

ABSTRACT

Emily M Meier. EMPLOYEE NET PROMOTER SCORE: A DEEP DIVE INTO A SINGLE QUESTION. (Under the direction of Dr. Mark Bowler) Department of Psychology, May, 2024.

The primary goal of the study was to assess Employee Net Promoter Score from a qualitative lens. This study also aimed to assess Employee Net Promoter Score's relationship to other work and personality variables, namely burnout, engagement, turnover intentions, and proactive personality. Quantitative results show a strong relationship between turnover intentions and Employee Net Promoter Score, with turnover intentions not only correlating, but predicting Employee Net Promoter Score in all samples tested. Engagement and burnout were consistent predictors, but proactive personality was not. Qualitative analysis uncovered many themes related to Employee Net Promoter Score, including benefits, people, organization, and change management. Scoring Employee Net Promoter score also came into question, with further research needed to better understand the implications of cutting promoters at a score of 9.

EMPLOYEE NET PROMOTER SCORE: A DEEP DIVE INTO A SINGLE QUESTION

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Health Psychology

By

Emily M. Meier

May, 2024

Director of Dissertation: Mark Bowler, PhD

Dissertation Committee Members:

Alexander Schoemann, PhD

Jennifer Bowler, PhD

Angela Lamson, PhD

© (Emily M. Meier, 2024)

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Mark Bowler, for their unwavering support, guidance, and encouragement throughout this project. His expertise, patience, and insightful feedback has been invaluable in shaping the direction and quality of my research. I am also immensely grateful to Dr. Jen Bowler, Dr. Alex Schoemann, Dr. Nikki Caswell, and Dr. Angela Lamson for their valuable input, constructive criticism, and scholarly advice, which have greatly contributed to the refinement of this dissertation. I extend my heartfelt appreciation to my family for their unconditional love, encouragement, and understanding during the challenging periods of this academic journey. Their unwavering belief in my abilities has been a constant source of strength and motivation. This dissertation would not have been possible without the contributions and support of all those mentioned above. Thank you for believing in me and for being part of this significant milestone in my academic journey.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Review of Literature.....	3
Employee Net Promoter Score.....	3
Research Questions.....	8
Proactive Personality.....	9
Employee Burnout.....	13
Work Engagement.....	18
Turnover Intentions.....	20
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	24
Overview.....	24
Sample Methods.....	24
Measures.....	28
Chapter 4: Analyses and Results.....	31
Quantitative Analytics.....	31
Quantitative Results Summary.....	33
Qualitative Analytics.....	35
Qualitative Results Summary.....	35
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	42
General Implications.....	42
Employee Net Promoter Score's Relationship to Variables of Interest.....	43
What does eNPS measure?.....	44

Study Limitations.....	45
Future Research.....	47
Conclusions.....	48
References.....	50
Tables.....	58
IRB Approval Memo.....	62

List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities for Sample 1.....	58
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities for Sample 2.....	58
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities for Sample 3.....	59
Table 4. Predicting Employee Net Promoter Score for Sample 1.....	59
Table 5. Predicting Employee Net Promoter Score for Sample 2.....	59
Table 6. Predicting Employee Net Promoter Score for Sample 3.....	60
Table 7. Hypothesis Summaries Across Samples.....	60
Table 8. Predictors of Employee Net Promoter Score Summaries Across Samples.....	60
Table 9. Themes, Subthemes, and Examples.....	61

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) is the sensation that is sweeping the business nation (Reichheld, 2003). The use of eNPS is advocated by many reputable professional publications, including Harvard Business Review (Reichheld, 2003), Forbes (Conway, J. D., 2021; Dunivan, L., 2021; Forbes Expert Panel and Coaches Council, 2021; Forbes Expert Panel and Human Resources Council, 2021), and more (Allen, D. G., 2008; Davies, J., 2020; Harris, A., 2021); however, they regularly fail to have much concrete empirical evidence to support its use. Despite rigorous empirical investigation, this one-item measure has become widely popular for its ease of use, but does it really measure what it is intended to? A deep dive into the measure will help define and anchor eNPS with other variables such as turnover intentions, burnout, and proactive personality using three separate studies with participants from various occupations. Using qualitative data, a third study helps to anchor the different responses to this measure with meaningful words to see whether the current reasoning stands or rather if the scale should be interpreted differently.

Employee Net Promoter Score was originally adapted from a measure of customer satisfaction, often referred to as Net Promoter Score. According to Satmetrix Systems, where NPS has been trademarked, it “measures customer experience and predicts business growth (NICE Satmetrix). This proven metric transformed the business world and now provides the core measurement for customer experience management programs the world round” (NICE Satmetrix). This measure was adapted for employees in an attempt to measure employee satisfaction. The question thus remains essentially the same: *How likely is it that you would recommend [brand] to a friend or colleague?* Rather than asking about a brand, it asks whether a person would recommend the company they work for to a friend or relative. As simple as it

seems, this is not the solution that is being sought by many companies.

The Employee Net Promoter Score is simple to use, which adds in its usefulness at capturing measures of satisfaction. Asking your employees a single question may seem like the perfect solution if a company is then able to use that information to make decisions or assess employee commitment. However, this may not be the case. Most researchers know that a one-item measure is risky and often multiple item measures have better psychometric properties than their single-item counterparts (Fisher, Matthews, & Gibbons, 2015). Without thorough empirical research, it is difficult to understand what the measure is really studying – That is why this research is necessary. There needs to be data supporting the use of eNPS, otherwise businesses may be making decisions from results that are not reliable or valid.

Subsequently, this study aims to utilize three separate samples alongside other variables to assess eNPS in an in-depth manner. As there has been almost no previously published empirical research, this will be the first empirical work on the construct. It is critical to ensure that its use and interpretation are accurate and appropriate. By measuring eNPS in multiple quantitative samples, along with a qualitative component, the goal is to be able to clearly begin to identify what eNPS measures.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Employee Net Promoter Score

Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) was adapted from the original Net Promoter Score (NPS). The original score was introduced in a Harvard Business Review Article as the “one number you need to grow” (Reichheld, 2003). Though the article was not published in a scientific journal, it became widely popular as a single-item measure of customer satisfaction. Net Promoter Score has been linked to revenue growth for companies, so many businesses wondered if they could use the measure on their employees. The NPS works by asking the question: *How likely is it that you would recommend [brand] to a friend or colleague?* and is answered on a scale from zero to ten where a zero means you are not at all likely and a ten means you are extremely likely.

Customers who answer this question are then grouped into three separate categories. Those who answered between nine and ten are considered promoters. These customers are thought of as loyal and not only will they continue to buy, but they will encourage others to as well. Customers whose scores range between seven and eight are considered passives. They are satisfied but could be swiped up from similar, competitive brands. Finally, those who answered between zero and six are considered detractors. They are thought to be unhappy and expected to limit the growth of the company through negative word-of-mouth (Reichheld, 2003).

After identifying how many customers are in each of the three groups, a percentage is calculated to find what percent of the whole are detractors, passives, and promoters (Reichheld, 2011). By subtracting the percentage of detractors from the percentage of promoters, you get a Net Promoter Score. The benefit to a score calculated in this way is that any business, regardless of how big or small, can use it. The calculations are simple, so it appeals to a wide audience as a

business only needs someone who can calculate a percentage. Due to its simplicity, the measure gained traction in the business community. Net Promoter Score was then expanded to test whether the question worked on employees. The concept is the same; instead of asking customers what they think of the brand, employees are asked if they would recommend working for the company.

The primary information source for NPS is a 2011 publication by Reichheld, *The Ultimate Question 2.0*, in which the use of NPS is detailed along with means by which numerous organizations have utilized it to gain insight into their customers' ideas. For example, companies like Nike, Macy's, Verizon, and American Express have all participated in meetings about NPS (Reichheld, 2011). Many of these companies have supported the measure, noting that it helped their businesses. The success companies felt with the measure led to the question of whether it could be used in other areas. Organizations thrive on the cutting edge, so when companies see a measure that is easy and effective, they readily jump at the opportunity to gain insight into their customers or employees' ideas if it could put them ahead of their competition. Although the NPS measure has been widely adopted, there is little research on it. Additionally, adopting the measure to use on employees is risky as there is little empirical evidence that the original measure is valid or reliable. It is also not generally recommended to change target populations using the same measure unless there is good reason to believe the populations differ very little. If modifications are made to a measure, the measure should be tested to ensure it is working as intended (Stewart, Thrasher, Goldberg, & Shea, 2012).

Measuring something via a single item is not without problems. Generally, it is not recommended, as more items tends to reduce bias (Wilson, 2005). However, using single-item measures is not always bad. For example, the measures for social support, job insecurity,

bullying, and self-esteem have all been established as valid, reliable single-items (Fisher, Matthews, & Gibbons, 2016). Single-items can be recommended when using a concrete construct, when you have limited sample size, and desired precision is low or if the construct of interest is a moderator or control variable (Fuchs & Diamantopoulos, 2009). For a company surveying their employees, this may mean that using a well-established, reliable single-item measure is fine. However, there is little to no research on the psychometric value of the eNPS measure. It does not seem to have been validated or tested for reliability. Purportedly, eNPS can “quantitatively measure ‘happiness’ over time” (Thomas, Friday). Using eNPS over longer, more complicated measures can be great for a company that wants to assess their organization’s standing with its employees but may not have the time, money, or knowhow to do so. eNPS can break down some of the barriers that would prevent them from measuring company culture. However, without validation or sufficient testing, it is impossible to really be sure the measure works as it is intended. Thus, the need for data-driven research arises.

More specifically, there are several empirical questions that need to be addressed. If eNPS measures what it is suggested to measure, what other variables might it be related to? Given that it is asserted to be an indicator of employee satisfaction and engagement, we would expect it to be associated with turnover and burnout. Additionally, are there personality traits that make an individual more or less likely to be a promoter? Given that eNPS is based on who will go out of their way to recommend their workplace to others, it may be that trait levels of proactive personality are associated with it. It is also likely that some Big 5 personality traits may relate to eNPS as well, such as extroversion or conscientiousness. This research will test some of those ideas. By beginning to clarify the nomological network of the eNPS, it will help organizations better understand what their eNPS means, thus allowing for more clear

organizational goals and change based on the measure. Burnout and turnover intentions are variables companies generally wish to avoid. They lead to negative outcomes for both individuals and organizations and can be incredibly costly. Additionally, proactive personality may be related to how highly a person may rate their company regardless of how much they may like working there simply due to their proactive nature. Some people may simply score lower due to aspects outside of the organization. Burnout, turnover intentions, engagement, and proactive personality are also commonly studied and have valid, reliable measures associated with them. By connecting these four variables to eNPS, it may help increase the understanding for what eNPS is and what it relates to so businesses can have a better idea for what they are really measuring.

As mentioned earlier, this subject has had little empirical research to determine whether it is a good measure of employee commitment – or anything else for that matter. Upon searching for eNPS or Employee Net Promoter Score in Psychology Journals, only one “net promoter” article showed up and no articles appeared specifically measuring eNPS. Even upon expanding the database to business articles, the results were incredibly slim, with essentially no articles specifically discussing eNPS. This shows a strong need for research on this topic.

Upon expanding this search to include other journals outside of psychology, the results were the same. Four results appeared when including all databases, none of which came from journals. Two were from news sources and the other two were from periodicals. This further solidifies the need for both quantitative and qualitative research on the subject. An extensive list of companies are using a metric that has not been studied. Without empirical evidence supporting the measure, companies are putting themselves at risk if they use it to make decisions. Although the risk is minimal, this study should help determine whether eNPS is measuring what

it intends to, allowing businesses the ability to use it without worry.

Though the empirical literature surrounding the score is quite limited, there is an abundance of information on the topic in general media outlets. For example, Davies (2020) notes the use of eNPS, suggesting that

“Although eNPS can be used to measure success, it’s only really meaningful when compared to a previous score or to another organization’s results. On its own, it can’t tell you much. But it is a good place to start.”

Additionally, it is noted that although it does not give you a complete picture, it is simple and easy to use, so it can be a great first question. As the score is represented numerically and familiar to many, it’s easy to compare and use. Davies suggests using this question along with follow-up questions such as why they feel that way (2020).

In contrast, Katina Richmond states “It provides a forum for employees to anonymously share feedback, comments and concerns in a safe way,” Richmond says (Tyler, 2013). “It doesn’t ask any ‘leading’ questions on a five-point rating scale as most traditional employee surveys do.” Richmond goes on to discuss that eNPS surveys generally have a better response rate than other surveys due to their length. Tyler discusses that many companies allow space for comments in these surveys as well. She indicates that these comments can be even more helpful than the scores themselves as they provide further insight into how employees are feeling. Splitting the comments into promoters and detractors can also help a company understand where the difference seems to come from. Simply having the numbers can be helpful, but understanding why people are making those ratings is often better.

Forbes experts and coaches suggest using eNPS monthly to improve company culture (Forbes Expert Panel and Coaches Council , 2021). “It’s all about how the culture is actually

lived, and one great way to know that is by conducting the monthly employee pulse using eNPS surveys instead of waiting for the big annual or biannual surveys” says Amy Nguyen in the article (Forbes Expert Panel and Coaches Council, 2021). She believes this helps employees know that the company is committed to culture and that communication and plans for change are important following these surveys. In fact, Forbes has articles on including eNPS pretty often, with nearly 100 results for “eNPS score Forbes” appearing under Google News with articles such as “15 Smart Steps to Help Measure an HR Department’s Success” and “Nine Practical Ways to Gain Insight Into Employee Engagement.” There is obvious interest in the score, which makes the lack of empirical research surprising. Ideally this study will only be one of many to try to understand eNPS from a scientific perspective.

Many companies are using this metric, so it is imperative that the measure is thoroughly assessed for its ability to predict what it is said to predict. These companies are blindly trusting that the measure is valid without any empirical evidence to that point. Many companies are outsourcing these surveys to other companies, costing them money that may not be worth it if the answers they receive are not accurate to what they intend to measure. Thus, there are a few questions about the score that need answers:

RQ1: What is the relationship between common organizational variables and eNPS?

RQ2: Is the common scoring method appropriate? Should 7s and 8s be excluded from the calculations? What is the impact of excluding those values from analyses?

RQ3: What does a “promotor” or “detractor” experience and do the scores align with the qualitative responses?

These questions will be assessed in the studies to come. In addition, it is important to understand what else may be related to eNPS. By assessing other well-known, reliable variables

alongside this measure, it may help provide more validity to its results. Although there has been little research to understand what eNPS may be related to, the concept of the measure is similar to job satisfaction in that they both are single-item measures. Ideally, the measure will tell companies how satisfied an employee is with the organization and their job based on their likelihood of recommending it to someone they know. If that is so, variables like burnout, turnover intentions, and proactive personality, which are all related to job satisfaction, should be related to eNPS as well.

Burnout and turnover intentions are highly valued organizational outcomes. Both are studied frequently and have years of research behind them. It is important to measure outcomes as potential associations with eNPS as this will provide value to the measure. If they are related, organizations may be able to get more information from one measure. Proactive personality is another highly valuable variable that differs from burnout and turnover intentions in that it is a trait. Proactive personality has also been studied for many years and is related to a wide array of organizational variables. These three factors are some of the most widely used at the moment which means most organizations will understand them with little to no additional information given. This makes them valuable to measure alongside eNPS due to its widespread use and interest.

Proactive Personality

The first measure of proactive personality came in 1993 with Bateman and Crant's introduction to the construct. In the study, they described proactive personality as "one who is relatively unconstrained by situational forces, and who effects environmental change." They also described people who "scan for opportunities, show initiative, take action, and persevere until they reach closure by bringing about change." In this study, they used a scale that has become

the basis for the vast majority of research available on proactive personality.

The outcomes associated with proactive personality can be broadly broken down into three categories, employee attitudes, job behaviors and performance, and career-related outcomes (Crant, Hu, & Jiang, 2013). Employee attitudes relate to satisfaction and emotional outcomes related to proactive personality. Job satisfaction is an outcome related to proactive personality that has the potential for many other organizational outcomes (Crant et al., 2013, Spitzmuller, Sin, Howe, & Fatimah, 2015). Life satisfaction has also been studied in relation to proactive personality finding that those higher in proactive personality are more likely to set self-concordant goals and attain goals and when goals are consistent with a person's values, interests, and needs, proactive personality is related more to life satisfaction, in-role performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) than when goals are incongruent (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2010).

Research also indicates that proactive personality is negatively related to burnout and its subcomponents of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Alarcon, Escheleman, & Bowling, 2009).

Finally, proactive personality has been positively related to job commitment of varying kinds, such as organizational commitment (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001), career commitment (Messara & Dagher, 2010), and occupational commitment (Yousaf, Sanders, & Shipton, 2013).

Another study indicated that proactive personality was negatively related to turnover intentions indirectly through information exchange and trust relationships such that those with higher proactive personality were less likely to indicate a desire to leave when information exchange and trust were high (Yang, Gong, & Huo, 2011).

A review on proactive personality showed it is a consistent predictor of proactive

behavior (Crant et al., 2013). Proactive employees will often take charge, have higher individual innovation than their less proactive peers, use their voice, and seek feedback (Parker & Collins, 2010). Voice behaviors were associated with another study in which researchers examined relationship proactive personality has with leader-member exchange as well as voice behaviors (Wijaya, 2019). In addition to the positive relationship found with voice behaviors, proactive personality was related to higher quality leader-member exchange.

Arguably the most important outcome related to proactive personality is job performance. Researchers found firm performance and supervisor rated job-performance were both related to proactive personality (Chong, Dyne, Kim, & Oh, 2020) This study showed, however, that proactive personality predicts objective and subjective job performance indirectly through work engagement, but only when empathy with customers is high (Chong et al., 2020). Crant (1995) also found proactive personality to relate positively with job performance as did other studies (Seibert et al., 2001, Spitzmuller et al., 2015). There is no doubt organizations want high performing employees. However, this relationship on its own does not necessarily explain why proactive people perform better. In fact, there are situations where this may not be the case.

A moderately recent study found proactive personality to be related to work-family conflict, social support, work engagement, absorption, dedication, and vigor (Li, Zhong, Chen, Xie, & Mao, 2014.) This study showed that those high in proactive personality were more willing to improve performance through their own efforts. These same individuals benefit more from an appropriate work environment with much social support and little work-family conflict, leading to higher work engagement compared to those lower in proactive personality, who seem to prefer the status quo (Li et al., 2014). The review of proactive personality found it was related to career satisfaction and commitment, higher salaries and occupational prestige, more

advancement potential, networking intensity, internal/external marketability, overall career success (Crant et al., 2013). Bateman and Crant also found a relationship between proactive personality and personal achievements via an involvement of extracurricular/service activities and constructive environmental change (1993).

Although proactive personality has been studied for nearly 30 years, there is not a lot of research linking it to many other individual differences. The Big Five factors of personality seem to be most commonly measured with proactive personality. General consensus is that proactive personality is significantly positively related to extraversion and conscientiousness, and many studies have also linked proactive personality with openness to experience and emotional stability as well (Crant, Hu, & Jiang, 2013, Spitzmuller, Sin, Howe, & Fatimah, 2015).

Agreeableness, however, has not shown significant relationships with proactive personality (Crant et al., 2013). The initial study introducing proactive personality to the field also showed a relationship with need for achievement and need for dominance as well as transformational leadership and private self-consciousness (Bateman & Crant, 1993). This suggests the idea that factors relating to personal achievements tend to be related to proactive personality.

Several demographic variables have also been tested with proactive personality, yielding few significant results. Proactive personality has not been shown to relate to age, gender, education, tenure or work experience (Crant et al., 2013). This review also didn't find many significant results when comparing proactive personality and GMA nor did the meta-analysis done by Spitzmuller and colleagues (2015). Regardless of how much education someone has or how much experience they may hold, their proactive personality does not seem to be related. This seems to support the idea that proactive personality is an innate personality trait that is stable, does not change easily, and is not learned.

As proactive personality puts people into a position of controlling their own outcomes, it is possible that people higher in proactive personality may provide eNPS scores that differ from those with low proactive personality. Those high in proactive personality are more likely to change the job to fit their needs, suggesting that they may get more out of a job than someone who does not do those things. Subsequently, that may influence how likely they would be to rate the company, especially if they have been successful in meeting their needs through their proactive behavior. This relationship has not been studied before, so any possible relationships are speculation at this point. However, there is good reason to believe that those with more proactive personalities would provide higher eNPS ratings than their non-proactive colleagues. With that in mind, the hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Proactive personality will be positively related to eNPS.

Employee Burnout

What happens when employees continue to work with little resources? Often, they become stressed due to the overwhelming demands placed upon them and their lack of resources to deal with those demands. According to the conservation of resources theory (COR), when the demands of a job outweigh the resources provided to them, employees will begin to experience strain (Hobfoll, 1989). If this strain is not addressed, it can lead to burnout. Burnout is a more extreme form of work stress with three primary components: depersonalization, emotional exhaustion, and a feeling of reduced personal accomplishment (Hobfoll, 1989).

One of the original definitions for burnout suggested that it is a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion that results from long-term involvement in emotionally demanding situations (Pines & Aronson, 1988). The Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey (MBI-GS), one of the most frequently used measures of burnout, was created in 1996 and has

three components: exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). Exhaustion, sometimes referred to as emotional exhaustion, refers to feelings of overstrain, tiredness, or fatigue that results from work stressors. It is the stress reaction portion of burnout. This component is the most obvious to those experiencing burnout and is generally the component most people think of when they consider what burnout is. The second, cynicism, referred to in other versions of the MBI as depersonalization, results in a lack of caring and indifference to work. People both lose interest in their work and the meaning behind work is lost. Finally, a lack of professional efficacy, often called reduced personal accomplishment, consists of feelings of incompetence and a lack of accomplishments in one's work. People who experience burnout tend to feel less successful in their jobs, which can lead to negative consequences to both the individual and organization.

As burnout is conceptualized mainly as a stress-response, it follows that many of its antecedents are related to stressful work contexts. Job demands, the work environment, and interpersonal issues all can be stressful and lead to burnout. In a survey of 7,500 full-time workers, the top reasons provided for burnout were: unfair treatment, unmanageable workload, lack of role clarity, lack of communication and support from managers, and unreasonable time pressure (Wigert & Argrawal, 2018). There are also non-work and individual difference factors that seem to be antecedents to burnout.

Though an employees' personality and personal life are not necessarily something organizations have control over, some of these aspects are significantly related to burnout. Multiple studies have linked self-esteem, self-efficacy, and locus of control to burnout (Alarcon, Eschleman, & Bowling, 2009, Shoji et al., 2016). Nearly all the Big Five personality factors are related to burnout (Alarcon et al., 2009). Extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness,

emotional stability, as well as positive and negative affect, optimism, proactive personality, and hardiness all had significant relationships with each aspect of burnout, but Type A personality was found to only relate to the personal accomplishment aspect of burnout and no relationship was found with openness (Alarcon et al., 2009). Age has been most consistently studied in terms of demographics and it seems younger employees tend to experience more burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001, Brewer & Shapard, 2004). A meta-analysis on burnout and gender found that women tended to experience higher mean levels of burnout and scored higher on emotional exhaustion and lower on depersonalization than men (Purvanova & Muros, 2010). Finally, it seems unmarried individuals seem more prone to burnout, especially those who are single rather than divorced (Maslach et al., 2001).

Organizational factors related to burnout are much more commonly seen than individual factors. For example, many studies have found various aspects of the job to potentially lead to burnout. Maslach and colleagues found employees with higher workload or work overload experience more burnout and higher job demands, including both physical and emotional demands, have positive relationships with burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). In a large meta-analysis, role conflict, role ambiguity, and time pressure were positively related, and resources and autonomy were negatively related to burnout (Alarcon, 2011). One study found control, reward, community, fairness, and values were all related to burnout (Toppinen-Tanner, 2011). Additionally, work-home interference, autonomy, social support, quality relationship with supervisor, and feedback were all related to burnout. (Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005). A study examining the job demands-resources model found that demands primarily were related to the exhaustion component of burnout whereas the lack of resources was primarily related to disengagement in three different occupational groups (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, &

Schaufeli, 2004).

Outcomes related to burnout are generally split into organizational outcomes and personal outcomes. To start, generally those who experience more burnout tend to have worse health outcomes. Personal distress, physical exhaustion and insomnia, as well as the increased use of drugs and alcohol have been associated with burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Another study yielded similar results, showing a relationship between burnout and substance abuse, physiological issues related to stress, and worse mental health (Maslach et al., 2001.) One review also found support that burnout was linked with headaches, depression, anxiety, and gastrointestinal issues (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). This depression-burnout link has been shown in a three-wave seven-year study as well where burnout predicted depressive symptoms and life dissatisfaction (Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012). There are interpersonal consequences to burnout too. It is related to marital and family problems (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). It also is related to a decrease in socialization and mood such that those with higher burnout are more impatient, moody and less tolerating of others (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993).

Finally, there seem to be interpersonal antecedents of burnout. When interpersonal conflict between colleagues, management, or clients continue unaddressed, one may start to feel burnt out. Transformational leadership was found to relate negatively to all three areas of burnout (Kelly & Hearld, 2020). Those who had transformational leaders had less emotional exhaustion, lower levels of depersonalization, and felt more accomplished. Social support, especially from supervisors, was also negatively related to burnout, suggesting a potential buffering effect (Maslach et al., 2001). A study examining how customer-related social stressors (CSS) can influence burnout showed that four different categories of CSS predict burnout beyond control variables, such as gender and work-related variables (Dormann & Zapf, 2004).

These stressors include disproportionate customer expectations, customer verbal aggression, disliked customers, and ambiguous customer expectations.

Burnout has been shown to be associated with deterioration in the quality care provided by staff, job turnover, absenteeism, and low morale (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Some of these have been shown in many studies. For example, Absenteeism, intention to leave, turnover, lower productivity and effectiveness on the job, and a spillover effect on other employees has been related to burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). Those who are burnt out also feel less satisfied by their jobs and feel less committed to the organization (Alarcon, 2011). It is easy to see how burnout can be detrimental to an organization.

Burnout has been associated with turnover intentions and organizational commitment, so it follows that it would be related to eNPS as well. As people feel more stressed and the demands at work continue to rise without sufficient resources to deal with them, people may begin to feel tired and unhappy. That may spill into their feelings about the organization too, and perhaps they would be less likely to recommend the company to others if they feel the organization is at fault for their stress. This link has not been formally established, but it seems that burnout may be negatively related to eNPS. Thus, the first hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 2a: Emotional exhaustion will be negatively related to eNPS.

Hypothesis 2b: Depersonalization will be negatively related to eNPS.

Hypothesis 2c: Personal accomplishment will be positively related to eNPS.

Hypothesis 3a: Emotional exhaustion will be negatively related to proactive personality.

Hypothesis 3b: Depersonalization will be negatively related to proactive personality.

Hypothesis 3c: Personal accomplishment will be positively related to proactive personality.

Work Engagement

While burnout may be a strain on employees, engagement is often thought to be the opposite. Employee engagement is a multifaceted construct central to organizational psychology and management literature. Originally defined by Kahn (1990) as the convergence of physical, cognitive, and emotional aspects in work roles, engagement involves individuals investing their hands, head, and heart into their work (Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010). Schaufeli et al. (2002) further characterized engagement as a positive, fulfilling state marked by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor denotes high energy and mental resilience, dedication implies strong involvement and enthusiasm, while absorption reflects intense focus and immersion in work tasks (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Macey and Schneider (2008) emphasized that engagement encompasses state, trait, and behavioral tendencies, representing affective energy and discretionary effort towards work and the organization.

Theoretical models such as Kahn's (1990) psychological conditions and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) underscore the significance of engagement in organizational contexts. Kahn (1990) proposed that psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability drive engagement, influenced by environmental factors and individual differences. The JD-R model posits job resources foster engagement via motivation and health promotion, whereas job demands may lead to burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Empirical research has highlighted engagement as a mediator between various predictor variables and outcomes. For instance, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) demonstrated engagement mediating the relationship between job resources and turnover intentions. Rich et al. (2010) found that antecedents like value congruence, perceived organizational support, and core self-

evaluation predict engagement, subsequently influencing task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. Similarly, Christian, Garza, & Slaughter (2011) identified engagement as a mediator between job characteristics, individual differences, and performance outcomes.

Proactive personality, adaptability, and environmental resources have been identified as antecedents of engagement (Bandura, 2001; Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012; Hirschfeld & Thomas, 2008; Hyvönen et al., 2009; Inceoglu & Warr, 2011; Karatepe, Keshavarz, & Nejati, 2010; Moliner et al., 2008). Individuals with proactive personalities tend to exhibit higher levels of engagement (Bakker et al., 2012). Additionally, organizational support positively correlates with engagement levels (Christian et al., 2011). Moreover, research has suggested that factors such as job autonomy, skill variety, and task significance contribute significantly to the levels of engagement experienced by employees (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Christian & Slaughter, 2007).

Work engagement not only impacts organizational outcomes such as customer satisfaction, productivity, and profitability but also influences individual behavior and performance (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Bates, 2004; Baumruk, 2004). Engaged employees are more likely to exhibit discretionary effort, positive behaviors, and innovative thinking, contributing to organizational effectiveness (Bates, 2004). Furthermore, engaged employees are less prone to burnout and turnover intentions, fostering a positive organizational culture and climate (Baumruk, 2004; Rich et al., 2010).

Hypothesis 4: Engagement will be positively related to eNPS.

Hypothesis 5: Engagement will be positively related to proactive personality.

Hypothesis 6a: Engagement will be negatively related to emotional exhaustion.

Hypothesis 6b: Engagement will be negatively related to depersonalization.

Hypothesis 6c: Engagement will be positively related to personal accomplishment

Turnover Intentions

It seems obvious that companies generally want to save money where they can. Reducing burnout helps improve employees' lives in many ways, but it also helps the business. Proactive personality helps businesses be more productive, which saves time. Another big concern for companies is turnover. When employees leave organizations it can be involuntary or voluntary. Although organizations are often concerned with both, the latter is generally a bigger issue as it is often unexpected and companies have less control over it. This is why turnover intentions are so often studied and so much research has been done to try to determine what makes employees leave organizations.

Turnover intent is the intention to quit the organization where a person works in the near future and is a cognitive, deliberate, and conscious process (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). In general, most research is focused on the antecedents of turnover intentions as that can help organizations understand why people decide they want to quit. Once someone has left an organization, the damage is done. It is important to mitigate these intentions due to the incredible cost to organizations. Finding new employees and training them takes both money and time that could be saved if employees did not leave in the first place. The cost of one person leaving the organization is anywhere from 90-200% of his or her salary (Allen, 2008).

These intentions only matter if they are associated with action. If employees have turnover intentions but never act on those intentions, organizations are not experiencing turnover. The theory of planned behavior suggests that people intend to engage in behavior that they feel positively about (Ajzen, 1991) –This is referred to as attitude. Intention is also associated with subjective norms and perceived behavioral control. Essentially, when we feel good about

something, others think it's okay, and we have control over that behavior, we have intent. Research indicates that this intent is one of the biggest antecedents to behavior (Azjen, 2011). Research has also shown turnover intentions predict turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). This means that once people have intent to leave a company, they often will do so. Thus, it is important to know why employees experience turnover intentions in the first place.

Turnover intentions are often established using the measure created by Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham (1999). The measure consists of four items ranging on a five-point scale. The items ask about whether people agree or disagree with the items which question them about their intent to leave their job. It has shown appropriate levels of reliability and validity (Kelloway, 1999). A recent review of turnover intentions found that "Six personal antecedents have been researched more intensely: age, sex, schooling, marital status, family or kinship responsibility, and professional experience" (Steil, Floriani, & Bello, 2019). They go on to discuss that older employees and women have fewer intentions to leave than those who are younger or male. There is also an association between schooling and turnover intentions, with those who have higher schooling showing greater intent to leave (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008). Though the research cited in the review was older, there is an association between marriage or family responsibilities and turnover intentions, with married people or those with more responsibility showing fewer intentions (Steil et al., 2019). The authors also discuss that those who have more professional experience generally have fewer intentions to leave. These personal antecedents seem to make sense. Younger employees who have fewer commitments and less experience may simply have more opportunities at other positions compared to others. The first years in the job market are often a time where someone starts to understand what they value in a job or an organization, so it is unsurprising that many may have multiple different jobs with

different employers until they find something they can settle into.

Some personality factors have also been associated with turnover intentions. For example, conscientiousness, core self-evaluation, and proactive personality have all demonstrated negative relationships with turnover intentions such that as these variables increase, the intent to leave decreases (Chang, Ferris, Johnson, Rosen, & Tan, 2012; Dudley, Orvis, Lebiecki, & Corina, 2006; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2010). Proactive personality is negatively related to turnover intentions such that the more proactive someone is the less likely they are to leave the organization (Yang, Gong, & Huo, 2011). Similarly, individuals who engage in proactive behaviors are less likely to leave (Frieder, Hochwarter, & DeOrteniis, 2015). Research has also found a relationship between organizational support and turnover such that it mediates the relationship between proactive personality and turnover intentions helping to prevent more proactive people from leaving (Prabhu, 2013). This means that, although those with higher proactive personalities are less likely to leave than those with low levels of proactivity, having support from the organization makes these relationships stronger, reducing the likelihood that proactive people will leave even further.

In addition to personal antecedents, there are occupational variables associated with turnover intentions. Namely, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Multiple studies have shown a consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave such that those who are more satisfied with their jobs are less likely to intend to leave (Choi, Cheung, & Pang, 2013; Nancarrow, Bradbury, Pit, & Ariss, 2014). Organizational commitment also has a strong negative relationship with turnover intentions (Mowday et al., 1982; Voigt & Hirst, 2015). The review showed perception of support, work-family conflict, quality of life or well-being at work, and perceptions of success and justice were related to turnover intentions as

well (Stiel et al., 2019). There are other organizational variables related to turnover intentions with less positive associations. For example, engagement and burnout are related to turnover intentions such that more burnout is associated with turnover intentions and less engagement (Halbesleben, 2010; Swider & Zimmerman, 2010).

Employee Net Promoter Score claims to be a single item measure of how committed and satisfied someone is with their organization, so it seems that it should be related to turnover intentions. When people have more intent to leave, it's likely for a reason. Many employees who are unsatisfied with their jobs have higher turnover intentions. If that is true and it is also true that eNPS is positively related to satisfaction, it would follow that eNPS should be negatively related to turnover intentions. The hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 7: Turnover intentions will be negatively related to eNPS.

Hypothesis 8: Turnover intentions will be negatively related to proactive personality.

Hypothesis 9a: Turnover intentions will be positively related to emotional exhaustion.

Hypothesis 9b: Turnover intentions will be positively related to depersonalization.

Hypothesis 9c: Turnover intentions will be negatively related to personal accomplishment.

Hypothesis 10: Turnover intentions will be negatively related to engagement.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Overview

Three separate studies were conducted to assess eNPS and its corresponding variables. By measuring these same factors multiple times with different audiences, we could better understand the measure across various groups. A qualitative study helps provide a wider context and deeper meaning to the answers provided. Assessing different groups of people allows for better understanding of how the measure works in varying contexts. The goal was to provide a wider frame of knowledge for how the eNPS measure works and what its score may be related to. The first two studies use archival data to allow for the widest possible sample size. As such, some of the methods and measures may differ. However, using these samples will provide much needed information and allow comparison across multiple samples.

Sample Methods

Sample 1

The goal of study one was to test the hypotheses related to burnout, turnover intentions, proactive personality, and their subsequent relationships with Employee Net Promoter Score. By using this archival data set, these hypotheses were tested as well as other potential relationships to non-study variables, such as age, gender, and other demographics. Hypotheses were tested using correlations. Additional relationships were established using the same method. This study has all study variables included.

For this study, a large real estate organization was used. An online survey using Qualtrics was sent to 4,000 real estate agents. Of these, 892 completed the survey leading to a response rate of twenty-two percent. The majority of the participants were women (62.6%) and 21.7% of the respondents indicated they were men. Though the vast majority of the participants were

Caucasian/White (76.6%), 2.1% were African American/Black, 1.1% were Asian, 0.7% were American Indian or Alaska Natives, and .1% indicated they were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Participants' ages ranged from 20 to 84 and the average participant was 55.5 years old. Years of experience in the industry ranged between less than a year and 54 years with an average of 16.3 years in the industry and 10.1 years tenure with the organization. In this sample, 11% (102) were detractors, 25% (234) were passives, and 65% (616) were promoters.

Sample 2

The second study also uses archival data. This set, as with the first, was used to assess all hypotheses. The data was additionally tested for other possible relationships that may be worth noting, such as demographic relationships with test variables or other variables available to check for significant relationships with burnout, turnover intentions, and proactive personality. Correlational research, while not able to imply direction or causal relationships, is still helpful at this point during the research process as there is so little information available about eNPS. Being able to establish these correlational relationships can help provide direction for further research. This study used a database of North Carolina Pre-K-12 teachers and staff members. 58,238 valid email addresses were found, and 5,484 individuals completed the survey, which was conducted via Qualtrics. Of those participants, 4,908 identified as teachers. The remaining 576 non-teacher participants were removed from the analyses to have a more uniform population. The survey respondents represented 112 school districts across the state of North Carolina, including over 2,800 public and charter schools. Participants were mostly women (82.7%) with 17.3% being men. Again, the majority were Caucasian/White (88.3%). Additionally, 6.9% were African American/Black, 1.6% were American Indian or Alaskan Natives, 0.6% were Asian, and 0.1% were Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Participants' age ran from

22 to 73, with the average teacher being 43 years old. Their tenure ranged from less than 1 year to 44 years with an average of 9 years. In this sample 25% (1,584) were detractors, 28% (1,803) were passives, and 47% (3,055) were promoters.

Sample 3

The final study was primarily qualitative. By adding in this aspect to the study, it allowed for a further assessment of what scores mean to participants. When a person responds with a 7 on the eNPS measure, it is unknown what that score means. According to Reiccheld, these people are considered neutral. Those who score 6 or below are considered detractors. This qualitative assessment can help determine whether that is the case or not. Using Qualtrics, an electronic survey was sent to participants with the same measures used in the previous studies. In addition, open-ended questions were asked to allow for more commentary by the participants. An example of this kind of open-ended question is “Can you elaborate on why you chose that number?” or “What went into your decision-making process?” This provides a space for respondents to explain their score, which then helps determine whether the current thinking regarding scoring is accurate by comparing the score a respondent provides with their additional thoughts on the matter. This commentary is then assessed for trends to determine if there are commonalities between people with similar scores.

In a method similar to the first two studies, the research hypotheses have been tested using correlations. In addition, this study allows for the assessment of the research questions to better understand eNPS as well. Those questions are assessed using the qualitative component of the data. Themes can be established and help provide context and useful information for researchers and organizations. The short-response answers will be compiled to help determine how people feel about their organizations and when compared with the score they chose when

answering the eNPS, a baseline can be established. A baseline helps indicate what the standard is for scores. That can then be checked against the current thinking for accuracy. By the end of these assessments, these research questions should be thoroughly answered.

Snowball sampling was used for this study. This sampling method is so called because of the ramping effect it has on participant numbers. The study link was first provided to a small number of people using social media sites like Facebook and LinkedIn. The post had a brief description of what the study is designed to do, a link to the survey, and asked to repost or share the link with others. Those who participated or those who cannot but wish to help then shared the post with their following. In addition to being a convenient method for sampling, this allows for a wider range of people with different audiences to take the survey than one might achieve with a sample from a single organization.

Though random sampling of the population of interest is the best method, it can often be cumbersome and time consuming and, in many cases, simply not a reasonable method to use. Although snowball sampling often leads to participants being from similar geographic areas and potentially similar backgrounds, this likely still is a wider variety than if a third sample were taken exclusively from a large organization as the first two were. Therefore, this method was both practical and provided a potential for a wider audience from varying disciplines than one would achieve with a different sample.

A recent study on using snowball or convenience sampling recommended sample seed diversity to help achieve sample diversity (Kirchherr & Charles, 2018). Because the study will be sent through a variety of initial sources, this should provide a more diverse sample than simply using a single organization would. Another study discussed how snowball sampling can be difficult when the snowball “fails to roll,” essentially meaning that those who are to pass the

study on don't have anyone to give it to (Geddes, Parker, & Scott, 2018). In this study, this wasn't an issue as the initial source was quite large and was sufficient for our sample size needs without the need for many people to pass it along to others. After cleaning, 201 responses were used for analysis. Of these, 28% (57) were detractors, 33% (66) were passives, and 39% (78) were promoters.

Measures

Employee Net Promoter Score. Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) was measured using the single-item created by Reichheld (2003). The item reads, "On a scale of 0 to 10, how likely is it that you would recommend this organization as a place to work?" Scores on this scale can range from zero to ten with higher scores indicating a higher probability of recommendation. The three samples in this study used the individual scores rather than combining the scores for a single net-promoter score the way a company would. To best understand how the measure relates to our other variables of interest, it makes the most sense to compare individual-level scores rather than combining them.

Proactive Personality. Proactive personality was measured using the proactive personality scale (PPS) created by Bateman and Crant (1993). The original study measured test-retest reliability over a 3-month period and found a coefficient of .72 and provided evidence for convergent, discriminant, and criterion validity as well (Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999). The PPS uses a summative score. Each of the items is measured on a 7-point Likert scale in which a one indicates strong disagreement while a seven indicates strong agreement. Sample items include, "If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen" and "I am always looking for better ways to do things." There is one reverse-scored item stating, "I tend to let others take the initiative to start new projects" (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

Burnout. Burnout was assessed using the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). It is the most widely used measure of burnout and consists of three subfactors: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of overstrain, tiredness, or fatigue that results from work stressors. Emotional exhaustion is the stress reaction portion of burnout. This component is the most obvious to those experiencing burnout and is generally the component most people think of when they consider what burnout is. Depersonalization results in a lack of caring and indifference to work. People lose interest in their work and the meaning behind work is lost. Finally, a lack of professional efficacy, often called reduced personal accomplishment, consists of feelings of incompetence and a lack of accomplishments in one's work. A review of the MBI showed the internal consistency for emotional exhaustion was .87 on average, with depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment averaging .71 and .76, respectively (Wheeler, Vassar, Worley, & Barnes, 2011). Nineteen questions are used to assess burnout in total. Seven questions assess emotional exhaustion, five ask about depersonalization, and seven ask about a person's feelings of accomplishment. The MBI is not combined into one total burnout score. Rather, each component is assessed separately. In some cases, only part of the measure is used to reduce the total number of questions and time a participant needs to complete the survey.

Engagement. Engagement was measured using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), a widely used tool for assessing work engagement. It comprises three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Each dimension is measured using a set of items rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "Never" to "Always." The UWES has demonstrated strong reliability and validity in numerous studies (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Higher scores on each dimension indicate greater work engagement in the corresponding area (i.e., higher vigor,

dedication, and absorption). Work engagement is typically computed as the sum of scores across the three dimensions, providing an overall measure of an individual's work engagement, which was computed for this study.

Turnover Intentions. Turnover intentions was measured using Kelloway, Gottlieb, and Barham's (1999) measure of turnover intent. The measure consists of four items assessed on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The scale ranges from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Sample items include, "I am planning to look for a new job" and "I am thinking about leaving this organization." This measure has demonstrated acceptable levels of reliability and validity (Kelloway et al., 1999). A total score is achieved for this measure with higher scores indicating greater levels of turnover intentions.

Demographics

Demographic variables were also assessed to provide further information for each of the studies. Items relating to sex, race, ethnicity, and other job-related factors were asked and assessed for their relatedness to the above variables.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Quantitative Analytics

Sample 1

To test whether eNPS is related to proactive personality, burnout, engagement, and turnover intentions, correlations were conducted. Descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities for this sample can be found in Table 1. Employee Net Promoter Score had significant correlations with all variables of interest in the hypothesized directions. Significant correlations were also found between proactive personality and all variables of interest except turnover intentions. Emotional exhaustion was significantly correlated with all variables of interest except engagement and turnover intentions. Moreover, depersonalization and personal accomplishment were both correlated with all variables of interest. Engagement was correlated significantly with all but emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions. Thus, hypotheses 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4, 5, 6b, 6c, 7, 9b and 9c were supported and hypotheses 6a, 8, 9a, and 10 were not supported.

A regression was also conducted to assess how each of the variables of interest affect a person's score, which can be seen in Table 4. This regression was statistically significant, $R^2 = .42$, $F(6, 776) = 91.73$, $p < .001$ and accounted for 42% of variance. Additionally, coefficients were further assessed to ascertain the influence of each of the factors on eNPS. The beta weights for proactive personality, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization were not significant. The beta weights for personal accomplishment ($b=.25$, $t=1.20$, $p=.045$), engagement ($b=.21$, $t=2.78$, $p=.005$), and turnover intentions ($b=-1.09$, $t=-17.87$, $p<.001$) were significant, however. Turnover intentions accounted for the largest portion of variance.

Sample 2

Correlations were also run on sample 2 to assess relationships of key variables with eNPS. Descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities for this sample can be found in Table 2. Employee Net Promoter Score had significant correlations with all variables of interest in the hypothesized directions. All other variables of interest tested were correlated with each other in hypothesized directions as well. Thus, hypotheses 1, 2a, 3a, 4, 5, 6a, 7, 8, 9a, and 10 were all supported. Because this sample did not include depersonalization nor personal accomplishment, these hypotheses were unable to be tested.

A regression was also conducted to assess how each of the variables of interest affect a person's score. This regression was statistically significant, $R^2 = .34$, $F(4, 5388) = 694.82$, $p < .001$ and accounted for 34% of the variance. Coefficients were also tested to determine the individual contribution each factor has upon eNPS, with all factors coming up as significant except for proactive personality. Emotional exhaustion ($b = -.31$, $t = -10.16$, $p < .001$), engagement ($b = .42$, $t = 10.98$, $p < .001$), and turnover intentions ($b = -.73$, $t = -30.34$, $p < .001$) were all significant, with turnover intentions accounting for the largest proportion of variance. Full details can be found in Table 5.

Sample 3

Correlations for this sample resulted in significant correlations with nearly all variables of interest, excluding proactive personality, though it was still correlated in the hypothesized direction. All aspects of burnout, engagement, and turnover intentions were significant in the hypothesized directions and can be found in Table 3 along with additional descriptive statistics and reliabilities. This supports hypotheses 2a, 2b, 2c, 4, and 7. Proactive personality was only correlated significantly with engagement and personal accomplishment. All other correlations were significant aside from turnover intentions with personal accomplishment. Thus, hypotheses

3c, 5, 6a, 6b, 6c, 9a, 9b, and 10 were also supported. Hypotheses 1, 3a, 3b, 8, and 9c were not supported.

A regression was run to predict eNPS scores from the variables of interest. The regression was significant, $R^2 = .49$, $F(6, 194) = 30.55$, $p = <.001$, accounting for 49% of variance. See Table 6 for full details. Upon examination of the coefficients for each variable of interest, results were significant for both emotional exhaustion ($b = -.74$, $t = -3.40$, $p < .001$) and turnover intentions ($b = -.79$, $t = -5.77$, $p < .001$). Turnover intentions again accounted for the largest proportion of variance in predicting eNPS.

Quantitative Results Summary

Across all samples, several hypotheses related to Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) received consistent support. These include the expectations that proactive personality, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal accomplishment, engagement, and turnover intentions would each have specific relationships with eNPS. Specifically, proactive personality, personal accomplishment, engagement, and lower levels of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and turnover intentions were consistently associated with higher eNPS scores.

These findings indicate robust connections between employee perceptions, attitudes, and intentions regarding their workplace and their likelihood to recommend it to others. There was variability in support between eNPS and proactive personality, however and the correlations between eNPS and proactive personality were often quite small. Sample size could be a factor into these results. In Sample 3, proactive personality did not show a significant correlation with eNPS, although it was correlated in the hypothesized direction.

In addition, regression analyses unveiled distinct predictors of eNPS across samples. In Sample 1, personal accomplishment, engagement, and turnover intentions emerged as significant

predictors, with turnover intentions exhibiting the most substantial impact. Sample 2 indicated emotional exhaustion, engagement, and turnover intentions as significant predictors, with turnover intentions contributing the most to eNPS variance. Sample 3 highlighted emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions as significant predictors, with turnover intentions playing a pivotal role in predicting eNPS variance. All three samples found turnover intentions to play the largest role in predicting eNPS scores, indicating a strong interplay between feeling the desire to quit one's job and rating that job poorly.

Key relationships also emerged between other variables of interest. Several hypotheses had support across all samples. Specifically, engagement was positively correlated with proactive personality in all three samples. Turnover intentions was negatively correlated with engagement in all three samples as well. Several hypotheses were supported in at least two of the samples tested. For instance, while there was some evidence of negative relationships between emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and turnover intentions with proactive personality, the findings were not consistent across all samples. Similarly, the positive relationship between personal accomplishment and proactive personality was supported in some instances but not uniformly across all samples.

Moreover, hypotheses concerning the relationships between engagement, turnover intentions, and proactive personality were not consistently supported across all samples. The anticipation that engagement would be positively related to proactive personality and negatively related to turnover intentions did not hold uniformly. Similarly, the hypothesis that turnover intentions would be negatively associated with proactive personality and personal accomplishment did not receive consistent support across the samples. Table 7 displays which hypotheses were significant in each sample and Table 8 displays which predictors were

significant for each sample regression.

Qualitative Analytics

Theme Analysis

Sample 3 contained data from 4 separate open-ended, non-leading questions. Participants had an unlimited amount of time to answer the questions in the survey with no time limit. Responses for each question were read individually and coded based on their similarity. This coding was done by hand by the primary researcher to identify initial schemes. Any responses that were incomplete or did not make sense were discarded. Codes were summarized in a short sequence of words, and developed through an iterative process. The codes were then analyzed for frequency and distribution to assess for broad themes and importance. From those broad themes, further assessments were made to determine any sub-themes. Table 9 shows an overview of these themes and subthemes as well as examples from the data for each.

Qualitative Results Summary

Overview of Themes

Analysis of open-ended responses to a question asking participants why they chose their eNPS score revealed several key themes and subthemes that influence employee perceptions within organizations. Internally, the meaningfulness of work emerges as pivotal, encompassing the rewarding and impactful feelings associated with tasks and contributions. One respondent, who provided a rating of 9, said:

“My organization exists to help people. They are currently growing and seem to be well respected by clients.”

Another who rated their company a 10 put it simply:

“My job is awesome and very gratifying.”

Externally, benefits play a crucial role, spanning financial rewards like pay and implicit benefits such as flexibility and work/life balance. The theme of 'People' encompasses relationships within the organization, including interactions with coworkers and management, both upper and direct. Organizational themes also emerge, namely factors such as culture and organizational values, which all impact employee sentiment. Change management factors also emerge as a major theme, encompassing both organizational change and development.

Delving deeper, within the main themes, specific subthemes provide additional insight into the intricacies of employee perceptions. These include various aspects such as financial benefits (e.g., pay), implicit benefits (e.g., flexibility, workload and stress, work/life balance), and union-related benefits within the broader category of benefits. A satisfied employee rated their company a 10, noting:

“Lots of opportunity to move up and around to different roles. Decent pay and benefits. Work life balance is significantly better than my last role but there is still room for improvement.”

Another had similar thoughts, rating their company a 9:

“I really love the people I work with. The president of the hospital is the best leader that I have ever worked for. I am confident in the hospital's local leaders. The work we do is meaningful. I have experienced personal and professional growth by working here. My position pays well, and our benefits are better than most companies in our area. I also get to work from home. I appreciate the flexibility.”

'People' subthemes encompass the dynamics of relationships with coworkers and management, distinguishing between interactions with upper management and direct supervisors.

Coworkers help play a role in employee satisfaction. One respondent provided a rating of

7 and says:

“Good and consistent benefits. I have many good friends at my work and it balances out the ones that drive me nuts. Flexibility and very kind managers.”

When it comes to direct managers, themes of support, micromanagement, and recognition and appreciation all emerge. A satisfied employee noted:

“My employer actually tries to make the employees feel appreciated and I have never had that at any other place of employment.”

For upper management, opportunities for advancement, role clarity or confusion, consistency, and recognition and appreciation all emerge. A disgruntled respondent gave their organization a 0, noting:

“My boss is unkind and I feel undervalued as an employee. I don’t feel comfortable speaking to my superiors or speaking to some of my coworkers. I am micromanaged and watched like a hawk for work that is unimportant, despite the fact that I always complete my work in a timely and efficient manner. There is no praise for work here; in fact, my boss believes berating people and giving low performance scores boosts morale. He doesn’t care about the employees or their well-being.”

Another noted feelings of being cared for by the organization, giving their company a 9:

“My workplace cares about their customers and employees. Most of our managers and senior leadership team are great to work with.”

Within the organization, subthemes such as culture and atmosphere, alignment with values like DEI missions and organizational direction, underscore the nuances of employee experiences. One satisfied employee, who rated their organization an 8 explains:

“I chose this score because my company has an excellent culture that fosters growth and

independent thinking while also have excellent compensation and benefits.”

Change management subthemes, such as turnover, management changes, stability, and training, further clarify the complexities of organizational dynamics and their impact on eNPS. For example, one respondent rated their company a 6, noting:

“I feel like the hours are good for me and I love my coworkers, but I feel like the organization as a whole doesn’t see the needs of its staff. The organization is understaffed, and I don’t feel enough is done to rectify that problem.”

This question saw a high response rate, with only eight respondents leaving the question blank or writing N/A. This provides a total response rate of 96% for this question.

Decision-Making

In analyzing the factors influencing respondents' decision-making regarding their eNPS scores, a notable distinction emerges between those who primarily consider their individual job satisfaction and others who evaluate the company as a whole. While some respondents focus specifically on their role within the organization, many more reference their job rather than the broader company context. One respondent noted:

“I considered how other people would view the job as opposed to my own personal experience.”

Interestingly, there's a prevalence of mentions regarding customers or clients in this feedback compared to the responses summarized above. Additionally, numerous respondents mention comparing their current experience with previous jobs or how their current job used to be, indicating a reflective approach to their assessment.

An important finding revolves around the interplay between tenure, experience, and change management. Many respondents base their eNPS scores on their tenure with the company, with

some expressing satisfaction due to longevity while others highlight dissatisfaction stemming from significant organizational changes. A respondent who rated their company a 9 said:

“The work environment wasn't good a few years ago and the organization seems to be on the rebound.”

This implies a nuanced perspective influenced by individual experiences within the evolving organizational landscape. Furthermore, several respondents consider the opinions of others in their decision-making process, indicating a collective aspect to eNPS evaluations. Notably, while some respondents admit to relying on their initial gut feeling, there's a sense that many others may do so but hesitate to acknowledge it openly, suggesting that there is more complexity to eNPS scores than may be explicitly noted. For example, one particular respondent noted:

“I thought about all aspects of my company - at first I was thinking a higher number, but I started thinking about recent frustrations I have had and stepped back to look at the company overall, not just my personal experience with my team.”

In this instance, it seems the respondent likely would have rated their company higher if they'd gone with their gut rather than taking time to consider their feelings.

Finally, there seemed to be a lack of clarity within the question itself. Many respondents seemed to not understand the question was meant for them to describe why they provided the score they did. Some instead explained their decision to stay with the company. This was not extremely common but occurred at a rate higher than anticipated (n=9). These responses were not used when considering themes around decision-making. This question was also left blank more often than the other three, with 30 respondents leaving the question completely blank, referencing their previous response, or writing N/A into the space. Response rate for this question excluding those who misinterpreted the language was 84%.

Positive vs. Negative Job Aspects

Respondents were asked which positive and negative aspects related to their job influenced the scores they provided. Positive aspects influencing eNPS scores include autonomy and agency in job roles, opportunities for growth and education, the presence of challenging work and task variety, alignment with organizational values, and the feeling of being rewarded and making a positive impact. Employees value environments where they can freely express ideas, pursue personal development, engage in diverse tasks, align with company values, and feel a sense of fulfillment from their contributions. One person put it simply, stating:

“I feel supported and encouraged to work with autonomy.”

These factors collectively contribute to higher job satisfaction, fostering a strong connection between employees and their organization, ultimately influencing their likelihood of recommending the company to others.

Negative aspects influencing eNPS scores encompass various challenges that hinder job satisfaction and employee endorsement. A prevalent concern is the difficulty in performing tasks efficiently, often attributed to obstacles like slow response to change, outdated technology, heavy workload, high turnover rates, and inadequate training and support. Poor leadership and unclear decision-making processes also contribute to dissatisfaction, along with issues of bureaucratic red tape and communication breakdowns within the organization. Pay disparity emerges as a significant concern, highlighting the discrepancy between job demands and compensation. Additionally, the presence of negative coworker dynamics and procedural injustices further exacerbates negative perceptions. Interestingly, while some employees find their roles either too mundane or overly complex, others struggle with the pace of work. For instance, one respondent mentions:

“Sometimes that pace of work can be too slow in my opinion while others might enjoy the pace though.”

Despite these challenges, it's notable that many employees who provided high eNPS ratings do not mention any negative aspects, suggesting a diverse spectrum of experiences within the organization. Response rate for these two questions was 100%, though many indicated they had no negative aspects to note.

Overview of Scoring

Scoring is important within the eNPS scale, as only those with ratings of 8 through 10 are considered to be promoters. Interestingly, those who provide a score of 7 to their employers often have at least one negative criticism to note. In comparison, those who rate an 8 have far fewer instances of citing a negative criticism. For example, only 12% of the sample who rated a 7 had exclusively positive notes, whereas 57% of those who gave an 8 had nothing but positive things to say about their organization. Even still, those who rated 9's or 10's were even more positive. Very few respondents had negative criticisms of their organization when rating a 9 or 10. Some even went as far as to explicitly state their promoter status, saying:

“I actively recommend working at my current company.”

This may provide some evidence into whether excluding those who provide a rating of 8 from promoters is the right method.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

General Implications

The research conducted addresses three main research questions (RQs) aimed at exploring critical aspects of the relationship between organizational variables and Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS), as well as the appropriateness of the scoring method and the alignment between scores and qualitative responses. Research Question 1 focuses on understanding the relationship between common organizational variables and eNPS. Through quantitative analysis, the study identifies consistent correlations between eNPS and key organizational factors such as proactive personality, burnout, engagement, and turnover intentions across multiple samples. These findings highlight the interconnectedness between employee perceptions, attitudes, and intentions toward their workplace and their likelihood to recommend it to others.

Research Question 2 delves into the appropriateness of the common scoring method for eNPS and the impact of excluding scores of 7 and 8 from calculations. The research findings reveal distinct scoring patterns among respondents, with those providing higher ratings demonstrating overwhelmingly positive sentiments, while lower-rated responses often include critical feedback. The implications of excluding scores of 7 and 8 from analyses warrant further examination to assess the potential biases introduced and the extent to which these exclusions align with the true sentiments of employees.

Research Question 3 aims to investigate the experiences of "promoters" and "detractors" and assess whether the quantitative scores align with qualitative responses. The qualitative analysis uncovers nuanced insights into the factors influencing employees' perceptions and decision-making processes regarding their eNPS scores. Themes such as meaningful work, benefits, relationships with coworkers and management, and organizational culture emerge as

key determinants of employee sentiment. Understanding the alignment between quantitative scores and qualitative responses provides valuable insights into the holistic employee experience and the implications for organizational improvement strategies.

Overall, the research addresses critical questions surrounding the relationship between organizational variables and eNPS, the appropriateness of scoring methods, and the alignment between scores and qualitative feedback. These findings offer valuable implications for organizational leaders seeking to enhance employee satisfaction, loyalty, and advocacy within their respective workplaces. Further exploration and validation of these findings can contribute to the development of targeted interventions aimed at fostering a positive work environment and driving organizational success.

Employee Net Promoter Score's Relationship to Variables of Interest

The research findings presented offer comprehensive insights into the relationship between Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) and key organizational variables, including proactive personality, burnout (encompassing emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment), engagement, and turnover intentions. Through rigorous quantitative analysis across multiple samples, significant correlations between eNPS and the variables of interest were consistently observed, highlighting the intricate interplay between employee perceptions, attitudes, and intentions toward their workplace and their propensity to recommend it to others.

Regression analyses further illuminate specific predictors of eNPS, with turnover intentions emerging as a robust predictor across all samples, indicating the pivotal role of job dissatisfaction in shaping eNPS ratings. Moreover, engagement, emotional exhaustion, and personal accomplishment were identified as significant predictors, underscoring the multifaceted

nature of employee experience and its impact on eNPS. Notably, while certain relationships, such as those between eNPS and engagement or turnover intentions, exhibited consistent patterns across samples, the relationship between eNPS and proactive personality demonstrated variability, suggesting context-dependent influences. Within the construct of burnout, emotional exhaustion consistently emerged as a significant predictor of eNPS, emphasizing its detrimental effect on employee perceptions. However, the nuanced relationships between depersonalization, personal accomplishment, and eNPS underscored the complexity within the burnout construct. Moreover, these findings contribute valuable insights for organizational leaders aiming to foster a positive work environment and enhance employee satisfaction, engagement, and loyalty, thereby promoting organizational success and well-being.

What does eNPS measure?

Examination of the results from these three samples including the expansive qualitative responses provided helps clarify what Employee Net Promoter Score is really measuring. Among these predictors, turnover intentions emerge as a robust and consistent determinant of eNPS across all samples, underscoring the significant impact of job dissatisfaction on employees' likelihood to recommend their workplace to others. Additionally, engagement consistently emerges as a significant predictor of eNPS, highlighting the pivotal role of positive organizational experiences and workplace interactions in shaping employee perceptions and attitudes. Emotional exhaustion, a dimension of burnout, also consistently influences eNPS ratings, indicating the detrimental effects of emotional strain and exhaustion on employee sentiments toward their workplace. Furthermore, personal accomplishment, another dimension of burnout, exhibits varying relationships with eNPS across samples, suggesting nuanced dynamics within the burnout construct that impact employee recommendations.

Study Limitations

The research findings presented above offer valuable insights into the relationships between Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) and various organizational factors, yet several limitations warrant consideration. First, the study's reliance on cross-sectional data poses limitations in establishing causal relationships between variables. While correlations and regression analyses provide valuable insights, longitudinal studies would be instrumental in highlighting how eNPS may change over time and directional relationships among variables of interest, particularly regarding turnover intentions and engagement. Additionally, the variability in support for certain hypotheses across samples highlights potential contextual influences that remain unexplored. Further investigation into the moderating effects of organizational characteristics, such as industry type or organizational size, may showcase the nuanced relationships observed.

Moreover, the exclusion of respondents who rated their workplace as a 7 or 8 from the eNPS calculation raises concerns regarding the appropriateness of the scoring method. Future research should examine the impact of including these ratings on eNPS scores and explore alternative scoring approaches to ensure a more comprehensive assessment of employee sentiments. In general, creating cut points on a continuous variable can be problematic for several reasons. Firstly, it introduces subjectivity into the analysis process, as the determination of where to set the cut points is often arbitrary. This subjectivity can undermine the validity and reliability of the results, as different cut points may yield divergent findings and interpretations. In this study, those who rate their companies an 8 have very few negative criticisms to note. Excluding their responses in calculating eNPS may result in drastic changes to their eNPS scores compared to what they may be if included in calculations.

Secondly, creating cut points may oversimplify the underlying complexity of the data. Continuous variables often represent a spectrum of values, and imposing cut points may obscure important nuances and variability within the data. By dichotomizing or categorizing a continuous variable, such as eNPS, employers risk losing valuable information and insight into the full range of relationships and patterns present in the data. Continuous variables inherently possess more information than dichotomized or categorized variables, and by converting them into discrete categories in the way eNPS does, organizations may reduce the precision and sensitivity of their analyses. This loss of information can limit the ability to detect subtle but meaningful associations and patterns within the data.

Moreover, creating cut points may introduce bias and misclassification errors into the analysis. Individuals near the cut points, such as those who rate their organization an 8, or those who rated a 6, may be misclassified into different categories, leading to inaccuracies in the assessment of relationships and associations. Furthermore, the choice of cut points may disproportionately impact certain subgroups within the data, potentially biasing the results and interpretations. If those with ratings of 8 are true promoters, excluding them only diminishes an organization's true promoter score. In the same vein, some employees who rate their organization a 6 may not be true detractors. By including those ratings, organizations may be overestimating the negative outlook their employees have. Though creating cut points on eNPS may seem appealing for simplicity and ease of interpretation, it can introduce several methodological challenges and limitations. Organizations should carefully consider the implications of categorizing this continuous variable and explore alternative analytical approaches that preserve the integrity and richness of the data.

Lastly, the qualitative analysis, while insightful, may be subject to response bias and

interpretation errors, necessitating careful consideration of respondent demographics and the reliability of coding procedures. Overall, addressing these limitations through methodological refinement and further exploration of contextual factors is crucial for enhancing the robustness and generalizability of findings in future research endeavors

Future Research

Future research on Employee Net Promoter Score should address several key areas to enhance understanding of its applications and limitations. Longitudinal studies are needed to assess how eNPS scores may change over time and to determine any causal relationship between eNPS and organizational variables, particularly employee turnover intentions. By tracking changes in eNPS over time, research can help identify critical inflection points and determine the affect of organizational interventions on employee perceptions and attitudes.

Future research should also examine the contextual factors that influence the relationships between eNPS and organizational variables. This includes exploring the moderating effects of organizational culture, industry type, leadership style, and employee demographics on the predictive validity of eNPS. Understanding how these contextual factors shape employee perceptions and likelihood to recommend their workplace can inform tailored strategies for enhancing employee satisfaction and engagement, potentially reducing turnover intentions and increasing tenure.

Additionally, more research is needed to assess the scoring method eNPS currently applies. Research should explore alternative scoring methods and cutpoints for eNPS to address concerns regarding the exclusion of respondents who rate their workplace as a 7 or 8. Comparative studies examining the predictive validity and reliability of different scoring approaches can help identify the most appropriate method for assessing eNPS.

Finally, more qualitative research is needed to gain deeper insights into the underlying drivers of eNPS ratings and the experiences of "promoters" and "detractors" within organizations. By conducting in-depth interviews and focus groups, new research can uncover nuanced factors influencing employee perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors, providing valuable context for interpreting quantitative findings. In summary, future research on eNPS should adopt a multidimensional approach that integrates quantitative and qualitative methodologies to explore its dynamics, contextual influences, and implications for organizational effectiveness and employee well-being. By addressing these key areas, researchers can contribute to the continued evolution and refinement of eNPS as a valuable tool for assessing and enhancing employee engagement and organizational advocacy.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the findings presented in this research provide valuable insights into the complex relationships between Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) and key organizational variables, including proactive personality, dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal accomplishment), engagement, and turnover intentions. Through rigorous quantitative analyses across multiple samples, significant correlations and predictors of eNPS were identified, shedding light on the multifaceted nature of employee perceptions and attitudes within organizational contexts.

The consistency of turnover intentions as a robust predictor of eNPS emphasizes the critical importance of addressing job dissatisfaction and retention strategies in fostering positive employee sentiments and organizational advocacy. Additionally, engagement and emotional exhaustion were identified as significant predictors, highlighting the pivotal role of positive organizational experiences and the detrimental effects of emotional strain on employee

perceptions.

Though proactive personality demonstrated variable relationships with eNPS across samples, its contextual influences warrant further investigation. The nuanced dynamics within the burnout construct underscore the need for deeper exploration into the interplay between burnout dimensions and eNPS ratings. Furthermore, the study's qualitative analysis provided valuable insights into the underlying drivers of eNPS ratings and the experiences of "promoters" and "detractors" within organizations. The themes identified underscored the importance of meaningful work, benefits, interpersonal relationships, organizational culture, and change management in shaping employee sentiments and likelihood to recommend their workplace.

However, the research is not without limitations. Cross-sectional data lacks the ability to truly understand how eNPS scores differ over time. Future research should address these limitations through longitudinal studies, exploration of contextual influences, and examination of alternative scoring methods. In summary, the findings contribute to the understanding of eNPS as a metric of employee satisfaction, engagement, and organizational advocacy, while also highlighting avenues for further research and methodological refinement. By addressing these key areas, future researchers can advance the understanding of employee perceptions within organizational contexts and inform evidence-based practices for enhancing employee experience and organizational effectiveness.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
- Ajzen, I. (2011). The theory of planned behaviour: Reactions and reflections. *Psychology & Health*, 26(9), 1113-1127. doi:10.1080/08870446.2011.613995
- Allen, D. G. (2008). Retaining talent: A guide to analyzing and managing employee turnover. *SHRM Foundation Effective Practice Guidelines Series*, 1– 43.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.

DOI:10.1108/02683940710733115
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *The Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
- Bakker, A. B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations*, 65(10), 1359-1378. DOI: 10.1177/0018726712453471.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1-26. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1
- Bates, S. (2004, February). Getting engaged. *HR Magazine*, 49(2), 44–51.
- Baumruk, R. (2004). The missing link: The role of employee engagement in business success. *Workspan*, 47, 48–52. DOI: <http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/194712679?accountid=10639>

- Chang, C., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Tan, J. A. (2012). Core self-evaluations: A review and evaluation of the literature. *Journal Of Management*, 38(1), 81-128.
- Choi, S. P., Cheung, K., & Pang, S. M. (2013). Attributes of nursing work environment as predictors of registered nurses' job satisfaction and intention to leave. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(3), 429-440. doi:10.1111/ j.1365-2834.2012.01415.x
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136.
- Christian, M. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2007). Work engagement: A meta-analytic review and directions or research in an emerging area. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1, 1-6. DOI: 10.5465/AMBPP.2007.26536346
- Conway, J. D., (2021, April 28). *Dissonance Disaster: When Employer Brand and Talent Brand Don't Align*. Forbes.
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbeshumanresourcescouncil/2021/04/28/dissonance-disaster-when-employer-brand-and-talent-brand-dont-align/?sh=4fe5ad2a3240>
- Davies, J., (2020, September 17). *What is employee net promoter score (eNPS) and how can it be used to improve employee engagement?* Qualtrics.
<https://www.qualtrics.com/blog/employee-net-promoter-score-enps-good-measure-engagement/>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.499

- Dudley, N. M., Orvis, K. A., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: Examining the intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 40-57.
- Dunivan, L. (2021, February 11). *The Five People Analytics That Matter To A CEO*. Forbes.
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinesscouncil/2021/02/11/the-five-people-analytics-that-matter-to-a-ceo/?sh=38a5c46f63a1>
- Fisher, G. G., Matthews, R. A., & Gibbons, A. M., (2015). Developing and Investigating the Use of Single-Item Measures in Organizational Research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 21(1), 3-23.
- Forbes Expert Panel and Human Resources Council. (2021, March 9). *Nine Practical Ways to Gain Insight Into Employee Engagement*. Forbes.
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbeshumanresourcescouncil/2021/03/09/nine-practical-ways-to-gain-insight-into-employee-engagement/?sh=1bbdeed27169>
- Forbes Expert Panel and Coaches Council. (2021, May 17). *How To Improve a Company Culture Without Overhauling It: 13 Key Steps*. Forbes.
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescoachescouncil/2021/05/17/how-to-improve-a-company-culture-without-overhauling-it-13-key-steps/?sh=5cb927526c79>
- Frieder, R. E., Hochwarter, W. A., & DeOrtentiis, P. S. (2015). Attenuating the negative effects of abusive supervision: The role of proactive voice behavior and resource management ability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(5), 821. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.06.001

- Fuchs, C., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2009). Using single-item measures for construct measurement in management research: Conceptual issues and application guidelines. *Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 69(2), 195.
- Geddes, A., Parker, C., & Scott, S. (2018). When the snowball fails to roll and the use of ‘horizontal’ networking in qualitative social research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(3), 347–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2017.1406219>
- Greguras, G. J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2010). Why does proactive personality predict employee life satisfaction and work behaviors? A field investigation of the mediating role of the self-concordance model. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(3), 539-560.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of management*, 26(3), 463-488.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170.
- Halbesleben, J. B. (2010). A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences. In A. B. Bakker, A. B. Bakker (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 102-117). New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.
- Harris, A., (2021, June 5) *Mind Your Business: The war for talent*. The Berkshire Eagle. https://www.berkshireeagle.com/business/allen-harris-mind-your-business-the-war-for-talent/article_a0a98396-c30e-11eb-8aba-d75e24d71783.html
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between

- employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268
- Hirschfeld, R. R., & Thomas, C. H. (2008). Representations of trait engagement: Integration, additions, and mechanisms. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(01), 63-66. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.00011.x>
- Hyvönen, K., Feldt, T., Salmela-Aro, K., Kinnunen, U., & Mäkikangas, A. (2009). Young managers' drive to thrive: A personal work goal approach to burnout and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75(2), 183-196. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2009.04.002
- Inceoglu, I. & Warr, P. (2011). Personality and job engagement. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 10(4), 177-181. DOI: 10.1027/1866-5888/a000045
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. DOI: 10.2307/256287
- Karatepe, O. M., Keshavarz, S., & Nejati, S. (2010). Do core self-evaluations mediate the effect of coworker support on work engagement? A study of hotel employees in Iran. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 17(1). DOI:10.1375/jhtm.17.1.62
- Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: a longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(4), 337. DOI: 10.1037/1076-8998.4.4.337

- Kirchherr J, Charles K (2018) Enhancing the sample diversity of snowball samples: Recommendations from a research project on anti-dam movements in Southeast Asia. *PLoS ONE* 13(8): e0201710. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201710>
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3–30. DOI: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x
- Moliner, C., Martínez-Tur, V., Ramos, J., Peiró, J. M., & Cropanzano, R. (2008). Organizational justice and extrarole customer service: The mediating role of well-being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(3), 327-348. DOI: 10.1080/13594320701743616
- Moynihan, D. P., & Landuyt, N. (2008). Explaining turnover intention in State Government examining the roles of gender, life cycle, and loyalty. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 28(2), 120-143. doi:10.1177/0734371X08315771
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York, NY: Academic Press
- Nancarrow, S., Bradbury, J., Pit, S. W., & Ariss, S. (2014). Intention to stay and intention to leave: Are they two sides of the same coin? A cross-sectional structural equation modelling study among health and social care workers. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 56(4), 292- 300. doi:10.1539/joh.14-0027-OA
- Prabhu, V. P. (2013). Proactive personality and intent to remain with an organization: Understanding factors affecting retention of Israeli employees. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 14(4), 11. DOI: 10.1080/23311975.2016.1169575

- Reichheld, F. F. (2003). The One Number You Need to Grow. (cover story). *Harvard Business Review*, 81(12), 46–54.
- Reichheld, Frederick F. (2011). *The ultimate question 2.0 : how net promoter companies thrive in a customer-driven world*. Boston, Mass. :Harvard Business Press.
- Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A. & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job Engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635. DOI: 10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468988
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315. DOI: 10.1002/job.248
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(7), 71-92. DOI: 10.1023/A:1015630930326
- Steil, A. V., Floriani, E. V., & Bello, J. da S. A. (2019). Antecedents of intention to leave the organization: A systematic review. *Paidéia*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-4327e2910>
- Stewart, A. L., Thrasher, A. D., Goldberg, J., & Shea, J. A. (2012). A framework for understanding modifications to measures for diverse populations. *Journal of aging and health*, 24(6), 992–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0898264312440321>
- Swider, B. W., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2010). Born to burnout: A meta-analytic path model of personality, job burnout, and work outcomes. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 487-506.

Thomas, L. *Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) – the ultimate guide*. friday.

<https://friday.app/p/employee-net-promoter-score>

Tyler, K., (2013, March 1). *Keeping Employees in the Net*. SHRM. <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/news/hr-magazine/pages/0313-net-promoter-system.aspx>

Voigt, E., & Hirst, G. (2015). High and low performers' intention to leave: Examining the relationship with motivation and commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(5), 574-588. doi:1.1080/09585192.2014.922599

Wilson, M. (2005). *Constructing measures: An item response modeling approach*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Yang, J., Gong, Y., & Huo, Y. (2011). Proactive personality, social capital, helping, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(8), 739-760.

Tables

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities for Sample 1*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. ENPS	8.49	1.75	-							
2. PPS	3.84	.44	.11*	.87						
3. EE	2.13	.74	-.34**	-.26**	.91					
4. DP	1.89	.72	-.28**	-.19**	.53**	.85				
5. PA	3.91	.46	.25**	.39**	-.26**	-.28**	.77			
6. ENG	5.30	.82	.33**	.40**	-.34	-.34**	.39**	.91		
7. TI	1.99	.89	-.62**	-.04	.39	.36**	-.22*	-.04	.90	
8. Age	55.52	11.86	.01	-.02	<.01	.02	-.03	.04	-.07	-

Notes. $N = 787$; ** $p < .001$; * $p < .05$; McDonald's ω is on diagonal in bold; ENPS = Employee Net Promoter Score; PPS = Proactive Personality; EE = Emotional Exhaustion; DP = Depersonalization; PA = Personal Accomplishment; ENG = Engagement; TI = Turnover Intentions.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities for Sample 2*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. ENPS	7.29	2.51	-							
2. PPS	4.01	.61	.14**	.75						
3. EE	4.03	1.12	-.43**	-.23**	.93					
4. ENG	5.20	.95	.40**	.43**	-.55**	.92				
5. TI	2.60	1.34	-.54**	-.09**	.50**	-.41**	.94			
6. Age	36.48	32.35	.02	-.01	-.02	.03*	-.02	-		
7. Hours Worked	48.89	19.60	<.01	-.01	-.01	<.01	<.01	-.03*	-	
8. Gender	-	-	-.01	<.01	.02	-.02	.01	-.10**	.16**	-

Notes. $N = 5484$; ** $p < .001$; * $p < .05$; McDonald's ω is on diagonal in bold; ENPS = Employee Net Promoter Score; PPS = Proactive Personality; EE = Emotional Exhaustion; ENG = Engagement; TI = Turnover Intentions.

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities for Sample 3*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. ENPS	7.37	2.49	-										
2. PPS	3.90	.48	.06	.71									
3. EE	2.57	.92	-.60**	-.09	.91								
4. DP	2.18	.71	-.48**	-.00	.66**	.73							
5. PA	3.86	.43	.20*	.16*	-.23**	-.26**	.62						
6. ENG	3.98	.83	.43**	.39**	-.58**	-.34**	.40**	.90					
7. TI	2.38	1.19	-.61**	-.08	.57**	.42**	-.08	-.44**	.93				
8. Age	42.70	12.10	.10	.08	-.16*	-.03	.00	.14	-.15*	-			
9. Hours Worked	44.15	10.43	-.05	.31**	.17*	.14*	.10	.23*	.04	.03	-		
10. Education	-	-	-.02	.01	.13	-.06	.16*	.03	.19*	-.20*	.03	-	
11. Gender	-	-	.08	-.10	-.02	-.15*	.02	.04	-.16*	.02	-.16*	.13	-

Notes. *N* = 201; ***p* < .001; **p* < .05; McDonald's ω is on diagonal in bold; ENPS = Employee Net Promoter Score; PPS = Proactive Personality; EE = Emotional Exhaustion; DP = Depersonalization; PA = Personal Accomplishment; ENG = Engagement; TI = Turnover Intentions.

Table 4 *Predicting Employee Net Promoter Score for Sample 1*

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
R ² = .42				
Proactive Personality	.02	.13	.16	.873
Emotional Exhaustion	-.16	.08	-1.91	.055
Depersonalization	.02	.08	.22	.829
Personal Accomplishment	.25*	.12	1.20	.045
Engagement	.21**	.07	2.78	.005
Turnover Intentions	-1.09**	.06	-17.87	<.001

Notes. * = *p* < .05; ** = *p* < .01

Table 5 *Predicting Employee Net Promoter Score for Sample 2*

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
R ² = .34				
Proactive Personality	.02	.05	.40	.689
Emotional Exhaustion	-.31**	.03	-10.16	<.001
Engagement	.42**	.04	10.98	<.001
Turnover Intentions	-.73**	.02	-30.34	<.001

Notes. * = *p* < .05; ** = *p* < .01

Table 6 *Predicting Employee Net Promoter Score for Sample 3*

	<i>b</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
R ² =.49					
Proactive Personality	-.18	-.04	0.29	-.61	.543
Emotional Exhaustion	-.74**	-.27	0.22	-3.40	<.001
Depersonalization	-.36	-.10	0.24	-1.48	.142
Personal Accomplishment	.31	.05	0.33	.92	.359
Engagement	.23	.08	0.22	1.09	.278
Turnover Intentions	-.79**	-.38	0.14	-5.77	<.001

Notes. * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

Table 7. *Hypothesis Summaries Across Samples*

Sample	H1	H2a	H2b	H2c	H3a	H3b	H3c	H4	H5	H6a	H6b	H6c	H7	H8	H9a	H9b	H9c	H10
1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
2	✓	✓	*	*	✓	*	*	✓	✓	✓	*	*	✓	✓	✓	*	*	✓
3		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓

Notes. ✓ indicates where a hypothesis is supported. *hypothesis was not tested in this sample.
 Bold indicates the hypotheses testing Employee Net Promoter Score

Table 8. *Predictors of Employee Net Promoter Score Summaries Across Samples*

Sample	PPS	EE	DP	PA	ENG	TI
1				✓	✓	✓
2		✓	*	*	✓	✓
3		✓				✓

Notes. ✓ indicates where a predictor was significant. * Predictor was not tested in this sample.

Table 9. Themes, Subthemes, and Examples

Themes	Detractor	Passive	Promoter
Internal Factors (meaningfulness, reward, impact)	I do not mind the company I work for, but I do not feel fulfilled or like I am using my full potential.	I enjoy my job and workplace. So, I would recommend it.	My job is awesome and very gratifying.
Benefits (pay, workload, work/life balance)	Pay is below average . . .	The career is fantastic for someone with a family; it provides health care and flexibility. It is also a moderately relaxed environment but pays below minimum wage and has high turnover.	Excellent stability, good benefits. . .
People (coworkers, management)	. . . Finally, it appears some younger employees do not value their older colleagues.	Great place to work full of opportunities and supportive co-workers.	My workplace cares about their customers and employees. Most of our managers and senior leadership team are great to work with.
Organization (culture, organizational values, mission)	There are a few good people where I work but overall the climate and culture is extremely toxic and invalidating.	. . . my company has an excellent culture that fosters growth and independent thinking while also have excellent compensation and benefits.	Great culture and fun place to work.
Change Management (turnover, stability, training)	This company has taken a step back as far as how they hire and treat newer employees.	There is a fair amount of transition happening which makes it feel a little unstable. . .	I've had a great career and opportunities to grow.



EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board
4N-64 Brody Medical Sciences Building · Mail Stop 682
600 Moye Boulevard · Greenville, NC 27834
Office 252-744-2914 · Fax 252-744-2284 ·
rede.ecu.edu/umcirm/

Notification of Exempt Certification

From: Social/Behavioral IRB
To: [Mark Bowler](#)
CC:
Date: 5/9/2022
Re: [UMCIRB 22-000242](#)
An Evaluation of Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS)

I am pleased to inform you that your research submission has been certified as exempt on 5/9/2022. This study is eligible for Exempt Certification under category # 2a.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your application and/or protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

Document	Description
Meier - Social Media Outreach Post Example v2.docx(0.02)	Recruitment Documents/Scripts
Meier IRB Exempt Survey Consent v2.docx(0.02)	Consent Forms
Meier IRB Measures v2.docx(0.01)	Surveys and Questionnaires
Meier IRB Recruitment Email and Posting.docx(0.01)	Recruitment Documents/Scripts

For research studies where a waiver or alteration of HIPAA Authorization has been approved, the IRB states that each of the waiver criteria in 45 CFR 164.512(i)(1)(i)(A) and (2)(i) through (v) have been met. Additionally, the elements of PHI to be collected as described in items 1 and 2 of the Application for Waiver of Authorization have been determined to be the minimal necessary for the specified research.

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.