to a small degree) are further met when employees enroll in higher-level work at the Shakedown. Although not all employees at the organization are attracted to these meetings, the ones who are passionate about a given aspect of the Shakedown, an aspect that will in fact further these employees' drives in a meaningful way—tend to find their way to the conversations. These added voices are fundamental to the Shakedown, and their voices will ensure its continued growth and success year after year.

Chapter 7:

Devotion

Thus far, I have explored the motivations lying behind the five Shakedown founders' efforts to open the restaurant and ensure its survival, why a student would choose to apply to work at the Shakedown in the first place, and what forces pull an employee to come to the Friday manager meetings and thus take up a more demanding role in the business. Now, I'll examine why someone who attends those meetings decides to take a larger, more impactful leadership role in the organization. But before we uncover what it takes to motivate one to fully devote him or herself, it will be useful to know what exactly this level of commitment looks like, and how exactly one goes from enrolling as a general leader to devoting oneself to the organization. As I would consider myself to be highly devoted to the Shakedown, I will use my own experience at the restaurant to illustrate this individual process.

I began writing recipes in the Spring of my sophomore year at the Shakedown. So, at this point, I was a somewhat valuable part of the organization's operations. However, I was not a critical part of the Shakedown; and the Shakedown was not yet a critical part of me. I did not lose sleep over the restaurant. Nor did I think about it unless I was on shift or was actively doing work for the organization. Did I care deeply about the Shakedown's cause? Yes. But if the Shakedown were to be in danger of failing, would I sacrifice my grades, time with friends, and athletics to stop this from happening? In all honesty, I probably would not have.

That all changed, though, in the fall of my junior year. As mentioned in the last chapter, towards the end of October, I sent an email to the primary leaders of the

organization (J. Martinez, personal communication, October 24 2010), calling for a meeting. I was upset with how things at the Shakedown were going, and was seriously considering quitting. I could not quite articulate what I was unsatisfied about, I simply felt frustrated with a lack of progression during my time there. I was putting in much effort without seeing positive results. I left the managers meeting, which I mentioned in the previous section, unconvinced that I should continue working at the Shakedown. The next day, after discussing the matter with my parents, I woke up feeling more certain that throwing in the towel would be the right decision. But then I spoke to Kris Brown, my roommate and co-worker, about the issue to see if he could give me any reason why my decision to leave the Shakedown might be the wrong. Kris was the only other leader of the organization who, at the time, if not shared my frustrations with the way things were going, at least could understand from where I was coming. I remember the conversation I had with him distinctly. “You’re not worthy of quitting,” he essentially said. “Neither of us are—the Shakedown is so much bigger than you, me, or anyone else who has ever worked there.” The fact of the matter was that, at that point, my quitting would throw a major wrench into things at the Shakedown. This is not to say that it would not survive, but it would potentially limit its ability to grow the next year. What Kris said made me realize that my suffering and my feelings of frustration were ultimately not as important or as significant as the greater purpose that the restaurant served. The organization was much more important than was I, yet my leaving the organization could threaten its ability to embody its cause. It was at this point that I not only decided to continue working at the restaurant, but to eventually make the place really work. From that point

on, I devoted myself to the cause of the organization, and to do all that was in my power to help it be as successful as possible.

As I mentioned, I could not quite put my finger on what exactly was causing the displeasure that I was feeling in my Shakedown experience at the time. Now, however, upon further reflection, I think it had much to do with the method of collaboration that we were employing as a group. In the last chapter, I write that the *dividing up* mode of collaboration seems to be most effective in complex tasks. I would argue that this is the mode of collaboration upon which the Shakedown was founded, and the mode that it employs today. However, in the fall of 2010, we basically utilized the *initial take* method of collaborative interaction. That is, we leaders did not have any specific roles, so meetings entailed various organizational members bringing up problems that they saw and asking who would be up to take on the necessary job to solve those issues. Whoever volunteered first would be the one to take on the job. The problem with this system, I now see, is that it is much better-suited for simple tasks and endeavors (Perkins 2003, p. 164). The implementation and coordination of work at the Shakedown is not, generally, such a simple undertaking. Last year, people did not focus on growing specific areas and aspects of the organization. Rather, the emphasis of group interaction was on what was specifically wrong and needed to be fixed in the organization as a whole. Under this mode of collective group work, growth is inevitably limited because there is nothing pushing new thought forward. The Shakedown was regressive. And I did not have a desire to be a part of such an organization.

I believe that the fundamental change that led to the Shakedown to shift from regressive to progressive was the altered form of collaboration that was employed.

Although this collaboration is a part of communication in meetings, the importance of it can extend much further than these formal gatherings. Generally, the form of collaboration used can inform an organization's leadership structure. At the Shakedown, when we *divided up*, a form of shared leadership emerged. This has been a very important part of the current year's successes. This leadership structure has also played an important role in attracting a new batch of fully devoted employees who, I believe, will be willing to put as much effort into the Shakedown as will be necessary to see its continued growth and development.

Shared Leadership Defined

Since the mid-1990's, there has been a general flattening of organizations in the western world (Pearce and Sims 2003). With this, the classic model of group interaction—with its heroic, all-knowing leader on top—has been questioned and highly scrutinized by many business and organizational scholars. Although people such as the late Steve Jobs are still being revered, leading many people to still believe in the power and effectiveness of the vertical leadership hierarchy, it is becoming more and more apparent that such successful modern business leaders have indeed shared much of the leadership responsibilities in running their organizations (Citrin 2011). In today's complex world, it is nearly impossible for one person to have enough knowledge, skill, time, or energy to be involved in and oversee every aspect of a complicated endeavor. Yet people still strive to become this paragon figurehead. The underlying cause of this may be due to our society's emphasis on independence and individual achievement. Or maybe it is because we have a tendency to name organizations after single individuals;

many of America's iconic companies are christened after single people (i.e. Ford, Chevrolet, Philip Morris, Oscar Meyer) and American government eras are associated with the president of the time. Whatever the case, the fact of the matter is that this emphasis on the individual self is simply not in line with how humans live. Our lives are hugely impacted by others—we are brought up by our parents, educated by our teachers, socialized by our friends, shaped by our circumstances, and aided by our coworkers; it makes no sense to credit somebody as being a truly “self-made man” (Couric 2009). Likewise, it makes no sense to credit the successes of a group to a single individual.

In order to address this potentially somewhat defunct way of thinking, the concept of shared leadership was first proposed around the year 2000 by Craig L. Pearce and Henry P. Sims. Here, they broadly define leadership as “a group process in which leadership is distributed among, and stems from, team members” (Pearce and Sims 2002, p. 172). In other words, shared leadership is seen as a process of influence in organizations in which the leadership function dynamically changes between multiple members of the group (Burke et al, p. 104). Importantly, organizations that utilize this form of leadership (which of course has existed for many years, only to get a name recently) view influence as a process that is not just to be applied downwards in the organizational hierarchy (Pearce and Conger 2003). Groups or teams, under shared leadership theory, act as collectives, thus allowing leadership to emerge as an activity that different people can perform at different times (ibid). Leadership is not seen as a skill or characteristic that some people are good at or possess; rather, it is understood as a certain activity in which people engage when appropriate. Essentially, the idea behind shared leadership is to put those who are best able to perform the work of a given area in charge

of improving the process of work in that particular realm (Burke et al 2003, p. 105). This allows organizations to take advantage of committed members' strengths and minimize the impact of their weaknesses. By sharing the process of leading, groups can effectively do what an individual cannot, making shared leadership an appealing theory in today's complex organizational environments.

Shared leadership is not a structure that will necessarily be more effective or more motivating in all organizational contexts; certain features must be present for this team-based approach to work. Specifically, it has been argued that progressive dialogue (Fletcher and Kaufer 2003, p. 35), attitudes of inquiry (ibid, p. 32), complex nature of tasks (O'Toole et al 2003, p. 254), the desire and ability to better understand and improve oneself and one's environment (Burke et al 2003), and a general embrace of egalitarianism (ibid) are all prerequisites for the successful implementation of shared leadership. That is, it is the learning organization, with its development-seeking conversations, that is best suited for this modern mode of leadership. In the words of Joyce K. Fletcher and Katrin Kaufer, "the kinds of social interactions that comprise the ideal of shared leadership are differentiated from other, less positive social interactions by virtue of their outcomes: mutual learning, greater shared understanding, and eventually, positive action" (Fletcher and Kaufer 2003, p. 23). Just as, in practice, enrolling in the conversations of Friday meetings is a critical first step for employees to become devoted members of the Shakedown, the desire to be a part of and contributor to an intelligent, ever-growing organization is the theoretical first step to applying the logic of shared leadership to a group. Below, I analyze the particular characteristics of this type of leadership structure, highlight its benefits and pitfalls, examine just how well this

model of leadership fits at the Shakedown Café, and discuss the overall effects all of this has on motivation to devote oneself to this organization in particular. Through this, I hope to not only uncover the leadership system that seems most fitted to drive work at the Shakedown, but also discover the reason for why the restaurant consistently is able to attract people to connect their personal selves with it.

Characteristics of a Shared System of Leadership

Shared leadership is characterized by its uniqueness in three fundamental areas. That is, this form of influence diffuses leadership roles among a certain number of individuals, fosters a specific kind of relationship between both leaders and followers as well as between leaders themselves, and stems from certain cognitive states regarding organizational life. All of these factors combine to influence the organizations in which they are implemented in dynamic, multi-directional ways that do not come about in the classic vertical organizational hierarchy.

How Roles Are Shared

In understanding the concept of shared leadership, it is critical to note that it is not based on a distribution of leadership across entire organizations. Although scholars such as Joseph Badaracco (Badaracco 2002) have convincingly argued that leadership behaviors occur at all levels of organizations, this discussion is concerned with the primary leadership actions and decisions that take place at the top levels of group interaction. As such, shared leadership is not based on task rotation, task sharing, or participative management. Instead, this theoretical framework is based on the use of

influence to inform group information processing, strategic planning, systems of decision-making, coordination of performance, and the establishment of group norms (Seibert et al 2003, p. 174-175). These tasks are shared by a number of important organizational members. The specifics regarding how many people this entails and how roles are shared will now be explained.

Shared leadership scholars do not reject the actions and duties of the archetypal heroic leader in and of themselves. Instead, they posit that these responsibilities are simply too great for expect of any one person to handle in a complex organization (Smith 2012). This breaking-up of leading roles has been present in the business world for years. For example, investment banking has a tradition of co-leadership, as seen by the numerous corporate partnerships in the industry (i.e. Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, Merrill Lynch, etc.). These companies were founded upon the utilization of the different strengths of two founding partners, typically one's talents in sales and trading and another's talents in investment banking (O'Toole et al 2003, p. 256). In other businesses, co-leaders have split up roles based on their different task and relationship orientations. The purpose of satisfying an organization's need for high job performance as well as subordinates' need for satisfaction and enjoyment of work is thereby served (McShane and von Glinow 2010, p. 265). This widely accepted system of leadership is indeed a form of shared leadership. However, there is no reason why an organization should limit its primary influencers to just two. Instead, as many leaders should be employed as is necessary to satisfy however many dimensions upon which an organization sees itself working. As long as the individuals involved in leadership are playing complementary and distinct roles, acting out different aspects of leadership, there should not be a

necessary limit to how many people can influence the structures and practices of the group as a whole (O'Toole et al 2003, p. 257).

It is important to note that the sharing of leadership roles should not be pushed through the entire organization, for this leads to minimal commitment for anyone as well as major complexities in regards to organizational communication. Additionally, once people are given certain responsibilities, it is not wise to compel him or her to share those with others. The reason for this is likely due to the fact when two people are forced to share duties in a specific realm, one of those people will inevitably garner more influence over the realm than the other, thereby simply making a mini-hierarchy in that area of the organization (O'Toole et al 2003, p. 255). Because of this tendency, shared leadership is most effective either when the existing leader initiates the idea of sharing leading activities or if the organization was founded upon a shared leadership platform (ibid). In the second case, the specific number of top leaders that an organization includes upon its founding generally seems to be the most logical number of leaders to employ throughout the organization's existence (that is, unless one leader feels the need to share responsibilities with an additional person). Thus, the exact number of leaders in a shared leadership system can vary from two to four to ten, depending on the manner in which the organization was formulated and later evolved.

Originally, when shared leadership was first conceptualized, scholars assumed that the leaders who share responsibilities ought to basically have the same level of influence in the organization as a whole as each other. In other words, within the leadership group itself, it was thought that there should be no power differentials between leaders. However, Seibert et al (2003) argue that this conceptualization may not

necessarily be true. “Equal sharing of influence,” they write, “is but one among several potentially interesting configurations of influence structures in groups” (p. 174). The whole concept of shared leadership is based on organizations distributing leadership activities to best utilize their most committed members’ strengths. As such, it is unrealistic to assume that all leadership team members have capabilities that are equally valuable and equally applicable to a specific organization’s goals. Therefore, one’s ability to contribute to group outcomes varies depending on where one’s talents lie (ibid, p. 176). Because of this, a minor status hierarchy is not automatically antagonistic to the shared leadership model. However, it is imperative that these hierarchies do not create a sense of strict task possessiveness. If one person is seen as responsible for leading a particular organization’s creative endeavors, another person should not feel prohibited from leading a specific creative task that is particularly suited to his or her interests or skills. If “titles and turf” (O’Toole et al 2003, p. 259) permeate a shared leadership structure to the extent that team members are discouraged from lending their special talents to the organization, the purpose of shared leadership is lost and the structure becomes an exercise in futility.

Although roles under shared leadership structures should be relatively fluid, “for the sake of accountability, tasks, must be divided” to at least a certain extent (O’Toole et al 2003, p. 259). Roles allow those who have proven aptitudes in certain areas to comfortably take charge of those aspects of the organization. Without any role definition, the distribution of leadership tasks inevitably will be delegated to the leadership team’s biggest personalities or to those who most aggressively seek to gain credit and have an impact. The system will quickly disintegrate into *initial take*

collaboration. This ambiguity has long been associated with dysfunction in groups (ibid) and is not an effective way to progress as an organization. The exact manner in which leadership roles are divided is not particularly important as long as the leaders involved understand their roles in the overall scope of the organization and are open with themselves and with their peers about their contributions to the group. The existence of this honesty is dependent on an organization's ability to foster particular types of relations. The specifics of these relationships will be the focus of the following section.

The Unified Group

Seeing as shared leadership focuses away from the importance of individual achievement and meritocracy and towards collective success, distributed responsibilities, and cooperative teamwork (Fletcher and Kaufer 2003, p. 23), group dynamics are obviously acutely important to the successful implementation of this form of influence. Specifically, relationships throughout shared leadership organizations should be generally positive and be based on those traits and values that are often referred to as feminine—empathy, community, grace, acceptance and collaboration, for example—rather than on masculine traits such as control, independence, assertiveness, strength, and tough skin ([Planned Parenthood 2012](#)). This is not to say that women are inherently more suited to function well under a model of shared leadership, but instead that the traits typically associated with femininity tend to foster better-suited relations in shared leadership structures than do those associated with masculinity (Fletcher and Kaufer 2003, p. 34). Shared leadership is based on the embrace of interpersonal dependence, which leads to mutual learning and a desire for further connection. Although this is possible to achieve

in the traditional organization, it is not an essential factor of such. With shared leadership, though, this kind of relationship *needs* to be present through an entire organization in order to enable leader effectiveness.

Within the leadership group itself, relationships should be based on a *generalized mode of interpersonal exchange* (Seibert et al 2003). That is, group members who share leadership responsibilities are most positively influential when they do not hold each other to strict modes of social exchange. If Bob picks up Sally from the airport, he will not necessarily expect that she do him a favor of exactly equal worth in the near future. Rather, assuming they have a generalized exchange relationship, Bob will trust that, over time, the favors that he does for Sally will balance out fairly with favors she does for him. This high-quality form of social exchange tends to lead to increased levels of mutual influence for people participating in the relationship. Ultimately, this generalized form of exchange facilitates the emergence of a unified group structure, depicted in Figure 6. It is typified by effective information sharing, good coordination, high levels of mutual cooperation, and a tendency to resolve conflict through consensus (ibid, p. 181). In these systems of social exchange, information flows from person to person, giving no single leader a particular informational advantage over any other. Although one's talents may give him or her slightly more group influence, the structure of interaction amongst the leadership team places no single person at the locus of control. In considering this unified system of interaction, it is valuable to note that individuals do not often engage in generalized social interactions—from which this unified form of interaction stems—with a large number of people within an organization. There are a number of reasons for this. First, relationships like these take a lot of time, energy, and resources in order to develop.

Second, not all people in organizations offer equal levels of social currency, so one person's generalized exchange relationship with another might lead to unequal sharing. Third, if a person devotes a little energy and personal resources to everyone within a group, he or she will be unable to devote much time and energy to anyone in particular. Fourth, not everyone believes or trusts the reciprocal nature of these generalized exchange relations, thus insisting on keeping tabs. Entering into a generalized exchange relationship with such a person makes no sense for someone who does believe in the effectiveness of such social interactions. Last, if one engages in these close relationships with every member of an organization, the unified web of interaction will become much too complex to be of any use (Seibert et al 2003).

Figure 7

Unified Group Structure: this particular model assumes shared leadership under a group of three leaders, each heading a different major aspect of organizational leadership. The web-like design of interaction could be expanded to however many people that might be needed to effectively lead a group.

Source:

(<http://www.interactionassociates.com/ideas/strategic-business-tool-you-can-use-now>).

Because of all of this, shared leadership teams should not be extended too far in number. They should also be composed of co-leaders who have good rapport with each other and have compatible personalities, rather than being based purely on leaders' complementary skills and talents (O'Toole 2003, p. 258). Under these conditions, organizational members who share the duties of leadership will naturally be inclined to credit their colleagues appropriately, within-group competition will be mitigated, and people's egos will be of minimal negative prominence (O'Toole et al 2003). These are critical outcomes of the unified system of interaction, as shared leadership cannot be effective if leaders are vying against each other for attention, praise, and recognition.

Shared leadership calls on leaders to hold many of the characteristics that characterize the change agents that Jim Collins highlights in his *Good to Great*. That is, they must be “ambitious first and foremost to the cause, for the company, and for the work. Not [for themselves]” (Rose 2002). These highly effective leaders were relatively anonymous, lacking the superstar quality we typically connect with great leadership (Collins 2001). Shared leadership demands this level of humility and will on the part of leaders. Without it, shared duties cannot serve the organization any better than can the iconic solitary leader of traditional business lore.

The Cognitive Underpinnings of Sharing Leadership

Now that we understand the context through which shared leadership arises, we can examine the specific mental states that are common to these organizational systems. We will first look at the cognitive underpinnings of shared leadership from an individual’s perspective, then move on to the group-level psychology of the shared leadership model.

Part of the reason why shared leadership might be counterintuitive or difficult to implement is that it advocates a different conceptualization of what it means to individually grow. In classic Western thought, maturation is often characterized by an increase in independence (Fletcher and Kaufer 2003); when toddlers can begin to feed themselves, when students can do their own research, and when corporate employees no longer need direct supervision, we call that development. This makes sense if we imagine the self as a completely separate entity from its environment. However, Fletcher and Kaufer (2003) argue that this is not the case. As supported by Malcolm Gladwell

(2008), humans are not independent at all; as such, the self should be seen as a “self in relation” to others (Fletcher and Kaufer 2003, p. 27). Therefore, becoming more adept at navigating through the world entails not the separation from others, but rather the ability to connect with them (ibid). Increased independence is indeed important under this frame of mind, but only to the extent that it allows one to then become *interdependent*. The authors argue that this state—in which people are dependent on others for some needs, to whom they provide complementary benefits—is the ideal human condition. Independence and dependence are simply necessary steps that must be taken to get there (ibid, p. 28). Much of capitalist thought envisions one class of people dependent on the other; the subordinates (followers) are dependent on the bosses (leaders) for the wages that sustain their lives. Therefore, the leaders are seen as independent and the followers are seen as dependent. But this is clearly an overly simplified view of how things actually work. The fact of the matter is that leaders are nothing without their followers. In reality, they are likely more dependent on followers than followers are on them. The relationship is clearly one of interdependence. Reducing the level of interdependence with coworkers, then, is clearly not a step towards professional development. Ensuring one’s own learning and growth, as well as the learning and growth of those around oneself, is what it means to individually mature.

When it comes to shared leadership, it is critical that everyone in a leadership team approaches the organization and their work in it from a self-in-relation stance. However, this frame of mind is quite general, and is useful in many other organizational contexts. Burke et al (2003) expand upon this broad sense of a shared cognition about how people relate to each other in groups. Specifically, these researchers argue that there

are four cognitive drivers that must be in place to serve as the foundation of the effective enactment of shared team leadership (p. 107).

The first cognitive driver of shared leadership upon which team members must operate is compatible mental models. These allow leaders within a group to work under a common set of assumptions, guiding how individuals act in regards to problems that arise, as well as helping them to determine which team leader should handle which type of problem. These mental models are important to shared leadership because they indicate when and how leading activities should be transferred between group leaders (ibid, p. 110).

The second cognitive driver that effective members of shared leadership teams have is a shared mode of situation assessment. This refers to the manner in which team members interpret cues from their environments that indicate problems or opportunities and how those cues apply to group mental model. With a shared mode of situation assessment, team members' knowledge from mental models is integrated with information within a specific context, allowing team members to understand and predict the behavior of their colleagues (ibid, p. 112).

The third cognitive mechanism that enables shared leadership is shared metacognition. Metacognition can be described as “an appreciation of what one already knows, together with a correct apprehension of the learning task and what knowledge and skills it requires, combined with the agility to make correct inferences about how to apply one’s strategic knowledge to a particular situation, and to do so efficiently and reliably” (Peirce 2004). To put it more simply, one engages in metacognition when one thinks about his or her own thinking. When team members share metacognitive knowledge,

they are able to update team mental models and modes of situation assessment to better suite the circumstances at hand. This helps to guide members in determining when and to whom a leadership activity should transfer (Burke et al 2003, p. 114).

Finally, shared leadership depends on leaders sharing attitudes in regards to efficacy, group orientation, and organizational climate. The group must have a common belief among team members that the team has the ability to reach the desired performance level (a collective efficacy). It must also value group goals over individuals' goals (a collective orientation). Last, the organizational climate must foster the free and open expression of ideas. These attitudes allow the group's leaders to feel comfortable with fluidity, ambiguity, and taking direction from numerous people (Burke et al 2003, p. 115-117). When these four cognitive functions are approached in the same manner from leaders within a team, the end result is a form of leadership that allows for group-influencing activities to easily and smoothly flow from one leader to another, allowing for leaders' strengths to naturally and consistently be utilized to the fullest.

Shared leadership seems to be an increasingly appealing form of group influence in the modern world of organizations. More and more problems with the vertical hierarchies of the prototypical American corporation are being uncovered all the time. Additionally, it seems that this traditional way of organizing larger groups of people does not necessarily fit with natural human tendencies. Shared leadership allows for the most passionate and devoted employees to lead groups. It also allows those who are most competent in given areas to take charge of roles associated with them. By and large, it seems that this new model of leadership is not just good for individual leaders, but is also beneficial to followers of the organization as a whole and, ultimately, the customers that

the organization serves. With all of this in mind, we now turn to the Shakedown to see how well this shared leadership model can be applied to its leadership practices.

Shared Leadership at the Shakedown

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, I do feel that the Shakedown employs, to at least a degree, a shared leadership structure. The organization possesses many of the qualities of the ideal of the learning organization, which seems to be an important part of shared leadership systems. Additionally, Pitzer College is a generally highly progressive institution, attracting many students who are open to challenging the widespread implementation of long status hierarchies in organizations. In general, then, the groundwork is indeed properly set for the Shakedown to work under a shared leadership model. Below, I will analyze whether or not the way the organization is run meets the more nuanced characteristics of this modern model of leadership.

What originally attracted me to apply shared leadership theory to the Shakedown was the fact that in my four years of work at the organization, I could not pick out a single person who was the clear and definitive leader during any given period. The hierarchy upon which so many organizations rely in order to structure their members simply did not fit. At the same time, though, the Shakedown is not a collective of totally equal people (even though some organizational members advocate for this completely flat structure). It is somewhere in between, primarily organized and run by a core group of dedicated individuals. This has been the case ever since the restaurant was founded. Although the exact structure of these leadership teams has varied over the years—

impacting how effective shared leadership has been—a sense of this leadership model has always pervaded.

Running any restaurant involves creating menus, scheduling staff, sourcing food, keeping track of finances, and, of course, cooking meals. Typically, though, these leadership functions are led by one person—the executive chef. There may be an accountant to help with financials and a sous chef to assist with management, but the executive chef ultimately oversees the operations of a restaurant on a day-to-day basis. Further above the executive chef is the owner of the business; however, the idea of the chef-owner is becoming more and more common, further consolidating the power in restaurants. At the Shakedown, the leadership activities that the executive chef performs are indeed needed. However, they are split up between a number of people. This is likely due to necessity, as no student would ever be able to perform the role of the traditional head chef and also be a full-time student. The effect of this necessarily alternative system, though, is a positive one overall.

From its founding, responsibilities at the Shakedown have been shared. Each of the five founders had a particular interest in a certain aspect of the restaurant and thus served as the prime influencer over that area (Beebe et al 2008). Therefore, in terms of talents and interests, the leadership system had complementary, rather than competing, contributors. There was no single person who could be credited with creating the Shakedown image, nor with seeing it through to fruition. Additionally, in support of shared leadership theory, these leaders had strong preexisting interpersonal relationships. Shared leadership roles were not forced upon them. Instead, they delegated leadership tasks as the situation demanded.

Since I have been a member of the organization, leaders have never seemed to mindfully attempt to replicate the manner in which the founders operated. However, many facets of their original system seem to constantly reemerge. The number of core leaders is one characteristic that always seems to hover around the original five, plus or minus one. For example, by the time we were set to open for the fall 2011 semester, there were six senior employees who were basically seen as the Shakedown's core. Specifically, there was Jake Harder (staff coordinator), Rmax Goodwin (finances), Maria Guererro (catering), Julian Martinez (head chef), Julia Gibas-Jones (marketing), and Mia Cetti (kitchen manager). Granted, there were other managers at the restaurant that had important responsibilities—maybe even roles that furthered the organization's goals more so than some of the six seniors. But from the outset of the year, the way the Shakedown operated, its basic strategic plan, the manner through which decisions were made, and its standards were largely determined by these core, clearly devoted employees*. Each of these six members of the organization was interested in taking on their specific role. However, sometimes their interests spanned outside of their specific job description. For example, Rmax Goodwin ('12) was primarily responsible for finances. However, he also enjoys sampling fine cheeses. Because of this interest, he has been responsible for dealing with the Cheese Cave, the Shakedown's cheese purveyor, for the past year. The organization's leadership structure is flexible enough to allow Rmax to participate in this particular sourcing role. The managers in charge of sourcing did not feel that their jobs

* By the middle of the school year, it was clear that additional employees had become devoted to the Shakedown, such as Jesse Gaddy ('13), Jake Kaplan ('13), and Kristin Dobbin ('13). As their passion has risen, it has allowed the core leaders to naturally step back from responsibilities and trust that the necessary work would get accomplished. Although Gaddy and Kaplan, for example, were primarily responsible for sourcing food throughout the year, they began picking up leadership activities unrelated to their specific roles, such as hosting a staff party and appearing at the Shakedown often when not officially on shift. These actions served to demonstrate to the core leaders that they were committed, allowing the transference of leadership to begin occurring.

were being encroached upon. Writes Jesse Gaddy: “I liked that he took that responsibility. I love going to the Cheese Cave, but having to physically go somewhere is extremely time consuming, so hi[s] going [there] took a lot of pressure off of me. I was relieved. I wish I could do all of the sourcing, but I simply have no time to dedicate to doing as good of a job as I would like, so delegating work is necessary” (J. Gaddy, personal communication, April 2, 2012). Thus, as this example demonstrates, the sense of one’s “turf” is not a major issue within the organization’s leadership practices. The job descriptions have alleviated much of the chaos that was previously present, but have not led to a sense of competitiveness or rivalry amongst the leaders.

In addition to the sharing of formal roles, the leaders of the Shakedown also shared more broad leadership activities during the fall of 2011. Jake Harder (’12) served as a very approachable, jovial leader who cultivated positive relationships throughout the whole organization. Rmax Goodwin (’12) and Julia Gibas-Jones (’12) provided a sense of hard-nosed authority, unafraid to criticize employees when necessary. Mia Cetti (’12)—calm, responsible, and reasonable—kept the leadership team in check with a demeanor that reminded everyone to not take itself or the Shakedown too seriously. I, Julian Martinez (’12), am a task-focused and hard-working person, and helped to maintain a sense of accountability and dedication to the organization’s leadership group and employees in general. Last, Maria Guererro (’12) brought a strong sense of enthusiasm, passion, support, and encouragement to the organization, while also serving as a “nagger” of sorts, who was willing to send emails to the whole staff to encourage further involvement. These personality differences enabled leadership at the Shakedown to cover a wide range of follower dispositions, motivating and influencing different

people in different ways. One single leader would never be able to lead in this all-encompassing manner. All of our leadership styles complemented each other's, and each of us took on different leadership activities that others would not want to do. For instance, I personally do not particularly enjoy serving as a disciplinarian, even when it is necessary for the good of the organization. It makes me uncomfortable in general, and especially so when I am disciplining peers. However, I have high standards for good food and am a relatively experienced cook, leading me to write the menu and the recipes. Rmax Goodwin, conversely, seems comfortable being an iron-fisted leader, but does not have as much restaurant or cooking experience as I do. I am thus dependent on Rmax's leadership to ensure that the dishes I design are prepared well, and he is dependent on my leadership to create those recipes and teach them to him. The interdependencies here lead us to avoid negative competition, as that would only force us to take on responsibilities with which we are not comfortable or quite as effective at performing. The idea that "none of us is as effective as all of us" (O'Toole et al 2003, p. 252) definitely does permeate the work of leadership at the Shakedown. Significantly, this feeling of mutual reliance is not new to this organization. In recalling the chemistry of the leadership team five years ago Alden Towler writes, "it was mutually beneficial symbiotic relationships we had going on. All of us also wore each others shoes to a certain extent[,] so we had sympathy. And we knew the importance of each other's roles, recognized co-dependency and capitalized in order to max out our individual and collective potential" (A. Towler, personal communication, April 2, 2012).

In considering intra-group relations among the leadership team, a unified structure of interaction is definitely predominant. Seibert et al (2003) write, "a core idea of the

shared leadership point of view is that a request or influence attempt by one person [...] will be reinforced by the influence of other group members” (p. 178). As there is no clear center of the leadership team at the Shakedown, no one’s personal influence is any more powerful than any other’s. Relationships are generalized because quantifiable forms of exchange (i.e. money) are not impactful in this leadership system, so people enter exchanges based on trust that others will contribute equal effort to the cause in the long-run. Additionally, communication does not have to go through anyone in particular to reach anyone else. If Mia Cetti has an issue with how catering is going, she can tell Maria Guererro directly. There is a generally unified sense of what needs to be done to reach the shared goals of the organization, so the group functions in ways that best utilize each person’s contributions. This unified group facilitates the shared mental models, patterns of situation assessment, metacognitions, and attitudes that are critical parts of effective shared leadership structures.

Ultimately, the underlying reason that shared leadership has developed in this organization is that those who are attracted to dedicating themselves to core leadership activities have no incentive to do so other than to further the restaurant’s cause. Therefore, the self-aggrandizing, attention-seeking person, who is antithetical to shared leadership systems, has no reason to seek a position of influence at the Shakedown. The leadership team continually finds itself, year after year, populated with people who are driven to make a contribution towards global food justice, community development (both at the college and within the local area), cooking healthy and delicious food, and campus artistic expression because they genuinely are passionate about those ideals. Leaders are thus willing to divide leadership, as that is a much more efficient and productive way to

further these goals. Shared leadership is utilized at the Shakedown because it is the powerful vision that drives the organization, more than anything else. This, in the end, is the fundamental prerequisite for this new conceptualization of leadership. Without an overwhelming sense of purpose, organizations employing forms of shared leadership will not be able to function effectively.

Shared Motivation

The Shakedown's current, as well as historical leadership structure has been based on, at least to a considerable degree, shared leadership. Although the founding members of the organization did not set out to follow such a model, the pieces fell in place that facilitated the rise of this mode of influence in the restaurant's core leadership team. But what exactly does any of this tell us about motivation at the Shakedown?

As it turns out, shared leadership has been shown to be highly motivational for people in general. For example, a group of McKinsey researchers surveyed 1,047 executives, managers, and employees from around the world and found that the three most influential non-financial motivators for respondents were participation in organizational strategy, participative meetings, and project leading (Dewherst et al 2009). Although these respondents do not specifically highlight shared leadership as a motivator (as they are not working in systems of shared leadership, for the most part), the three most important motivators are all integral parts of sharing leadership activities. People seem to have a strong desire to shift towards participative forms of leadership; however, our rigid system remains prevalent due to ingrained practices and habits.

Bass (1998) suggests that shared leadership teams serve the function of the traditional highly motivational heroic leader. "Instead of motivation being supplied by

identification of members with an idealized, charismatic leader, similar motivation would be supplied by identification with the team [...] Inspiration would come from a sharing of mutually articulated goals [...] Empowered, self-managed work teams ideally epitomize substitution for much of what was done before by the formal hierarchical leader (Bass 1998, p. 157). The classic hero leader motivates followers by articulating a purpose for people to devote their selves. Significantly, though, this purpose is the heroic leader's, and its inherent goodness (or lack thereof) is not necessarily tied to how it is imparted to followers. Shared leadership, conversely, relies on the continued lifeblood of an organization to communicate its cause not with rhetoric, but with actions. It then offers people who have proven themselves to have vested interests in furthering that cause a chance to do so as a part of a leadership team.

When one has a passion or interest in an organization's purpose—as leaders must have in a shared leadership system—being given high-level responsibilities is highly motivating. In these situations, failing to produce or follow through means so much more than simply not receiving a bonus or getting praise; it means failing to further a cause in which one firmly believes. And when one is surrounded by a team of people who are highly committed to the same cause, failure becomes unthinkable. When Shakedown employees go from committed, enrolled members of the restaurant to devotees, it is because they find themselves with more and more means of changing and/or helping the organization. Significantly, under shared leadership, these means of further participation usually entail doing what one already knows how to do or that which one is comfortable. Devoting oneself thus means that one can further his or her own interests while beneficially serving a significant cause. This requires no extra money. Instead, it is

completely driven by forces from within. “It is important,” writes Shakedown co-founder Dane Pollock (’08), “to see the Shakedown as something that is part of you [,] and you in it” (Beebe et al 2008, p. 10). Devoting oneself to the Shakedown involves indentifying personally with the restaurant. When one identifies with what the Shakedown is all about, it becomes natural to want to play a major role in shaping how exactly that manifests itself. For as once something is a part of your self, you need no incentive or bonus to devote time and energy to that; it simply becomes something you feel the need to do. Motivation to devote oneself to the café is not something that can be forced upon anyone—no matter how good of a chef, accountant, party organizer, or what have you. Instead, devotion comes from within; from within the individual and from within the Shakedown itself.

PART III:
THE FRUITS OF OUR LABOR

*How Lessons Learned
from the Shakedown
Enhance our Understanding of
Organizations*

Chapter 8:

Motivation Beyond Money

Money does not motivate work at the Shakedown. That much was clear well before I set out on this research. What I have uncovered, though, is why this is the case.

At the most basic level of the organization, its founding was based on a unified vision that was developed not to serve the interests of the founders themselves, but rather to solve a variety of problems that they felt were important in the world at large. This gave reason to the many hours of sleep each of the founding members of the organization gave up. It also ensured that they would be motivated to see to the continuation of the restaurant after they left, as it was the cause that they deemed important, not their specific participation in it.

The founders were able to attract initial employees by creating a comprehensive system that addressed the whole of the human psyche, rather than a single isolated part, which is what many businesses do in this day in age. More precisely, people were (and still are) driven to work because the restaurant provides a means of addressing the four primary human drives to acquire, to bond, to learn, and to defend. From a purely capitalistic perspective, it seems illogical for a person to opt for this more difficult and demanding work over other options available on campus that provide equivalent wages. However, this is only the case because the typical Western mind frame simply includes one of these motivations—the drive to acquire—as a part of rational decision-making behaviors. The Shakedown clearly demonstrates that there is more at play in one's decision to work than just the opportunity cost involved in employment (Byrns 2011).

The motivation to further involve oneself in the organization is brought about by the direct interactions that take place within the Shakedown. People literally enter the conversation because they want to make a difference. And they are able to make this difference because of the progressive nature of the dialogues that occur within the group. There is no reason why one employee's view will necessarily be of more value than anyone else's. This openness motivates certain Shakedown workers to offer their thoughts, in the hope that doing so will contribute to the success of the organization, and thus to the overriding causes that the organization seeks to address.

Once people learn to navigate their way through the organization's internal interactions, they are motivated to further devote themselves to the organization because, according to Abraham Maslow, humans naturally seek to have their talents utilized and valued to the greatest extent possible (McShane and von Glinow 2010, p. 135). The Shakedown's shared leadership structure is designed to allow people to contribute their strengths to the group in order to influence the restaurant as a whole. People who devote themselves to making sure the Shakedown succeeds see the fundamental vision as alluring and highly important. Thus, they are motivated to work together, cooperate, trust, and be honest with each other because not doing so necessarily detracts from the group's overall goals. Shakedown devotees give up so much for this small restaurant because the organization is a part of them; as such, they do whatever it takes to improve it for the long-run, including sacrificing their egos and their objective personal self-interests.

So there you have it. That is, in its briefest form, why the Shakedown functions and continues to grow despite an inherent incapacity to tangibly reward employees. Most

importantly, the factor that this all ties back to is the organization's purpose: to provide the community of the Claremont Colleges a space of engagement through the service of local, personal, and responsibly-produced food while serving as a campus social center for creative and personal expression. This, in one way or another, has lead over one hundred college students to sacrifice their time and energy—to differing degrees of course—to a shabby little eatery which is hidden on the fringes of the Colleges.

At this point, I can imagine that my thesis readers are just about ready to put down this paper. What more can be extrapolated from this Shakedown place anyway? Why not just give an me A- and move on? But here's the thing: all of this is meaningless unless it connects to a broader point. And it is this point that serves as the crux of this paper. For, although I am passionate about the Shakedown's goals and ideals, I think that what it teaches us about the world is far more important than anything it materially accomplishes for these colleges. As it turns out, it is the very idea of the A- that lies at the center of this lesson. If you will bear with me, below will I explain how.

Carrots and Sticks? Or Carrotsticks?

The idea of the reward—not just in terms of money, but also in regards to grades in school, toys for children, and even simple verbal praise—has been seen as the paramount human motivator since the United States was founded (Appleby 1984). In conceptualizing the new society that would be America, the theories of philosophers and thinkers such as Locke, Hobbes, and Adam Smith became the norm. No longer did one work to feed his family or community; now, one worked to maximize his own self-interest. “The rewarding system,” writes labor historian Joyce Appleby, “intruded upon

customary ways of distributing wealth. The market reached through the old groupings of town, guild, and family to the single individual. When the market economy was examined, its inner dynamic was located in an internal drive within each person” (Appleby 1984, p. 36). From this capitalist framework, motivation to do something went from “*if you do this, we’ll be able to get that*” to “*if you do this for me, I will give you that.*” The newly-envisioned rational agent views effort as a disutility that must be dealt with in order to collect the reward from the principal, who himself is a rational agent who necessarily tries to exploit the first agent’s effort to the greatest degree possible (Park 1996). Hence, to motivate, the manager must offer the smallest reward possible in order to ensure the worker’s compliance. Under behaviorist thought, one’s actions can be manipulated by operant conditioning. Therefore, in order to get somebody to learn, all that is necessary is to follow good behaviors with tangible rewards and bad behaviors with punishments (Staddon and Niv 2008). This, it was and is still thought, is the unquestioned way of mankind. It is natural, universal, predictable, and, above all, American.

But what if that fundamental generalization about people is wrong? After all, this economic model was “built up from general propositions rather than composed from empirical evidence derived from historical example” (Appleby 1984, p. 37). America may be symbolized by the lone eagle, but what if actual human nature bears more resemblance to the wolf pack or the flock of birds? Then, it would seem, pitting two people within the same group against each other would not serve the purposes of either individual—or the group itself, for that matter—very well. To put it another way, if people actually do care about the well-being of those around them—not just as a means

of bettering their own self-interest, but as an end in and of themselves—then the use of contingent rewards and punishments (carrots and sticks) must be at least questioned. Call it socialist, call it communist, call it what you will—if this conceptualization of human nature is at all true, then relying purely on monetary incentivization would be an illogical manner in which to motivate. If this is at all true, then under this system, the whole as well as the sum of its individual parts may actually be punished by the very nature of incentives themselves. The carrot and stick become one and the same.

The Morality of Incentives

The idea of equity—rewarding the people who are most deserving with the highest bounties and greatest honors—is fundamental to Western economic thought. Not only is equity considered most effective and motivating to reward a person's contributions to a whole according to his or her perceived usefulness to it (McShane and von Glinow 2010, p. 152), but it is also considered a core aspect of moral philosophy. The idea that those who are most deserving should be externally rewarded accordingly is completely central to Western ideology.

On the surface, this approach to the equity principle makes a good deal of sense. However, when further considered, critical questions arise that are often overlooked. For example, how do we decide who exactly is most *deserving*? Is it the person who has put in the most effort? Well, probably not, as effort does not equal success. Then is it the person who is the most successful? But the most successful according to what standards (Kohn 1999, p. 21)? For, as clearly demonstrated in the previous chapter of this paper, successful work is often based on cooperation and other factors that do not allow one to stand out as “better” than her peers. Additionally, if equity is so effective and essential,

shouldn't parents treat some of their children—the ones who do more chores and follow more rules—better than others? Shouldn't they be equitable in their rewarding of food, education opportunities, gifts, and attention? Or is equity only an aspect of impersonal and/or economic relationships? If this is the case, how can we claim that it is fundamental to motivation? For people certainly act in motivated ways in many aspects of life in which the idea of equity does not even arise.

The primary reason that equity became such an important part of our way of thinking is that the American mode of enterprise developed through one class's control over another. Managers create the system, workers follow that system. Taylorist thought assumed that “in general, workers forced to perform repetitive tasks work at the slowest rate that goes unpunished” (Global Management Analysts Association 2009). Thus, in order to motivate workers to maximize performance, pay should be directly tied to output. Those who follow the system best, who overcome Frederick Winslow Taylor's concept of the “soldiering” level of output and therefore sought to maximize his own best interest, should be rewarded with the most money (Taylor 1911). Through incentivization, managers could control employees' level of motivation. This was indeed an efficient and productive manner of doing things. Companies that employed these practices of scientific management, such as Ford, flourished. This led to a booming industrial economy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. But one critical caveat to the Taylorist model is that this equitable system of compensation should be employed when the work is repetitive, only two-tiered (i.e. involving just laborers and those who manage the laborers), and menial. After all, Taylor only applied his theories to jobs such as loading pigs onto railcars and other jobs involving solely brute labor

(Bungay 2011, p. 16). The problem with relying on a pay-for-performance structure today is that so much work done in this day in age is highly complex, involving creativity, decision making, and interconnectedness. In writing about equity in law, Plato wrote, “The differences of men and actions, and the endless irregular movements of human things, do not admit of any universal and simple rule. No art can lay down any rule which will last forever” (McIlwain 1947, p. 33). Thus, determining equity was considered an art, of sorts, which took great practice and knowledge of the situation to apply. In the court of law, to which Plato referred, it may be realistic to assume that one person would be capable of determining what is fair, as cases are extensively laid out and examined. But how can we expect a single manager to always know exactly how deserving each one of his many employees is when the web of interaction is so complex? Can this so-called art truly be practiced through the use of generalizations about and brief interactions with workers?

The fact of the matter is that we cannot expect this. Yet, the system of relying on incentives persists. Why? Most likely because people who are in power like to be in power, and deemphasizing “conventional rewards threatens the existing power structure” (Csikszentmihalyi 1978, p. 210). Additionally, under the current incentive system managers are seen as more important than the managed, so those who design the incentive systems are naturally given better rewards than their subordinates. Why would a manager/leader design a system that took rewards away from herself and further distributed them across the ranks that she fought so hard to get out? By holding out carrots, managers can feel a sense of control over employees. Whether or not the manager deserves this feeling—either because of talent, connections, or hard work—is

irreverent. The reality is that the idea of an incentive constrains subordinates' abilities to choose their actions and suppresses their natural curiosities, their desires to overcome challenges, their drives to master new skills, and their aspirations to reach for more complex work (Kohn 1999, p. 25). "We must acknowledge," writes business scholar Alfie Kohn, "that because [incentivization] is fundamentally a means of controlling people, it is by its nature inimical to democracy, critical questioning, and the free exchange of ideas among equal participants" (ibid, p. 29). Good management involves time, effort, persistence, and passion to create an environment that will foster a person's potential and allow her to do her best. The use of rewards is a way for managers to get around this extra work, mimicking what would happen if an employee were truly motivated, but ignoring all the psychological benefits that come with true commitment to a cause.

Are Rewards *Demotivating*?

In response to all of this, the pragmatist might ask, *so what?* If incentives lead to more productivity and allow workers to live comfortable lives, they should be used to their greatest utility. The problem with this line of thought, however, is that incentives may not actually improve one's motivation. I am not questioning whether rewards are effective at getting us to act in a certain manner. If you offered me \$10,000 to serve as your personal butler for a week, sure I'd do that. Money is a motivator. But is it the kind of motivator that we should seek to employ in our organizations? Is it the underlying factor that should drive the system? And will it help to change the way people act in the long term?

At the core of the problem of financial rewards is the difference between internal and external motivation. Self-determination theory (SDT) states that while the former is based on tasks that allow one to be autonomous and that satisfy internal feelings of ambition and curiosity, the latter hinges on one's "behaving with the experience of pressure and demand toward specific outcomes that comes from forces perceived to be external to the self" (Deci and Ryan 2008, p. 14). In today's professional world, it is clear that one cannot rely totally on him or herself to subsist and/or succeed. We certainly do need money to get by and therefore need a means of receiving a steady income. Thus, we will be clearly be externally motivated to a certain extent; if somebody is not getting adequate rewards to satisfy her need for a comfortable life, she will be determinedly focused on the money factor. The drive to acquire is, after all, one of the four fundamental human motivations. If she is worried about being able to feed her children, then yes, she will indeed work hard and have a monetary purpose behind her efforts. But once one's worries about making a literal living are satisfied, raising one's salary or bonus may not raise her level of creativity, effort, or commitment. In fact, some researchers postulate that monetary rewards may actually *decrease* one's motivation to do his or her best.

There is a serious wealth of anthropological and psychological research available that shows that intrinsic rewards are highly motivating while external rewards, like bonuses and promotions, serve very little practical motivational purpose. Describing the intricacies and research behind this field of study is fascinating. But it is also a major undertaking and would require a whole other thesis to which to do full justice. Because of this, I will provide here just a few of the key points and conclusions to which many

researchers have come. For more information on this argument, as well as the research on which it is based, please refer to Alfie Kohn's *Punished by Rewards* (1999), Daniel Pink's *Drive* (2009), and Deci and Flaste's *Why We Do What We Do* (1996). For the time being, here are the most important points and conclusions of the literature on this topic:

→ *Paying people money for a task may turn enjoyable work into drudgery.* Many studies have shown that when a group of people is paid for a task that they otherwise enjoy, and which they would do without financial incentives, their interest in that task greatly decreases. After one is told that he or she will contingently be paid to, for example draw pictures, one will be much more likely to then only draw pictures if he or she is paid to do so. By taking passion out of the activity, the use of contingent rewards “nourishes short-term performance, annihilates long-term planning, builds fear, demolishes teamwork, nourishes rivalry, and [...] leaves people bitter,” according to the influential statistician and consultant W. Edwards Deming (Deming 2000, p. 102).

→ *Wages and bonuses are consistently shown to have less import to and affect on people than do other factors.* Instead of money, people look more for “interesting work” in assessing their satisfaction (see figure 8). When unhappy with their job, people rarely cite salary as the source of the problem for they themselves. Yet, when employees see their coworkers in unhappy or unsatisfied states, they assume that the problems stem from issues having to do with money. Thus, managers feel that money will solve most

issues for people, even though they realize it would not solve the issue for they themselves (Kohn 1999).

Figure 8:

McKinsey survey assessing the effectiveness and use of various means of motivation, from the worker perspective

→ *Contrary to traditional Western economic thought, work is not seen as a disutility for everyone.* As demonstrated by wealthy people who have no financial reason to work, but who continue to exert much energy doing so, work is not a simple means to an end for people who truly value what they do. There are certain people (labeled “Type I” by Daniel Pink 2009) who are fueled by intrinsic desires. Research based on factor analysis has shown that these people’s long-term goals centered around personal growth, building relationships, and being generative for the community. In contrast, there are more extrinsically-focused people (similar to those people Pink labels “Type X”) for whom goals center around amassing wealth, becoming famous, and projecting an attractive image (Deci and Ryan 2008, p. 17). For Type I’s, the activity inherent in the work itself and the far-reaching results of it are more important than the objective compensation that one reaps from the work. These Type I’s consistently outperform their Type X counterparts in the long run. Additionally, the psychological well-beings of people similar to Type I’s was shown to be much higher than that of those similar to Type X’s (Deci and Ryan 2008, p. 18). For Type I’s, behavior is driven not by money, which needs to be constantly funneled in. It is instead fueled by the renewable resources of

autonomous work, the satisfaction of personal mastery, and the ability to meaningfully contribute to a group's important purpose.

→ *Contingent rewards may diminish high levels of performance.* When a person is told, “do this and I’ll give you that” (or when a relationship is established based on this underlying agreement), the “this” becomes essentially the limit to performance. For instance, if you offered me \$40 to cook your family a nice dinner, I’d do it. But my primary reason for doing so, and therefore my focus would likely be that money. So you would basically get as good a meal as I thought would be necessary to be worth that \$40. However, if you asked (or maybe even challenged) me to cook you the best meal you’ve ever had, giving me whatever ingredients I needed, I would also do that. Maybe I am odd in this way, but I would do it for my love of cooking in and of itself. And, I would do whatever I could to make that the best meal you had ever had.

When pay is contingent on performance, there is little reason to exceed stated expectations. One might argue that extrinsically-motivated people will still desire to create the best product possible, as that will lead to promotions and bonuses. But in reality, when the business relationship hinges primarily on money, a sense of being controlled on the part of the worker is inevitable. This is not the ideal human condition. Financial exchange-based relations create the feeling in people that “I am doing this for you.” Because of this, if a supervisor will accept a certain level of work, the worker will only put out the amount of effort necessary to achieve that level of performance. There is very little likelihood that he or she will go above and beyond.

→ *In today's world of work, creativity is undoubtedly highly important to working life. Rewarding, however, most often serves to diminish creative thought in people.* “People,” writes Kohn (1999), “will do precisely what they are asked to do if the reward is significant” (p. 139). This is a good thing for the assembly line system. But is it desirable when workers must come up with novel solutions to problems and creative ways to work through projects? Studies indicate that this is unlikely. For instance, artists doing work on commission have been shown to produce significantly less impressive works than artists who are creating for the sake of it (Pink 2009, p. 44). When performance is based on pay, people tend to approach the task in a single-minded way; that is, they focus on the result of their work and what exactly it will take to reach that result. Their focus is narrowed. Risk-taking lies at the heart of creative thinking. However, if there is not a reason to go above-and-beyond what will elicit the reward—or if that reason is overshadowed, (i.e. if our intrinsic desires are blocked out by the objective of money)—then taking risks is illogical. Why would one risk creating something truly new and innovative (when there is the chance that it will fail) when the same contingent reward will be given for something more conventional? People’s abilities to be creative are mitigated when if-then rewards are offered (ibid, p. 40-45). Research shows that larger rewards lead people to choose easier tasks and that when the rewarding stops, the thoughts that were once tied to those rewards also stop (Kohn 1999, p. 65). These two tendencies are the antitheses of exploration and creative thought.

→ *Increased levels of rewards can lead to the increased likelihood of unethical behavior.* When the extrinsic goal becomes the focus of one’s work, people’s sense of awareness to

the broader dimensions of their behavior is lost. A wealth of studies have indicated that when measures such as sales quotas, revenue goals, group competitions, and production objectives are implemented, people do whatever they can to reach the numbers that will elicit the reward. This includes fudging with data, manipulating customers, overcharging, diminishing the quality of coworkers' work, and cheating (Pink 2009, p. 49). Rewards and financial incentives turn the destination of work into its most valuable aspect of it. This in turn leads people to often take the low road to get to the destination. Rewards shift focus away from the journey and to the final product. The fact of the matter, though, is that for those labeled "Type I," it is the process, not the product, that brings about fulfillment. Pink puts it well: "When the reward is the activity itself—deepening learning, delighting customers, doing one's best—there are no shortcuts. The only route to the destination is the high road. In some sense, it's impossible to act unethically because the person who's disadvantaged isn't the competitor but [oneself]" (ibid).

The reasons this system have persisted, despite its apparent serious drawbacks, are twofold. First, as noted above, supervisors assume that their subordinates are mostly interested in money. They therefore assume that the most effective means of motivation are contingent rewards. These reward structures serve to degrade intrinsic motivation. People thus become less interested in their work and then do indeed require extrinsic inputs prior to their putting out an effort. Supervisors point to this cycle, and say that

rewards are therefore necessary. But they are only necessary when the system is built upon them as a foundation (Kohn 1999, p 141).

Second, as touched on above, the system rewards those who perpetuate the system. That is, the people who decide who will be paid how much are the very people who are paid the most. And the people who rise to the top of the system are often the people who are inherently most motivated by external rewards. *Of course* managers and leaders support performance-based rewards—their performance on devising the most equitable system views their work as the most valuable. If one values rewards, he would be crazy to try to equalize the system of which he strove so hard to reach the top.

The Jackass and the Carrot

Essentially, the moral and practical problems inherent in the predominant reward system tie directly back to the origins of the metaphor of the carrot and the stick of which I have made reference to several times. The phrase, whose modern usage was first referred to in *The Economist* in 1946 (Popnik 2009), evokes the image of a donkey lured by a dangling carrot, held just out of reach, whose rider readies his whipping stick any time the donkey slows down or stalls. Maybe this method of motivation can drive jackasses to do work, but I like to think that there is something more profound lying behind the actions of the people with whom I enjoy interacting. Controlling people as if they are animals, useful only to the extent that they can do an organization's dirty work, is demeaning and (if it weren't such an accepted system) humiliating. "Man," a meat processing worker is quoted as saying in a *New York Times* article, "this can't be for real. This job's for an ass. They treat you like an animal" (LeDuff 2000). This quote is

noteworthy because the meat processing industry, which is almost completely based on the Taylorist assembly line model, has an approximate 100% annual turnover (indicating a clearly demotivated workforce). Practically, for forward-thinking, intelligent people, this method of motivating—based on commanding, controlling, then rewarding—simply does not work. Although the jackass holds out hopes that the carrot will eventually be reached, it loses its appeal after awhile for the discerning human being. Because of this, organizations offer bonuses and promotions to accommodate for this decreased drive. But just as is the case with the donkey, the carrot will never fully satiate. When one finally does get it, at the end of a long journey, the driver will simply tie up another carrot and again dangle it, just out of reach. The problem with all of this is that the donkey will always be hungry. And, likewise, employees who are contingently rewarded will always have a hunger for more, no matter how high their salaries are. Carrots offer donkeys the sustenance to complete the journey. But they do not offer them what they truly want—open fields, fellowship of the herd, and freedom to explore. Likewise, rewards offer people their basic need to get by in today's market-based economy. But means of motivation that simply focus on incentives do not address our human drives to learn, defend, or bond. We, as intelligent beings, have a deeply-seated need to control our own lives, rather than be controlled by the person with the checkbook. We have the desire to expand, rather than limit, our abilities and talents. And we strive to make an original and meaningful contribution to the causes that we feel are most important. The use of incentive programs of motivation are an easy way to get around these human desires. But they may not be serving us well. Many Americans feel that individual the trust in the profit motives is what has made our country great (Peikoff 1993). But the fact of the

matter is that the factors that really developed the Western world were ingenuity, cooperation, commitment to meaningful values, and democracy. These are being undermined by financial reward structures in organizations.

Rewards and Motivation at the Shakedown Café

The Shakedown, as noted many times in this paper, basically does not reward on a contingent basis. People do get paid, but the only prerequisite to receiving this pay is that one comes to his or her scheduled shifts. In fact, three of the organization's most influential and committed members this past year were some of the lowest-paid members of the organization. Jake Harder ('12), Maria Guererro ('12), and I were all paid \$80 per week. On average, this probably was equal to about \$4.00 per hour, when all was said and done. The reason for the low level of pay for us was that the three of us are not on the Federal Work Study program, and the Shakedown only has about \$320 per week to pay to non-work study employees. Despite this seemingly inequitable situation, I do not believe pay has ever dictated how hard any of us has ever worked.

Out of necessity, the Shakedown needed to develop a system in which money was not a major part of the question of motivation. But it was through this seeming disadvantage that organization has been able to bypass many of the flaws inherent in the typical organization today. The Shakedown addresses all employees' fundamental needs. It does so in four primary ways. First, by creating a fun and casual work environment that allows for socialization to occur between workers and with customers, employees' desire to bond with others is satisfied. Second, by permitting experimentation and failures—which opens avenues for the emergence of new practices—learning can occur

at all levels of the organization. Third, by serving, as an organization, as a steward of the environment and as an advocate for social justice, the individual need to defend that which one feels is important is addressed. And last, the restaurant operates in a situation in which the majority of employees already have been allocated a certain amount of money that will satisfy their need for tangible acquisitions. By addressing these fundamental needs, the Shakedown is able to separate itself from other on-campus jobs and thus attract new employees every semester.

As employees become more involved, the Shakedown system motivates people by opening the potential opportunities for learning up to whoever feels compelled to join the conversation. Organizational interactions allow people to take a part in controlling their own experiences within the organization. This opportunity needs no financial lure. The freedom and autonomy it brings are enough of an incentive to get people to enroll in a specific area of the organization, thus committing themselves to doing their best to bettering the whole. Money plays very little role in enticing people to enroll. Therefore, the organization naturally keeps those “jackasses*” out of decision-making roles.

Shared leadership, upon which the organization was founded, truly promotes team objectives. Whereas “most so-called managerial teams are not teams at all, but collections of individual relationships with the boss in which each individual is vying with every other for power, prestige, recognition, and personal autonomy” (McGregor 1960, p. 228), the Shakedown’s leadership group truly is a collective. Nobody holds reward power over anyone else. Because of this nobody is in total control. Instead, it is the vision and purpose of the organization as a whole—which is, for the people who are as committed as

* I do not mean to make a character judgment about people who are extrinsically motivated by calling them “jackasses.” I simply use that term because it is illustrative of what motivates this type of worker, from the metaphor of the donkey and the carrot.

these leaders are, also a part of the self—that determines leadership behavior. What is good for the organization is good for the individual leader and also generally good for the rest of the Shakedown’s employees. By taking money off the table at the restaurant, the real problems at hand can be addressed. People can put their full energy into such issues, focusing on actually improving the whole rather than satisfying just what will bring in the paycheck*.

The end result of all of this is something that I believe is truly rare, in terms of performance. Consider this: Although orders are sometimes slow to get to the table, the Shakedown’s food has been compared to that of restaurants that charge double the price for similar menu items. For example, I have heard from multiple people that the Shakedown’s hamburger is the best in Claremont—better than Eureka Burger and the Back Abbey, two restaurants that garner large crowds and are often cited as some of the best burgers around (the Back Abbey was named by CBS News as one of the top 10 hamburgers in the Los Angeles/Orange Counties) (CBS Local Media 2011). The Shakedown has reached this level of performance despite the fact that its employees have, on average, approximately zero hours of restaurant experience prior to their employment in at the café. Additionally, there is the major obstacle that these workers are all part-time employees. Restaurant work demands consistency. Yet, how can one ensure this when there is no one consistently present? Last, the Shakedown’s primary competitors are the dining halls of the five Claremont Colleges. Students who live on

* I cannot argue that this is true for every employee at the Shakedown. There are inevitably employees who just want to cook food as a means of making money. However, the nature of the organization essentially suppresses the influence of these people. Therefore, those who are extrinsically motivated by money remain as regular shift workers, or as is more often the case, quit/get fired. I cannot emphasize enough that the system of the Shakedown, by its nature, basically only enables those people who are highly committed to some or all aspects of its vision to emerge as influential.

campus *must* prepay for a meal plan. And, as it just so happens, three of these dining halls—McConnell (Pitzer), Collins (Claremont McKenna), and Mallot (Scripps)—are *all* ranked in the country's top 25, according to one of the most reputable sources on this highly contentious matter (College Prowler 2012). As such, the Shakedown is going up against an essentially free option that is of a high quality. Yet people continue to eat here. I truly do think there is something quite valuable that can be learned from this example. And I think that it can be applied to the wider world of businesses and non-governmental organizations.

Deep Motivation at Work in the Modern Organization

With the clear limits of rewards and financial incentives now outlined, we can finally examine how exactly all of this might apply to the modern world of work. The Shakedown is, unfortunately, an aberration. The government pays the majority of employees, so there is no way someone within the organization could really challenge the pay structure. An equal level of pay is what the organization has to deal with and all employees accept that manner of operation. Additionally, there is inherently little difference between leaders and followers in terms of experience, age, power, and knowledge—at least relative to the typical business of hospitality. However, although this is an anomaly of an organization, I do think many of the strengths of the Shakedown's system can be applied to organizations operating in the so-called real world.

If differential and performance-based pay structures in organizations lead to unhealthy competition, strife, loss of creativity, the increased prominence of carrot-

seeking activities, unethical behavior, and unsatiated desires, then why should these structures be used?

What the answer to this question comes down to is this: it is simply difficult to construct a system that gives people autonomy, allows for creativity to emerge, leads to organizational learning, and inspires true devotion. Why is this? Because all of these factors hinge on an organization having a deeply important purpose for being. It is difficult to find this type of purpose, and even more difficult to create a structure that completely and truly supports this. It is much easier to use money as a motivator to create money for the sake of it. But this ignores and wastes so much human potential. When we approach motivation as a purely objective emotion, stemming only from dollar amounts, the organization's *why* is about maximized profits, while the individual member's *why* is to earn the highest salary possible. This seems to be too narrow a focus. An organization's existence should be embedded in reason and passion. Once that is present, money will inevitably follow, as it is necessary in order to sustain the *why* with which the individuals and the group strongly identifies.

In order to create a system based on more than just money, one must find a way to attract not just any intrinsically-motivated people, but people who are intrinsically motivated by the organization's important cause. Then, and only then, can the group achieve, grow, learn, and develop more and more meaning. Developing a special model under particular circumstances, the Shakedown has been able to do this. Although it would be naive to assume that the practices that work at this student-run organization would work in the free market economy, some of the core ideals that help run the café could indeed prove effective at bringing a greater sense of significance, passion, and

fulfillment back to the experience of work. Adam Smith (yes, that Adam Smith) puts it well:

It is then, in the last dregs of life, his body wasted with toil and diseases, his mind galled and ruffled by the memory of a thousand injuries and disappointments which he imagines he has met with from the injustice of his enemies, or from the perfidy and ingratitude of his friends, that he begins at last to find that wealth and greatness are mere trinkets of frivolous utility (Smith 1759).

The Shakedown reminds us that human beings can indeed achieve not only for their own objective self-interests, but also for the interests of society at large. Human drive is an incredibly complex phenomenon that cannot be reduced simply to numbers on a paycheck. Salaries do play a part in fostering dedication, but we must always remember that interactions with peers, environments that satisfy our curiosities, and the pursuit of meaningful and impactful organizational goals all play an equally—if not more—important role in driving us to commit to work for a whole that is much greater we ourselves are.

Appendix A:

Shakedown Job Descriptions

Below is a divided list of job descriptions that must be done at the Shakedown. You may have one job. Or you may have two or even three. All of them are equally vital to the success of this place, so take pride in whatever your task is. The first 7 tasks will have one primary person assigned to them. A secondary staff member will be associated with that task to help the role leader when needed. This person should learn as much as possible, and be ready to fill the role when the head is unavailable, as well as being prepared in the future to take the lead of that role. Not all employees will work in the kitchen. And not all shift managers will be in charge of other leadership tasks.

You are responsible for everything outlined under your role description. Please take these responsibilities seriously. But feel free to experiment with them and have fun. The Shakedown is all about learning as much as possible, so feel free to take risks and bite off

potentially more than you can chew. And when you do bite off more than you can chew, don't be ashamed to ask for help from others.

Note that these tasks are not completely clear-cut--there is some overlap. So you must communicate what you are up to with everyone. Also, each task is not completely detached from the others. Therefore, if you have an idea for advertising or a menu item, for example, but work in some other area, please feel free to share it with the people in charge of advertising or menu, and work with them on that project so that it's successful. We're all in this together, so let's help each other out and have a great time doing it!

1) Menu/Head Chef—Julian

- Write up and print recipes, prep sheets, serving instructions, and put in respective place by Sunday shift.
- Create weekly specials. Should be planned by the Wednesday before they'll be on menu.
- Monitor quality and consistency of the food.
- Communicating exactly what menu items should look and taste like to managers. This entails physically creating all dishes that will be served and let all shift managers see what it should look and taste like. Also, the head chef should explain and demonstrate any difficult aspects of recipes. This should be done at Friday meeting.
- Communicate menu and specials to aesthetics, so they can write it on the menu board.
- Responsible for training staff and managers in regards to all things cooking-related (ie, knife skills, basic principles of cooking, certain tricks and techniques that specific recipes use, etc).
- Be on top of all current health code measures and make sure we're not violating any.
- Help train staff in sanitation measures.
- One of several people responsible for re-writing mission statement, so it fits current ideals.

2) Finances—RMax, Jesse

- Responsible for RFC's and approving them at meetings.
- Approve time sheets and take them to Grove House.
- Responsible for cash in register; must have appropriate change at all times.
- Price differentials on all menu items.
- Keep track of how Shakedown is doing, financially, and report how we did each week at the meeting.
- Deal w/ the card center and get menu items on computer menu.
- Allocate certain set budgets to people for large projects (ie, maybe aesthetics person wants to buy furniture for whole restaurant...finance must come up with an amount this person can spend).
- Facilitate the meeting for how much each non-work study employee will be paid.
- Train employees how to submit RFC's and where to put time sheets.
- Make sure employees are not logging false hours.
- Work with administration*

3) Catering—Maria

- Check Shakedown email regularly
- Create set menu for catering with standard prices
- Staff all catering events
- Create a contract that can be used for events- include information such as contact person, non-food items provided, set up time, clean up time, payment due by, etc...
- Send contract to client at least 5 days in advance.
- Send evaluation to client after event
- Give invoice to client the day of the event
- Create a cancellation policy
- Work with finances to make sure payment is received
- Work with advertising to create a campaign to increase catering events.
- Work with kitchen manager to make sure we have all the serving dishes needed for catering events.
- Work with sourcerors to make sure we have the necessary food ordered for each event.

4) Staff Coordinator/Personal Relations—Jake H.

- Create employee shift schedule for the semester. Post in restaurant.
- Create employee contact list and post in restaurant.
- Designate someone to be meeting facilitator for the next week's meeting.
- Take minutes at all meetings and send them out that same day to staff.
- Make sure it's clear in the minutes who signed up to do which job and what important things were discussed at the meeting.
- Distribute important information discussed at meetings to all shift managers.
- Checking in with the shift leaders weekly and make sure they are doing their jobs appropriately
- Create application for hiring.
- Hire new staff/setting up interviews.
- Set up employee bonding events like staff parties.
- Being at job fair booths to recruit new workers (along with Marketing).
- Send out any important info that staff should know.
- Serve as primary person that staff thinks of when they have a problem or question.
- Talk with employees who managers have noted are doing very well or poorly.
- Fire employees when necessary.
- During training, discuss how to get shifts covered.

5) Sourcerer (Ordering and Sourcing)—Jesse & Jake K.

- Take inventories of all food items
- Order food from all purveyors, including UNFI, Sergio the tortilla man, Shelton's, Brandt, Cheese Cave, coffee source, bakery, dining hall, and any other purveyor.
- Responsible for the pick-up of all food from stores and the dining hall.
- Research new farms and dry goods sources.
- Stemming from group ideals, decide if sources fit the Shakedown's standards.

- Lead and organize trips to farms. These should be open to staff and/or customers to attend.
- Create some sort of way to advertise where our food comes from so customers can see it.
- One of several people responsible for re-writing mission statement, so it fits current ideals.
- Communicate to staff our ideals during employee training.

6) Aesthetics—

- Keep the Shakedown dining room looking in top condition at all times
- Replace old furniture
- Keep kitchen orderly
- Create permanent physical menu and be in charge of chalk board
- Buy anything needed for dining room as needed. Work with Finances to figure out proper budget.
- Take responsibility for making the overall ambiance at the Shakedown as pleasant as possible.
- Train staff how to interact with customers (at register, while serving, etc).

7) Marketing—

- Advertise in any way possible (student talk emails, posters, getting a table at club day and welcome week for the freshman, etc....).
- Be at job fair booths to recruit new workers.
- Website creation/maintenance.
- Make the Shakedown a Facebook profile. Periodically post pictures and set statuses talking about our specials. Get lots of friends.
- Advertise to different departments that we are available for catering
- Be in contact with Events, and advertise their projects.
- Talk about the Shakedown as much as possible to friends (this applies to all staff members, actually).

8) Events— Briana and who else??

- Organize and spearhead major Shakedown events, such as birthday party.
- Plan weekly or biweekly small events (like movies, open mics, mini concerts, art shows, tv events, cooking classes, etc).
- Communicate any money earned or lost from all catering events to Finances.
- Communicate all catering events to Advertising, so they can market them.

9) Kitchen Manager—Mia

- Make sure that the kitchen clean, orderly, tidy, and sanitary at all times.
- Buy anything needed for kitchen as needed. Work with Finances to figure out proper budget.
- Wash table cloths and linens on a regular basis, at least 2 times per week. Coordinate with Grove House to get rags and aprons washed.
- Make sure we have enough silverware, plates, glasses, bowls, etc.
- Organize staff for deep cleaning.
- Make list of things to do for deep cleaning.

- Make sure deep cleaning gets done.
- Be responsible for getting anything fixed in the kitchen (so, submitting work orders, replacing freezer/ deep fryer, etc...).
- Train staff where everything is in the kitchen and how to use appliances.
- Be on top of all current health code measures and make sure we're not violating any.
- Help train staff on sanitation measures.
- Create nightly closing checklist

10) Weasels—Rmax, Jesse

- Maintain a good relationship with the administration. Serve as the contact people who will communicate with the school's administrative members.
- Be informed of all plans school has in long-term.
- Let admins know financial situation of restaurant.

11) Shift Manager—Jesse, Jake K, Rmax, Mia, Maria, Julian, Kayla, Kristen (I'm thinking these could change though.... maybe give the lowerclassmen some more responsibilities)

- Lead shifts
- Ensure food quality is high and as close to possible to the standard.
- Attend all meetings, so messages can be communicated directly.
- Responsible to ensure employees are doing things the way they were trained to do and/or which are communicated in meetings.
- Report which employees are doing exceptionally good or poor work on shifts
- Make sure everyone comes to his or her shifts.
- Ensure that employees on shift have are committed, believe in what we stand for, learn as much as possible, and have a good time.
- Ensure enough cash is in register at all times of service. If running low, get money from Chris Brunelle.
- Pick music for shift. Or delegate that responsibility to someone with better taste.

12) Staff—

- Come to all shifts, when appropriate.
- The above is not appropriate if you are: contagiously sick, out of town, bleeding uncontrollably, intoxicated, stoned, or in the midst of a life crisis. If any of these issues may arise, find a cover. You are responsible if the cover doesn't show up, so make sure they don't forget.
- Make bomb food and drink.
- Wash dishes.
- Work register.
- Make the Shakedown a great place to both eat and to work.
- Keep kitchen and dining room clean.
- Respect your managers and learn from them. Same goes for everyone else who you work with.
- If you like this place, come to our Friday meetings at noon.
- Get to know us all, show commitment, strive to do your best, have fun, and learn.

Appendix B

Shakedown Meeting 1/27/12

Attendance: Jake H., Mia, Rmax, Kristin, Jesse, Jake K., Maria, Julian, Vivian, Megan, Kayla, Cora, Lauren

Approved finances:

Mia Cetti: \$58.52

Julian Martinez: \$42.89

UNFI: \$1,144.77

Maria Guerrero: \$72.40

Jobs for next week

- Mia and Jake K., finalize food ordering and picking up schedule, and who will pick it up every week.
- Jesse will talk to Zenia about the online timesheets
- Lauren will spruce up dining room
- Cora and Maria doing grand opening poster
- Jake H. will do staff wall and finalize schedule, post staff roster and sched in kitchen
- Julian will post recipes and instructions in kitchen
- Jesse will update the register and email Ricky
- Mia will get masking tape, sharpies, saran wrap, and butane.
- Rmax will talk to Chris B about getting a cart
- Managers come in Saturday (tomorrow) at 3 to start prepping for opening
- Jake H. will send email to staff advertising opening

Last week's business

- Motley: containers didn't come with lids, so might not have first delivery tomorrow. Weekly delivery during Monday 2:30-5:30 shift. If we don't send an invoice we won't get paid. Check with manager on shift.
- Mural: paint it pleez. Before Sunday...

Events

- Shake Grand Opening: a week from this Sunday (SUPER BOWL SUNDAY): now having a super bowl party, opening at 3:30, serving snacks (free hummus and chips), then band plays after. I'll take pictures.
Cora got speakers and mic from Drew. Figuring out which band(s) we want to play: Chris McKinney, Thomas Ochoa, One Plus Two, Kip's band...want some nice background music for the opening.
- Cora has a schedule for bands to play (at least once a month), and events Monday nights 8:30-11:30. (bands, movie night, open mic, jam seshes)
- Eco-Center wants Thursday nights every other week, environmental film screening series.
- Shake B-day party April 14th. Need to rent the pool area online.

Founder updates

- Rmax and Maria talked to founders Fred, Alden, and Gabe: Alden and Fred want to start a Shakedown-type-place in Philly, want our finance numbers and stats.
- Want to start a shakedown alumni association to provide oversight (non-administrative oversight), to check in on us once in a while to see how we're doing, offer advice on improvements, and could help us get donations. Should set up a facebook group. Could be very handy, as the Shake's vision and knowledge may get lost in the staff turnover over the years, like how we're apparently in Pitzer's 10-year plan...

Sourcing

- Beef. Look through UNFI?
- Julian researched Premier Meat in Vernon, butchers grass-fed beef from Paso Robles. Delivers the next day. Sounds legit. However, need to find out about the slaughterhouse they use. Are cows grazing or just fed grass? So many questions! Kristin will research along with Julian and Jesse. They sell poultry, too.
- Turkey burgers for this Sunday, we'll figure out beef after opening.
- We don't like Shelton's anymore

Misc.

- Can't use dirty aprons! Someone (Mia?) will do laundry on Sundays and Wednesdays.
- Want to find new egg source, maybe from Amy's. currently from dining hall.
- Using dining hall for produce this week.
- Nancy Neiman (Scripps Prof.) might make an internship for people to pick fruits and veggies from community gardens and bring them to the Shakedown. Try to not overlap with what we order from Amy's.
- We should promote Shake gift cards over Parents' Weekend, in Feb.
- By doing independent studies and such, we can show administration the educational value of the Shakedown.

References

- Agriculture and pollution*. (2012, March 11). Retrieved from <http://www.equalearth.org/agriculturepollution.htm>
- AOL Inc. (2012). *Brand names: Bet you didn't know...* Retrieved from <http://www.dailyfinance.com/photos/companies-named-after-people/>
- Atkins, A. (Designer). (2009). *The interaction method*. [Web Graphic]. Retrieved from <http://www.interactionassociates.com/ideas/strategic-business-tool-you-can-use-now>
- Amabile, T. M., & Kramer, S. J. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Appleby, J. (1984). *Capitalism and a new social order*. New York: New York University Press.
- Badaracco, J. L. (2002). *Leading quietly*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press
- Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military and educational impact*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.
- Beebe, F., Towler, A., Guerro, G., Pollock, D., & Lipkowitz, J. (2008). *The shakedown manifesto*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bennett, S., & Brown, J. (1995). Mindshift: Strategic dialogue for breakthrough thinking. In S. Chawla & J. Renesch (Eds.), *Learning Organizations* (pp. 166-183). Portland, OR: Productivity Press.
- Bohm, D. (1990). *On dialogue*. Paper presented at Ojai, CA conference.
- Bungay, S. (2011). *The art of action: How leaders close gaps*. Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealy Publishing.
- Burke, S. C., Fiore, S. M., & Salas, E. (2003). The role of shared cognition in enabling shared leadership and team adaptability. In C. Pearce & J. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 103-122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Byrns, R. (2011). *Human behavior and the economic way of thinking*. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/depts/econ/byrns_web/Resources/Behavioral/Behavioral.htm
- Cannon, W. B. (1945). *The way of an investigator: A scientist's experiences in medical research*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Caproni, P. J. (2005). *Management skills for everyday life*. (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Pretence Hall.
- CBS Los Angeles. (2011, October 29). *Best burger in los angeles*. Retrieved from <http://losangeles.cbslocal.com/top-lists/the-best-burgers-in-los-angeles/>
- Chan, A. (1997). Corporate culture of a clan organization. *Management Decision*, 35(2), 94-99.
- Citrin, R. S. (2011, July). Courageous leadership. *A Monthly Publication from Citrin Consulting*, Retrieved from <http://www.citrinconsulting.com/wp-content/newsletter/july-2011.php>
- Cohen, S., Karten, R., Martinez, J., Sprague, A., McRae, S., & Sabel, M. (2011). *An organizational study of the shakedown cafe*. Unpublished manuscript, Organizational Studies, Pitzer College, Claremont, California.
- Cohen, W. A. (2010). *Drucker on leadership*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- College Prowler. (2012). *College rankings-campus dining*. Retrieved from <http://www.collegeprowler.com/rankings/campus-dining/>
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Couric, K. (Performer) (2009). *Is the self-made man a myth?* [Web]. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-18563_162-4619369.html
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1978). Intrinsic rewards and emergent motivation. In M. Lepper & D. Greene (Eds.), *The Hidden Costs of Rewards*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Hooker, C. (2003). Flow, creativity, and shared leadership. In C. Pearce & J. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 217-234). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Darwin, C. (2004). *The descent of man*. London: Penguin Group.
- Dawson, K. (2008). *Personal mastery*. Retrieved from <http://www.createnow.ca/PersonalMastery.htm>

- Deci, E. L., & Flaste, R. (1995). *Why we do what we do: Understanding self-motivation*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(1), 14-23.
- Demming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Boston, MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- Dewhurst, M., Guthridge, M. & Mohr, E. (2009). Motivating people: Getting beyond money. *McKinsey Quarterly*.
- Dobbin, K. (2012). [Written Response]. *Shakedown job application*.
- Escoffier On Line. (2012). *The brigade de cuisine*. Retrieved from <http://escoffier.com/index.php/culinary-reference/124-the-brigade-de-cuisine>
- Ferraro, G. (2008). *Cultural anthropology: An applied perspective*. (7th ed.). Wadsworth, Inc
- Fletcher, J. K., & Kaufer, K. (2003). Shared leadership: paradox and possibility. In C. Pearce & J. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 21-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Frank, R. H. (1988). *Passions within reason*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Freeman, J. (2008, March 08). The carrot unstuck: A new twist in an old debate. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved from http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2009/03/08/carrot_unstuck/
- Gauthier, A. (1995). The challenge of stewardship: Building learning organizations in healthcare. In S. Chawla & J. Renesch (Eds.), *Learning Organizations* (pp. 384-401). Portland, OR: Productivity Press.
- Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.
- Global Management Analysts Association. *Scientific management*. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.gmaaweb.org/gmaa/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=12:scientific-management&catid=4:theory&Itemid=8
- Gray, P. (2008, August 20). *A brief history of education*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/freedom-learn/200808/brief-history-education>

- Hackman, R. & Oldham, G. (Designers). (2012). *The hackman-oldham job characteristics model of work motivation*. [Web Graphic]. Retrieved from <http://www.mcgraw-hillanswers.com>
- Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the art of thinking together*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Janis, I. (1972). *Victims of groupthink*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Karash, R. (2002). Learning-org dialog on learning organizations. *Learning Org Discussion Pages*, Retrieved from <http://www.world.std.com/~lo/>
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). A dark side of the american dream: Correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(2), 410-422.
- Kohn, A. (1999). *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, a's, praise, and other bribes*. (2 ed.). New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Nohria, N. (2002). *Driven: How human nature shapes our choices*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- LeDuff, C. (2000, June 16). At a slaughterhouse, some things never die . *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/race/061600leduff-meat.html>
- Leonardi, C. (2007, July 27). The practice of personal mastery *Gordon Institute of Business Science*, Retrieved from http://www.gibs.co.za/news-and-events/news-and-events_1/gibs-info-sharing/the-practice-of-personal-mastery.aspx
- Loewenstein, G. (1994). The psychology of curiosity: A review and reinterpretation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(1), 75-98.
- McShane, S. L., & von Glinow, M. A. (2010). *Organizational behavior: Emerging knowledge and practice for the real world*. (5 ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- McIlwain, C. H. (1947). *Constitutionalism*. (2 ed.). Ithica, NY: Great Seal Books.
- O'Toole, J., Galbraith, J., & Lawler, E. E. (2003). The promise and pitfalls of shared leadership. In C. Pearce & J. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 250-267). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Park, H. (1996). A comparative analysis of work incentives in u.s. and japanese firms. *Multinational Business Review*, 4(2).
- Patel, R. (2007). *Stuffed and starved*. London, England: Portobello Books.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). All those years ago. In C. Pearce & J. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 6(2), 172-197.
- Peirce, W. (2004, November 17). *Metacognition: Study strategies, monitoring, and motivation*. Retrieved from <http://academic.pg.cc.md.us/~wpeirce/MCCCTR/metacognition.htm>
- Perkins, D. (2003). *King arthur's round table: How collaborative conversations create smart organizations*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Piekoff, L. (1991). *Objectivism: The philosophy of ayn rand*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.
- Planned Parenthood. (2012). *Gender & gender identity*. Retrieved from <http://www.plannedparenthood.org/health-topics/sexual-orientation-gender/gender-gender-identity-26530.htm>
- Pollan, M. (2006). *The omnivore's dilemma*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Popik, B. (2009, July 09). *Carrot-and-stick (stick-and-carrot)*. Retrieved from http://www.barrypopik.com/index.php/new_york_city/entry/carrot_and_stick_stic_k_and_carrot/
- Potier , B. (2003, July 17). Groups, like people, can be intelligent *Harvard University Gazette*, Retrieved from <http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2003/07.17/03-kingarthur.html>

- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, R. (1983). A spacial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29(3), 363-377.
- Rose, C. (Performer) (2002). An hour with management consultant jim collins [Television series episode]. In *Charlie Rose*. Retrieved from <http://www.charlierose.com/view/interview/2485>
- Seibert, S., Sparrowe, R., & Liden, R. C. (2003). A group exchange structure approach to leadership groups. In C. Pearce & J. Conger (Eds.), *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 173-192). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline*. (2 ed.). New York: Doubleday.
- Sidney, G. (2012). *Restaurant failure rates recounted: Where do they get those numbers?*. Retrieved from <http://www.restaurantowner.com/public/302.cfm>
- Sinek, S. (2009). *Start with why*. New York, NY: Portfolio.
- Smith, A. (1759). *The theory of moral sentiments*. New York, NY: Cosimo, Inc.
- Smith, P. M. (n.d.). *Are you a graduate of the john wayne school of leadership?*. Retrieved from http://www.opi-inc.com/shared_leadership.htm
- Staddon, J. E. R., & Niv, Y. (2008). *Operant conditioning*. In Scholarpedia Retrieved from http://www.scholarpedia.org/article/Operant_conditioning
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Cosimo, Inc.
- Towler, A. (2008). *Shake the hand that feeds you: A theory and practice guide for the shakedown cafe*. (Unpublished bachelor's thesis, Pitzer College).
- U.S. Department of Education, (2012). *Federal work-study program*. Retrieved from website: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/fws/index.html>
- Zust, C. (2008). *When leaders should step aside and use a facilitator*. Retrieved from <http://www.emergingleader.com/article36.shtml>