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Abstract

Today we are no longer only motivated by a paycheck, the new generation needs to feel that the work they are doing is stimulating, fun, and challenging. Gamification is based on the old concept of sales competitions. It is about using game elements in non-game contexts to bring out the fun in work. However, one has to keep in mind the culture in which the gamified system is implemented. Since it is in culture, values and goals are developed. These goals and values have an effect on our motivation, by affecting how we are motivated.

Masculinity is one of Hofstede’s six cultural dimensions. Masculine cultures are more focused in achievements and rewards. This is something that is also commonly employed in gamified systems. Consequently, what is researched is: Does the cultural dimension of masculinity have an impact on the motivation from gamification? – Why, or why not?

The question is studied with theoretical foundation from three perspectives: motivation, gamification, and culture. Furthermore, to answer this question, both qualitative and quantitative research was conducted. The study was done with Volkswagen in Sweden and their employees, and it centered around Volkswagen’s use of gamification in their sales department, and employee motivation. The results indicated that the employees generally appreciate the sales competitions and that they generally feel motivated. However, the results also indicated that they were not motivated in accordance with traditional gamification elements and theory. Nevertheless, it could be concluded that in Volkswagen’s case, gamification does have a motivational impact on the employees, even though they belong to a feminine culture.
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Key Concepts

This will deal with defining key-expressions or phrases in the thesis so that the reader will be aware of how the researchers view them.

i. Masculinity

Masculinity is one out of Hofstede’s six cultural dimensions (more on these in chapter 3.3.1). The dimension can be applied to different parts of a national culture and has varying meanings in different areas of life. Masculinity does not play the same role in a family setting as it does in a corporate one. Since this thesis is focused on corporations, masculinity will be defined in accordance with the masculinity in the workplace.

A country with a high level of masculinity will exhibit a strong drive for, and put a lot of importance on, success, achievement, and materialism. As the level of masculinity goes down, the drive for these things goes down. The less a culture is masculine, the more feminine it is since these are two ends of the same spectrum. (Hofstede, 2001).

ii. Gamification

Gamification is the usage of game-design elements and game principles in non-game contexts. It can also be constructed and adapted in many different ways. A review of research on gamification shows that a majority of studies on gamification find that is produces positive motivational effects and increases user engagement. However, individual and contextual differences exist.

The term gamification is quite new. A lot of people adopt gamification without realizing that they are using it. Sales competitions can, in certain aspects, be seen as gamification in the workplace if they incorporate game elements. Game elements can be, for example, points or leaderboards. (Richter, 2015).
**iii. Culture**

When presented with the word culture one can associate that with a lot of things. In this thesis, culture is defined in accordance to Hofstede’s definition of national culture. That is “the collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one group or category of people from others” (geert-hofstede, 2016a). This generally speaking of how countries, rather than individuals in a society, have different perceptions and opinions on something when presented with the same thing.

**iv. Motivation**

There are several definitions and theories concerning motivation - what it is and how it is achieved. This thesis defines motivation as the factors in an individual that ignite, form and guide the behavior towards certain goals. (NE, 2016).
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1 Introduction

This chapter will present a background of what this thesis is about, and explain the problem statement and aim of this thesis. Then it will present the delimitations of the study. The chapter will be concluded with a brief disposition of the thesis.

1.1 Background

In today’s society, intrinsic motivation and the factors that trigger it have grown to be more in focus than ever. This is mainly because we now know that intrinsic motivation can contribute to higher total motivation (Anthony et.al., 2014). We have moved away from a society in which the individuals only require a paycheck to keep them motivated. The new generation needs to feel that the work they are doing is stimulating, fun, and challenging (Pink, 2009) and that is the idea on which gamification formed. (Gartner, 2016)

Gamification, although a relatively new term, is based on the old concept of sales competitions. The publications concerning gamification go back to the 1980’s, but the term “gamification” was first used by Nick Pelling in 2002, and did not become popular until 2010 (Dale, 2014). The competitions, or challenges, presented to the salesmen have been more thoroughly developed during the last couple of years and now include many real game elements. This is something used in the automobile industry where many manufacturers are competing for consumers, and new brands are arising frequently. In such an industry, it is especially important to differentiate the brand (The Economist, 2016-04-26), and that can be done by having the best cars and/or the best people selling them (Crosby, 1990).

Gamification is used as a stimulating tool for salesmen across the world. However, culture as a factor influencing motivation, cannot be forgotten. In the 1970’s, Geert Hofstede, a Dutch social-psychologist, developed dimensions to measure culture. Today there are six different dimensions that define a national culture. These dimensions were developed to better understand the reasons why people act differently and view things differently across the planet. In culture, values and goals are developed. These goals and values have an effect on our motivation, by affecting how we are motivated (Munro, 1997). Cultural disconnects (when different cultures clash) are one major reason why a project that was successful in one
location is not in another. This would, of course, be a central concern for management when implementing a control system (Anthony et.al., 2014). The researchers believe that for managers and companies to succeed in a globalized world, they must be aware of how culture can affect the outcome of their work. Hence, this thesis should be helpful for global companies when they are looking to implement sales stimulating systems, more specifically gamification, into their sales organizations around the world. Prior research has not touched upon this specific topic. Flora Chiang (2005) investigated the impact of culture on reward systems, and Sebastian Hohenberg and Christian Homburg (2016) looked into, among other things, how to motivate sales representatives in different cultures with financial and non-financial measures. These two studies relate to this thesis in the sense that they try to expand on the impact of culture on gamification. The Hohenberg and Homburg study came to the conclusion that national culture does “[affect] the effectiveness of various steering instruments” (Hohenberg and Homburg, 2016, p.117), when investigating how to motivate sales representatives. Chiang, focused on the extrinsic motivational factor (rewards) and how that was affected by national culture. She compared four countries, and through her research she could conclude that the countries scoring high on masculinity “tend to place a greater value on material rewards than feminine countries” (Chiang, 2005, p.1558).

This study hopes to further the understanding of cross-cultural motivation and the implementation of sales stimulating systems. This would be relevant for sales managers across the world working internationally or with a multinational team.

1.2 Problem statement

Today, we live in a globalized world where most companies have to be aware of, and accommodate for cultural differences. When implementing control systems, managers have to be aware of many cultural factors that can influence the interpretation and adoption of that system. Gamification, one of many control systems (motivationally driving), is something that oftentimes is a standardized incentive system (Bogost, 2014; Khaled, 2014). This, however, contradicts the assumption that “culture is an important contingency variable that influences management control” (Anthony et.al., 2014, p.147). The purpose of this thesis is to study whether the result of implementing sales stimulating systems, or rather gamification, would vary based on differences in cultures. To put it more concretely: to see if the cultural dimensions have an impact on the result from gamification.
Since masculine cultures are more focused on achievements, gamification that is focused on only that would be heavily influenced by such a cultural factor. The Chiang study supports the fact that the masculinity dimension has an impact on extrinsic motivation. (Chiang, 2005). Although “gamification is the application of extrinsic motivators [...], implementation of these motivators will trigger internal motivation and aid in maintaining it.” (Richter, 2015, p.38).

Consequently, the aim of this thesis is to see if the cultural dimension of masculinity has an impact on motivation from implementing gamification. Therefore, the question this thesis aims to answer is:

- Does the cultural dimension of masculinity have an impact on the motivation from gamification?
  - Why, or why not?

### 1.3 Delimitations

This thesis, aiming to study how the level of masculinity/femininity can affect the results of gamification, has been delimited to one country. In the research, while comparing cultural dimensions on Hofstede’s webpage (geert-hofstede, 2016b), it was found that Sweden has a particularly low level of masculinity. This makes Sweden an appropriate choice to study because it is a good representative of an extremely feminine culture.

Masculinity was chosen as the cultural dimension to study. Since masculinity, as mentioned previously, is focused on achievement, it would be a relevant factor when looking into gamification. Gamification is based on success and achievement. The researchers’ belief is that it would be affected by the level of drive for achievement residing in the salespeople of a certain culture. Multiple cultural dimensions, other than masculinity, would be relevant for gamification, such as uncertainty avoidance and individualism. However, the choice to focus on one single dimension, masculinity, is so that the researchers are able to obtain a more specific, deeper analysis. With this comes a more narrow research question, which is very relevant considering the limitations in resources. The masculinity dimension also seemed like the most relevant to investigate considering how extreme the factor is in Swedish society, compared to the other cultural dimensions.
Sweden was chosen as the country to be studied because, according to Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, it is a country with a very feminine culture. It has a masculinity of 5 out of 100. Thus, it should be a relatively accurate representative for low-masculinity cultures.

Volkswagen, a global car manufacturer, was chosen as the company on which this thesis will be based. This is due to the fact that they use sales competitions, which could be a form of gamification, as a part of their sales strategy. It will be studied to see if these sales competitions are indeed gamified.

Although more extensive research on the subject with a bigger variety of countries, companies, and cultural dimensions would have been preferable, due to lack of resources this thesis had to be delimited to one country and one company. The resources lacking are primarily time, money and connections.

1.4 Disposition

The second chapter will be presenting previous research in gamification, motivation, and culture to give a background to the subjects and demonstrate how they affect each other. The third chapter will present the methodology used for this thesis. It will explain the methods chosen, and the reasoning behind these choices. The methodology chapter will also cover the validity, reliability, and ethical considerations of the research done. The chapter will end with a critique of the work done and sources chosen. The fourth chapter will present the findings of the empirical study. The fifth chapter will analyze and discuss said findings. The sixth chapter will conclude the thesis with a summary and discussion of the contributions, potential impact, or significance of the study done, and suggestions for future potential research in the field.
2 Theoretical Framework

The chapter on theoretical framework will give a background to gamification, motivation, and culture. Previous research relevant to this area of study will be presented. This chapter will also discuss how these three topics influence each other and the connections they have.

2.1 Motivation

“To be motivated means to be moved to do something” (Ryan and Deci, 2000, p.1). There are different kinds of motivation, notably intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation comes from finding something interesting, and the motivation comes from within, as the name suggests. An important thing to point out is that intrinsic motivation is not the same for all individuals. All individuals are not motivated in the same way by the same thing.

Extrinsic motivation is the contrast of intrinsic motivation. In extrinsic motivation, rewards or punishment motivates an individual, and the motivation comes as an effect of events outside the individual. The motivation to achieve a goal goes hand in hand with the reward reaching that goal implies. (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Salespeople, according to an American study by Steenburgh and Ahearne (2012), can be divided into three groups; stars, core performers, and laggards. These three groups are motivated differently:

- The stars are more motivated by rewards and bonuses.
- Core performers are not as motivated by rewards since they believe the stars will receive the rewards. However, they are motivated to outperform the average.
- Laggards are mostly motivated by social pressure. Leaderboards are one way of putting pressure on laggards.

These three groups exist in all organizations. (Steenburgh and Ahearne 2012)
2.2 Gamification

“Companies often want employees to "buy in" by identifying with the vision and the culture of the organization, and that starts with having a rewarding experience on the job.” (Lanciault, 2014, p. 1)

Gamification is a tool used to motivate employees by using gaming strategies and tools in the workplace. Meaning, in everyday work life, management implements systems that turn work activities into a sort of gaming experience. For example, they may implement a competition where a salesman can accumulate points by selling cars, and extra points for selling insurance as well. Then, after a set period of time, whichever salesman has the most points will be recognized as the winner and receive some sort of reward, whether it be monetary, or as simple as recognition (Lanciault, 2014). The goal of implementing a strategy such as this is to help motivate the salesmen to sell more and have fun in doing so. “Gamification has been defined as a process of enhancing services with (motivational) affordances in order to invoke gameful experiences and further behavioral outcomes” (Hamari et. al., 2014, p. 3026). Gamification can be more focused on either business processes or outcomes. When focused on business processes, it could be for customer acquisition, and when focused on outcomes, employee sales (Robson et. al., 2015).

In order to better understand gamification, below is a model explaining the process with brief descriptions of the different parts of the model.

![Figure 1. Conceptual model of gamification as a driver of employee engagement](image)

- **Game mechanics** - These are the rules to the game and the guidelines for how the game works. Mechanics are described in more detail below, in the MDE
section. Game elements and game mechanics work together to affect perception, situational affordances, and interactional context.

- **Game elements** - These are the things used to design a game. Examples include, badges, leaderboards, levels, and rewards. Using elements such as these together will help to make employee’s jobs more challenging and interesting.

- **Perception** - This is the players’ interpretation of the use of gamification. A player’s perception is usually comprised of whether they acknowledge the game and agree to it, the extent of their understanding of the game, and the extent to which they find the game to be fair. Together, these perceptions will lead to if the player accepts the gamified experience or not.

- **Situational affordances** - These are measurements of how much the game elements and mechanics work in the gamified experience to properly address the motivational needs of the players. Situational affordances allow the designers of the game to focus on what each of the players need in terms of motivation. Because they can be so specific, this helps to keep the employees engaged and helps to alleviate burnout.

- **Interactional context** - This is the organizational framework, such as the culture of the organization itself, its processes, enabling systems and structures, and work systems. This working together with perception and situational affordances determines how engaged the players are in the gamified process.

(Sarangi and Shah, 2015)

There are three principles that make up the framework of gamification, the MDE Framework, in which the MDE stands for Mechanics, Dynamics, and Emotions. In order to create the gamified experience, the implementer needs to set up the game mechanics, which will help to formulate the gaming emotions, which will, in turn, establish the gaming dynamics (Robson et. al., 2015). The MDE Framework has been adopted from the MDA Framework, which is mechanics, dimensions, and aesthetics. This framework helps the designers to conceptualize the game (Ruhi, 2015). Below, in Figure 2, the three aspects will be explained further.
“Mechanics are the decisions that designers – those who wish to gamify a non-game context – make to specify the goals, the rules, the setting, the context, the types of interactions (i.e., opponents), and the boundaries of the situation to be gamified” (Robson, 2015, p. 414). There are three kinds of mechanics to be considered: setup, rule, and progression. Setup mechanics are what you use to setup the environment of the experience, the setting, objects needed, and how to distribute said objects amongst the players. Rule mechanics are what you use to set the concept and goals. Rule mechanics specify what the limits and constraints of the experience are and what the players are allowed to do. Progression mechanics are basically the rewards the players receive as they make their way through the game. These could be physical rewards, such as monetary compensation, or virtual rewards, such as a level-up or a new status on the leaderboard. (Robson, 2015; Ruhi, 2015). “Gamification mechanics are the foundational aspects of gamified experience: they determine who the key parties are, how they interact, how to win or lose, and where and when the experience takes place” (Robson, 2015, p. 415).

“Gamification dynamics are the types of player behavior that emerge as players partake in the experience” (Robson, 2015, p. 415). Dynamics are the in-game behaviors that the players create by their strategic actions and interactions during gameplay. The nature of the dynamics depends on what mechanics the designer puts in place and how the players choose to use them. Dynamics can either be positive or negative. (Robson, 2015; Ruhi, 2015)

“Gamification emotions are the mental affective states and reactions evoked among individual players when they participate in a gamified experience” (Robson, 2015, p.
Emotions refer to how the players feel about the gamified experience. Do they enjoy it? Do they find it fun? Or does it leave them feeling disappointed if they lose, or sad for not having received a reward? (Robson, 2015)

The most commonly used mechanics are points, challenges and levels, trophies, achievements and badges, virtual goods, and leaderboards (Hamari et. al., 2014). Points indicate status and can act as rewards. Participants can exchange them for something else that they value. Earning points can have a dramatic effect on participants’ behavior even when the points have no monetary value. They also offer flexibility to employees by targeting their specific needs. Challenges and levels are a reflection of accomplishment by achieving milestones through positions, levels and grades specifies accomplishment and commands esteem and respect. It serves to help employees to set priorities and keep their performance in perspective. Trophies, achievements and badges serve as visible signs of recognition that participants can show off. They are the tangible accomplishments that instill the sense of pride and purpose that are critical to employee engagement. Virtual goods provide employees with an opportunity to customize and give them a sense of empowerment. They could be non-tangible objects that could be redeemed for points. They keep participants engrossed. They also offer flexibility and delight to employees by targeting their specific needs. Leaderboards showcase participants’ achievements and standing compared to their competitors in the gamified process. They encourage healthy competition. They are used as trackers for enhancing employee performance and development. (Sarangi and Shah, 2015; Durinik, 2014; Sailer et. al., 2013).

2.2.1 Gamification and Motivation

Gamification is a technique used to help employees become more engaged. One of the ways of doing this involves having a focus on helping employees to enjoy what they’re doing, therefore, wanting to make things fun for the employees (Hamari et. al., 2014). Fun can be considered a form of intrinsic motivation. Fun has been defined as “a positive emotional state of playful enjoyment: a pleasurable and active mental state in which one is intrinsically engaged - meaning that the value of the experience is the experience itself; rather than the experience being instrumental in achieving something else” (Rigby, 2014, p. 116). While having fun is a good way to initially get employees engaged, it is not enough for employees to only be engaged at the start, they need a high quality engagement and a deep connection. Deep connection is what will provide sustained engagement and a lasting
impact (Rigby, 2014; Durinik, 2014). It is important for employees to be deeply engaged in their work because it is shown to increase customer satisfaction (Robson et al., 2016).

To understand how to acquire sustained engagement, it is necessary to understand how to motivate employees in a better way. Motivation has been broken down into two dimensions, energy and direction. Energy refers to simply having the energy to take the action, and direction is to direct said energy towards the particular action the person is being motivated to take (Rigby, 2014). Both aspects are important because while someone may be directing their energy to a specific action, if they have low energy, they are not very motivated to take that action. Similarly, if someone has a lot of energy to get things done, but is not directing their energy to that action, they are not motivated to take said action.

It is believed that energy can come from three different sources: physiological, emotional, and psychological. The psychological source can also be broken down into competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Rigby, 2014; Sailer et al., 2013). Competence refers to the longing to seek out new challenges and learn new things and grow without being overwhelmed. Autonomy refers to the need to feel in control of what the individual is doing, and when, to not feel controlled by other people or circumstances. Relatedness refers to the need to feel support from others and that the individual matters. When deciding how to implement gamification, it is key to consider each of these aspects, but competence is the most important and applicable to gamification because gamification uses challenges and learning experiences to motivate (Rigby, 2014). In order to maintain intrinsic motivation in individual employees, it is necessary to keep these three needs fulfilled (Aparicio et al., 2012).

Because gamification has such a strong focus on external rewards, the question has been raised as to if it might hinder intrinsic motivation (Rigby, 2014; Mekler et al., 2013). Studies have shown that physical rewards can decrease intrinsic motivation to complete a particular task (Pink, 2009; Mekler et al., 2013). In the context of gamification in the workplace, this was not found to be an issue; instead all participants in a study done specifically to see if there was a negative impact on intrinsic motivation were motivated to similar degrees and had no variance in their performance (Mekler et al., 2013). One way to counteract the risk of undermining intrinsic motivation is to use internalization. Internalization takes extrinsic motivators and turns them into a form of intrinsic motivation through factors such as self-pressure, self-endorsing the goals, and integrating these goals into inherent satisfaction (Rigby, 2014).

Although intrinsic motivation is stressed to be the better of the two, extrinsic motivation has its place as well. Sometimes goals are intrinsic, and sometimes they are
extrinsic. When one has an intrinsic goal, it is better to use intrinsic motivation, but if the goal is extrinsic, it is not necessarily bad to use extrinsic motivators. These are important points to consider when using gamification. When using a new motivator, it must be used for the right kinds of goals, and in the right ways. If implemented correctly, it can aid to achieve deeper engagement and help reach goals. (Rigby, 2014).

2.3 Culture

“Culture can be thought of as the foundation of the social order that we live in and of the rules we abide by” (Schein, 2010, p.3). And the content of a culture is the shared values, assumptions and rules that the individuals, that are a part of that culture, abide by. Many have tried to define culture, but the most recognized definition of national culture comes from Hofstede (2001). Hofstede started out by defining a culture as a combination of four different dimensions. Today, a national culture consists of six dimensions according to Hofstede’s webpage (geert-hofstede, 2016a). These six dimensions influence the way we act and how we perceive things. “For organizations, the effects of culture are witnessed or manifested in employee attitude and behaviour, such as [...] motivation” (Chiang, p.1546). Culture, defined by Hofstede, can be used to predict, or infer, what kind of control system would be more effective in different cultures (Anthony et.al., 2014).

Albeit Hofstede’s theory is the most commonly employed, there are some who critique his work. Sondergaard summarized the constraints on Hofstede’s work, which had been brought up by many researchers, to three main issues. Firstly, all the subjects Hofstede based his dimensions on were from one single corporation - IBM. The subjects were mostly male, middle-class, and working within the same industry, which could, together with a strong company culture, create bias. Secondly, some believe that the data Hofstede’s dimensions are based on is no longer relevant, or that they are “artifacts of the period of analysis” (Sondergaard, 1994, p.449). Lastly, Sondergaard says, “Some questioned whether the use of only attitude-survey questionnaires was a valid base from which to infer values” (Sondergaard, 1994, p.449). This means, that other researchers questioned the methodology on which Hofstede’s work was based.

Even though Hofstede’s dimensions have been criticized by a number of researchers, the dimensions are still deemed valid and are regularly used to define culture and cultural differences.
2.3.1 Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions

As mentioned above, Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions consists of 6 factors; Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Long-Term Orientation (Hofstede, 2001). These are measured from 0 - 100, where 100 means that the dimension is fully “met”, and 0 where the dimension is not at all “met”.

The dimension of Power Distance measures how well societies handle inequality in power, prestige and wealth. In an organization “inequality in power is inevitable and functional” (Hofstede, 2001, p.79). In countries with low power distance hierarchy is not valued, and the employees are not subordinates to be ordered around but rather consulted on issues. The organization is usually more flat and the employees have greater autonomy. (Hofstede, 2001).

Individualism, to put it simply, is the degree to which you focus on yourself or your goals. If a county has a low (over 0, under 50) individualism, they value the group over the individual. “[I]n individualistic societies, one would expect a stronger tendency to define performance in individual terms, as well as widespread efforts to link personal success with individual compensation” (Pennings, 1993, p.267). The employees in a culture whose individualism is high will put “more importance [...] on] freedom and challenge in jobs”, they also have higher regard for individual initiative and achievement (Hofstede, 2001, p.226).

If a culture scores high in Masculinity, that means it is more focused on materialism, success, and achievement. A focus on quality of life, cooperation and modesty are traits of a society with low masculinity - a.k.a femininity. In masculine cultures there is “the desire for heroes: the glorification of individual success and achievement” (Pennings, 1993, p.267). Challenge and recognition in jobs, and advancement and earnings are in focus in a masculine culture. In contrast, the feminine culture concentrates on security and cooperation. Hofstede also connects the dimension of masculinity to Schwartz studies where he specifies a masculine culture as “high mastery: ambitious, daring, independent” (Hofstede, 2001, p.298). He also explains that achievement in high masculinity cultures are a lot about ego boosting, wealth, and that there is a greater need for recognition. In the workplace, performance and mutual competition is key, and the common thought is “live in order to work” (Hofstede, 2001, p.318)
Uncertainty Avoidance can be explained as the “hope of success” or “fear of failure” (Hofstede, 2001, p.165). Having a low score on uncertainty avoidance means that a culture is more open to the unknown. Normally, these types of cultures are also more open to risky and uncertain tasks. In the work situation, innovation can be blocked by high uncertainty avoidance since “innovators [feel] more constrained by rules and regulations” (Hofstede, 2001, p.166). Overall, in countries with high uncertainty avoidance, introducing new innovations will be seen with critical eyes. However, once a new innovation is accepted, it will be taken more seriously than in a low uncertainty avoidance county. A trait of low uncertainty avoidance countries is that competition among employees is generally accepted. (Hofstede, 2001).

Long Term Orientation does not affect the work to great extent. It mainly focuses on family and social relationships. However, the area it does have an impact on in an organization is if you focus more on results (short term), or building relationships and market position (long term). (Hofstede, 2001).

The last dimension of national culture is Indulgence. The dimension was added just a couple of years ago and is explained on the Hofstede website as “Indulgence stands for a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives related to enjoying life and having fun”. It can also be explained as the degree to which people within that culture restrain themselves from impulses and desires. (geert-hofstede, 2016a).

2.3.2 Culture and Motivation

“It has become common in the social sciences to interpret motivation in terms of desires and strategies for attaining various goals, which may be seen as having been socially constructed and internalized through the social group and culture in which the person grows” (Munro, 1997, p.7). Since culture has a great impact on what goals and values an individual has, and how they wish to reach that goal, one can say with certainty that there is a strong link between culture and motivation. However, it is hard to completely apply culture to an individual since each individual’s goals and values also are personal. But, it has been proven that national culture does influence over a larger group of individuals. (Munro, 1997)

That motivation is a function of culture is something that both anthropologists and psychologists generally assume. Claudia Strauss (1992) believes that motivation is based in interactions with the world and the interpretation of those interactions. “These interpretations
usually, if not always, involve cultural knowledge” (Munro, 1997, p.161). Munro argues that culture must be seen as something that impacts the personal motivation of each individual.

The importance of motivation as an effect of culture is further discussed by Landy and Conte. They also conclude “motivational interventions need to be modified to fit the culture in which they are applied” (Landy and Conte, 2010, p.395). Furthermore, they discuss the impact the dimension of masculinity has on motivation. This would be the fact that achievement motivation, and motivation in, and from, competition is more prominent in masculine countries. (Hofstede, 2001; Landy and Conte, 2010).

2.4 Gamification and Culture

Although the research in this area is scarce, there have been some things written about the subject. Most only scratch the surface of the impact culture has on the results of gamification. In the article *Gamification and Culture* written by Rilla Khaled, he compares gamification to Schwartz’s cultural dimensions (Walz and Deterding, 2014). Although Schwartz’s dimensions are not the same as Hofstede’s, they include many of the same factors and are easily comparable. Khaled defines 6 dynamics that could arise a result of gamification; differentiation, competition, community cohesion, knowledge sharing, interdependence, and normative action. “Differentiation and social recognition make sense in mastery- and achievement-focused cultures where it’s acceptable to draw focus to one’s success” (Khaled, 2014, p.307). Differentiation in gamification is when players are separated by, and emphasis is put on, how players are different from one another. This is something that according to Khaled would be more relevant in cultures that uphold the same values as masculine cultures. He also says that cultural rules in egalitarianism- and harmony-focused cultures, such as Scandinavia, “may mean that people view markers of differentiation, particularly those focused on achievement, as needless and almost offensive self-promotion” (Khaled, 2014, p. 307). The second dynamic is competition, which comes as a natural consequence when the players are compared, or ranked, openly to one another. In egalitarianism-focused cultures, “achievement and competition-centric values directly conflict with and undermine” important values “as they foreground inequalities between individuals” (Khaled, 2014, p.309). The competition dynamic usually consists of points, levels, and leaderboards, which are some of the most common gamification tools.
Khaled argues, “the ways in which typical gamification applications use well-known game elements tend to privilege cultural value orientations of mastery and hierarchy at the expense of egalitarianism [and] harmony” (Khaled, 2014, p.313). He adds that “[t]o move gamification to being more inclusive, we must actively acknowledge culture and other forms of diversity as part of the design frame” (Khaled, 2014, p.318).
3 Methodology

This chapter will deal with the process of the empirical study, and the methods that have been used. In this thesis, both inductive and deductive methods have been used. Also, both qualitative and quantitative studies have been made. The following chapter will present the advantages and shortcomings with each method, and how they were dealt with, or taken into account. This chapter will also discuss the validity and reliability of the choices made in the methodology for this thesis, and what exactly that means for the research. Next, this chapter will present the ethical considerations in the study, and a critique of both the researchers’ work, and choices of sources. Lastly, the limitations of the study will be presented.

3.1 Abductive Method

This thesis is based on abductive theory. Abductive theory is a combination of both inductive and deductive theory. Deductive theory means a hypothesis has been produced, or rather deduced, based on already existing research and theories. Inductive theory means that the theory is the outcome of the research. When using induction, the researcher makes observations and uses them to find generalizable inferences to form theory out of (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The researchers use a combination of theories and the underlying conceptions behind them to build a base on which the problem questions will be answered. As in the deductive approach, the theory “comes first and drive[s] the process of gathering data” (Bryman and Bell, 2011, p.11).

There is not a lot of former research done in gamification. There are some theories that are applicable to this study though. Therefore, abductive theory is an appropriate choice for this thesis because it is a nice balance between using already existing research and theories, and using observation to form new theories. (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

3.2 Method Choice

This thesis uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods. Qualitative research usually emphasizes words as opposed to quantification in gathering and analyzing information (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Qualitative research can
evaluate issues and subjects in depth and detail, the direction and framework of the research can be revised quickly as soon as it is found, and the data found depends on human experience and is, therefore, more compelling than data gathered through quantitative research. (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Quantitative research is a distinctive research strategy. It entails collecting numerical data and observing the relationship between theory and research. The main advantage to using quantitative research, for this thesis, is that it allows the researchers to gather a larger quantity of data in a shorter amount of time from a wider span than qualitative research would allow. (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

The reason for incorporating both qualitative and quantitative interviews in this thesis is to use the material from the qualitative interview as a foundation for the quantitative interviews. It is also important to use qualitative interviews to build a basis on which it is possible to investigate the current gamification implemented in the company, and deepen the knowledge and understanding of the gamification, and the managerial perspective of it.

The quantitative research is to get a broader image of how the employees in the organization perceive gamification. In this case a qualitative interview would be redundant because what the researchers seek from the employees is not depth but rather width in answers. (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

3.2.1 Qualitative Research and Process

One of the main parts of qualitative research is the interview. Since, the researchers need an understanding of the current gamification in the company; how it is designed and implemented, a qualitative interview with the Sales Manager of Volkswagen in Sweden (henceforth referred to as Country Manager) was conducted. The Country Manager is the person solely responsible for conducting and implementing sales competitions, and other sales incentives, throughout the country. Therefore, the interview was conducted to give a base on which further questions could be designed, and an in-depth understanding of the reasons management chose to implement gamification in the company. A semi structured interview was chosen as the interview format, because the researchers already had the general topics of discussion and questions prepared, but at the same time wanted to give “the interviewee [...] a great deal of leeway in how to reply” (Bryman and Bell, 2011, p.467). It also gave an opportunity for follow-up questions and additional questions. This was important in the sense that the researchers could dig deeper in certain topics, and also explore new topics if they were presented. The interview was mainly centered around three subjects; the sales
competitions’ structure (to find correlation to gamification), the sales competitions’ purpose, and perceived motivational implications.

The interview with the Country Manager was conducted over the phone with one of the researchers, it was recorded, and it lasted around 15 minutes (questions and topics found in 8.1). The reason for recording the interview was to be able to transcribe it afterwards and therefore be able to focus on what was being said in the moment, only making small notes. Transcribing and analysing the interview is, of course, very time consuming, which is one of the disadvantages with qualitative interviews. (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Another disadvantage with using this method is that it is easily influenced by bias. Since an awareness of this disadvantage was present in the researchers’ minds before conducting the interview, a lot of effort was put in as to not influence the Country Manager, or his responses. Hence, follow-up questions were presented as; whys, hows, and asking for further explanation. (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

After the interview was completed and transcribed, it was compared to former findings in the theoretical framework to see if, based on previous research, gamification is present in Volkswagen.

3.2.2 Quantitative Research and Process

This thesis includes two types of quantitative research types; structured interviews and questionnaires. The structured interviews were made with standardized questions and clear instructions (questions found in 8.3), in accordance with what Bryman and Bell suggest (2011). The reason for choosing this method was primarily because the researchers were expecting a larger group of respondents, and therefore wanted to more easily compare results and answers. (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The structured interviews were conducted with locally responsible Brand and Sales Managers for Volkswagen (henceforth referred to as Sales Managers). All Volkswagen dealerships in Sweden were contacted and asked to participate in this study, however, only five responded to the request for an interview.

The reason to not choose to do a survey, or a questionnaire, for the Sales Managers was mainly because the researchers wanted more elaborate answers concerning how they perceive the implementation of gamification, and its motivational impact on themselves and their salesforce. Consequently, interview was mainly centered around three subjects; the sales competitions’ structure (to find correlation to gamification), the sales competitions’ purpose, and perceived motivational implications.
Most interviews were conducted over the phone, one over email, and one in person. The interviews were conducted as requested by the interviewees. Because they were conducted differently, some of the Sales Manager interviews are longer and in more detail (the phone and in person interviews), and some are shorter. However, because it is a structured interview, they are still comparable since the structure, and questions asked, are the same for every interview conducted. The interviews conducted over the phone and in person took about ten minutes each and were recorded and transcribed as well. The Sales Managers were all male and in the age range of 39-56.

However, there are disadvantages connected to the structured interview. These are mainly the “influence of the interviewer on respondents and [the] possibility of systematic bias in answers (known as response sets).” (Bryman and Bell, 2011, p. 201). These were kept in mind when formulating the interview questions for the Sales Managers and conducting the interviews as to limit their impact on the outcome.

Once the interviews were completed and transcribed, they were compiled together to find common themes amongst the different managers. The data was then compared to former findings in the theoretical framework to see if there was any correlation between the newfound data, and previous theories.

The questionnaires were sent out to the Sales Managers of all Volkswagen dealerships across Sweden. This was done in combination with the request for an interview. The Sales Managers were asked to further the questionnaire to their employees. This method was chosen because it was deemed to most efficient solution when dealing with a large number of respondents, and the least time consuming. The questionnaires were also sent out once again to the salespeople’s own email, this way all who wished to participate were included. A questionnaire is fitting for the salespeople since no in-depth views on gamification and its impact were needed from them, but rather simple answers regarding their perception of it, eg. if they like it or not. (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Hence, the subjects that were broached were concerning perceived motivation, preference of reward, and perceived performance. There was a need to survey the employees to get a better view of the motivational impact of gamification, not only the managerial perspective of it, since dissonance between perceptions might exist. This way, the researchers are able to get a good indication of how the employees actually feel about the use of gamification. 34 employees from various Volkswagen dealerships in Sweden answered the questionnaire.

The questionnaire (found in 8.5), much like the structured interviews, was constructed using Likert’s scale (explained in chapter 2.5). The site used for the questionnaires was
GoogleForms, which allows unlimited answers, unlike many of its counterparts. The main advantage of using a web questionnaire, compared to other questionnaires (eg. email or postal), is that the answers are automatically compiled. There are some disadvantages with a web questionnaire, for example allowing or restricting access to it, however, this is prevented by not sharing the questionnaire with people who are not participating in the study. GoogleForms not only automatically compiles all data, but also creates charts with the data found. From there, the researchers took the statistics GoogleForms compiled, and compared the trends with the former research found in the theoretical framework to see if the new data is consistent with former research or not. (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

3.3 Validity

“Validity refers to the issue of whether or not an indicator (or set of indicators) that is devised to gauge a concept really measures that concept.” (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Therefore, when designing the questionnaires and interview questions it is important to keep in mind the initial research questions. Since this thesis aims to measure motivation and results, or rather perceived motivation and results, the questionnaire was formulated accordingly. The employees were asked to which degree they agree with a statement. They were given a scale of 1 to 5 to how much they agree to a statement, where 5 is “strongly agree”, and 1 is “strongly disagree”. This method is called the Likert scale and is commonly used when conducting quantitative studies. The interview questions encompassed the main themes and also sub-questions that could be relevant for the analysis. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix 8.3. One of the questions directly asked the subject of the motivation received from sales competitions. The subject then answered according to his, or her, point of view. This gave the personally perceived motivation of the subject and is therefore a relevant measurement, when aggregated for all subjects, to represent the Volkswagen national salesforce. However, the validity might be lower due to the fact that the population is very homogenous (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Although, it is a good representation of Volkswagen salesforce which consists of mostly men in their 30’s and 40’s. Also, the sample size is quite small to make bigger generalizations (Bryman and Bell, 2011). However, it represents the Volkswagen salesforce, and is there to confirm statements, and is supported by them as well.
3.4 Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency of a measure of a concept. The three main points to reliability are stability, internal reliability, and inter-observer consistency. Stability ensures that the measure will be able to stand the test of time so that if the test were redone in the future using, for example, the same sample size, it would not cause the results to vary. This thesis may not necessarily pass the test of time because it is focused on one company’s current choices in motivational techniques. In the research for this thesis, it has been found that the company’s current practices are different than they were in the past. Companies often adjust their practices in the area of motivational techniques and sales stimulating systems. In order to repeat this study in the future, one would have to first assess changes in the specifics, but the underlying principles and concepts should remain the same. Internal reliability refers to making the measures of the tests consistent so that when comparing, they can accurately be related to each other. The studies in this thesis consisted of interviews and a questionnaire that used the same and similar questions in order to make the answers easily relatable to each other. Inter-observer consistency refers to when multiple researchers are handling subjective data; there is a risk that their personal influences could vary in the data. All subjective data in this thesis was read and analyzed by two different researchers, both separately and together so as to avoid any personal attitudes influencing the data. (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

3.5 Ethical Considerations

It is important for all studies to take ethics into consideration. There are four ethical principles in particular that are the most important to address: harm to participants, lack of informed consent, invasion of privacy, and deception (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Each of these aspects are relevant and key considerations for all studies.

Harm to participants refers to any negative effects that might come to anybody who partakes in the study. This encompasses all kinds of harm, whether it is physical harm, or any other form of harm, such as harm to a person’s reputation (Bryman and Bell, 2011). In order to ensure no harm comes to the participants, the researchers assured the participants that everything will be kept anonymous unless they specifically give permission to use their names. This will ensure job security and no harm to their personal reputations. This particular study poses no physical risk to any participants because they are only required to respond to a short list of questions.
Participants also need to not only be aware that they are partaking in a study, but it is important that they also agree to do so (Bryman and Bell, 2011). No participants have been forced to respond to the questions, it has all been up to the individual if he or she desired to partake in the study. All participants were informed that if they felt uncomfortable answering any questions in particular, they were free to skip that question. This option helped to keep the researchers from invading any participant’s privacy or forcing them to do anything they did not want to.

The last aspect is deception, which occurs when researchers present their study as something different than what it actually is (Bryman and Bell, 2011). For this study, the researchers were careful to not deceive any participants in any step. They informed each participant of the general field of the study, but did not fully explain every aspect so as not to influence their responses.

3.6 Critique

This part of the chapter will present a critique of sources, and a critique of the researchers.

3.6.1 Source Critique

When conducting research it is important to always look at the conducted work with critical eyes (Bryman and Bell, 2011). When Internet is becoming a more prominent source for materials gathered it is especially hard to distinguish which sources are relevant and trustworthy, and which are not. Published studies go through tougher scrutiny than sources online. Anyone, in this day and age, can publish an article online. When looking at online sources it is, therefore, very relevant to ascertain they are supported by other publications, online resources and published non-fiction books. Using online sources is becoming increasingly common in this day and age (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

For published materials, it is important to keep in mind that some publications might be too old to still be relevant, that they have been disproven by later studies or publications. Therefore comprehensive gathering and reading of materials related to the subject, both new and old, is needed to make sure it still is accurate.
3.6.2 Self Critique

The researchers are aware that, when conducting qualitative research, there is a chance of bias in the answers due to influence of the interviewer on the respondent (Bryman and Bell, 2011). During the course of this paper, it has been of utmost importance for the researchers to take a critical stance to themselves, and their preconceived opinions, as to not influence, or mislead, the results of the empirical study.

The researchers, before the empirical study began, tried to define what results they expected to find, and what conclusions were expected to be drawn. This was to identify preconceived notions of results, and thereby try to prevent these notions influence on the structuring of interview questions and the questionnaire. To ascertain the questions were fair and open, and not contorted by the researchers’ viewpoint, they were examined and appraised by the tutor. The tutor’s opinions were taken into account, and questions were rearranged and restructured.

The researcher’s believe that the gathering of data was done with self criticism as the results of this thesis do not reflect the initial assumption of results made by the researchers. As the results did not guide the researchers in the direction they thought, the researchers did not let bias guide their gathering of data, nor their analysis of it.

3.7 Limitations

When this study began, the researchers were hoping to look at multiple countries to compare a feminine country, such as Sweden, with a more masculine country. Unfortunately, the study had to be limited to just one country because the researchers were not able to get in contact with managers from Volkswagen in other relevant countries.

After the study was adjusted to focus on Sweden, the researchers found that they were limited within Sweden as well because many sales managers were either not available to participate in the study, or never responded to the emails sent out. Furthermore, there were fewer salesmen available to respond to the questionnaire than expected which also limited the results.
4. Empirical Study

This chapter presents the findings from the primary research. It contains summaries of the interviews with both the country manager, and the sales managers, and the results from the survey completed by the salesmen at Volkswagen.

4.1 Volkswagen

Volkswagen is a multinational automobile company. The brand Volkswagen is a part of the Volkswagen Group, which includes many other automobile brands, such as Audi, Skoda, and Porsche, as well. The Volkswagen group is primarily focused on manufacturing cars, but also offers a variety of mobility-related services (Group, 2016). Volkswagen was founded in, and is currently based in, Germany, but is present in the automobile industry all over the world (Volkswagen AG, 2016).

4.2 Sweden

Below, a chart of Sweden is presented according to Hofstede’s dimensions.
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Sweden has a score of 31 for power distance, which means power is decentralized, and control is disliked. For individualism, Sweden has a score of 71. This means that Sweden is a society in which the individual person is expected to care for him or herself, and decisions, such as promotions, are expected to be merit-based. Sweden has the low score of 5 in masculinity, indicating that it is a very feminine country. In feminine countries there is a strong focus on the life/work balance and having a high quality of life. A score of 29 in uncertainty avoidance indicates that Sweden has a more relaxed attitude and is more accepting of people deviating from the norm. For long-term orientation, Sweden has received a score of 53, which puts them very much in the middle and not showing any preference. Long-term orientation refers to whether a country focuses more on maintaining time-honored traditions than new and modern, short-term practices. Sweden has scored 78 in indulgence, which means that people in this society are likely to indulge on their wants and just focus on enjoying life. (Geert Hofstede, 2016b)

4.3 Country Manager Interview

An interview was conducted with the Country Manager responsible for sales of Volkswagen passenger cars in Sweden. In this interview, his views on sales competitions; their purpose and results, were discussed.

He started working for Volkswagen in 1998 and after a few years with other companies, he returned to Volkswagen six years ago. He is currently responsible for all sales of Volkswagen in Sweden, and as a part of that job he is also in charge of sales competitions.

Sales competitions, although declining in frequency, have been used in the company. At Volkswagen, “the shortest time [they] have used [a sales competition] was a quarter, and the longest a full year”. They rank the salesmen on leaderboards to show whom the best, and the worst, salesmen are. “[It] is a way to subliminally show the people that are in the bottom that they should speed up”, and to “acknowledge good performance” for the top performers.

The employees’ place on the leaderboard depends on a lot of factors. The Country Manager explains that there is more to the business than just selling cars. Since there are usually additional questions on how to finance the purchase or what insurance to get for the car, the salesmen get points not only depending on how many cars they sell, but also on extra sales they make in e.g. insurance or financing. So, “[a] typical sales competition within [the]
filial is that all salesmen get points for each action they take”. However, the Country Manager was clear when specifying that what is most important to them nowadays is customer satisfaction. And “as a part of the competition, you get extra bonus points if you have happy customers, more so than average”.

Also, the competition is divided into sections depending on the size of the dealerships. Since Volkswagen has “very small dealerships with 150 as an annual sales target, and up to 2400 as an annual sales target for the biggest [dealerships].” This is “in order for the competition to be fair and somewhat equal within the bigger companies […] and cities”. The way they usually group the dealerships, is into small, medium, and large.

The reward for top salesmen is to go on a trip paid for by the company. The Country Manager specifies that “[they] have different ways [to reward salesmen], but trips to be honest” is the most common one. This is because monetary compensations and bonuses are heavily taxed, and Volkswagen “like[s] to use money so that it comes to the ones that have been selling a lot of cars, and the government hasn’t done that”. However, if a salesman does not fill the customer satisfaction requirements they will not get awarded anything. “If you are not average or better in customer satisfaction, you are not welcome on our trip”. They are measured in “one million different ways” by Volkswagen, and the measuring is not only applied when sales competitions are held. This is because customer retention and satisfaction is a key aspect for Volkswagen today.

According to the Country Manager, the main reason for implementing sales competitions in the company is to steer the employees. “If you want to sell blue cars instead of red cars, or big cars instead of small cars. Then there is a benefit in using sales competitions”. The reason for pushing a specific type of car is because sometimes there is a lot of a certain type of car in stock. Other times, a specific car model might be a more beneficial sale in terms of profit. The sales competitions, as perceived by the Country Manager, usually have no real impact on volume sales. Sometimes Volkswagen sees minor changes in volume due to sales competitions, but normally not anything noticeable. This is because the salesmen of today are not the stereotypical salesmen. They are not “really eager, and pushing the customer”, like how people often view salesmen. He also believes that the stereotypical salesmen are slowly “getting fewer and fewer”. “A lot of new salesmen are working far more with relations and customer retention” rather than just pushing the product. This kind of salesman, he believes, is not as touched by the sales competitions, and the rewards they bring, and “they don’t really increase their speed during sales competitions”.
Some salesmen, the Country Manager says, “get really, really motivated [by the sales competitions]. Some really want to have that trip. And if not the trip, they want to win because that is how they are programmed”. Other salesmen feel untouched by this and may have the attitude: “if I win, I win. It’s not very important to me [and the reward] is not going to make me work harder”.

The Country Manager, although questioning motivational and performance driving aspects, still has a very positive attitude on the concept of sales competitions. He “think[s] it is a great way to acknowledge good performance, and hard work”.

The Country Manager summarized with: ”sales competitions are, as I see it, always a positive thing. Not necessarily to drive volume in total, but to make the salesmen really feel they are getting the acknowledgement. We will see better performance from some of the salesmen but far from everyone. Because sales today is so much more than just pushing the metal (pedal to the metal).”

4.4 Sales Manager Interviews

In the following, the results from the Sales Manager Interviews will be presented. The number behind each quote corresponds to the interview from which that quote was taken.

4.4.1 Culture and Motivation

Every dealership interviewed takes part in the national sales competitions; some also implement their own local competitions. The reason for this is because some “believe the national level sales competitions are too far away” (#2), because the reward comes several months after the actual sales competition was finished. “They are not in the mood waiting for a trip to another country in 8 or 9 months.” (#2). Instead, some of the dealerships “use sales competitions almost everyday” (#2) while others “try to arrange some kind of sales competition at least 2 - 3 times per year” (#5). For most dealerships however, the competitions “were mostly national. [Although they]’ve had some local sales competitions when [they] have a certain type of car model [they] need to sell more of.” (#3) Sometimes, “the financing company is in charge of the sales competitions” (#4) other than Volkswagen. The financing company is part of Volkswagen Group, but not in direct relation to the private car sales sector.
All the Sales Managers were positive, or neutral, to the sales competitions. However they did point out some shortcomings. One of the disadvantages with the national sales competitions is that it takes “too long to reach a goal and the salespersons often really like when it pays off really quickly” (#2). Another big disadvantage with the national sales competitions is that they create a “lack of staff” (#3). Since, like the Country Manager mentioned in his interview (chapter 4.3), the prize is usually to travel somewhere, “[t]hen somebody else needs to replace [that salesman]” (#3). “If you have a sales competition, the prize could be to travel, most usually it is. [...] And when you do, you’re gone for a full week” (#3). One manager mentioned “the kinds of competitions that remove the salesmen from the “production” [he doesn’t] like” (#5). It is also hard for the Managers to keep the salesmen from going, they “don’t want to tell the salesmen that; they aren’t allowed to go on that trip over the weekend because [they are needed] here to sell cars instead. Then, they’ll be upset with me when they’ve won something and I tell them no.” (#5)

In the local competitions, travel is not always the prize presented to the salesmen since that would be “just shooting myself in the foot” (#5), as one manager pointed out. In most local competitions the prizes are a variety of small things. “It could be a bottle of champagne, [or] it could be a clap on the shoulder (pat on the back)” (#2), it could also be “dinner for the salesman and their partner” (#3). In most cases, “there is always some kind of reward, either that you go out to eat, or you get a bonus in cash, or you win a thing” (#5). For most of the local competitions “the most expensive price that [is used] is usually two movie tickets.” (#2). However, for other dealerships “the rewards are often focused around trips, or travels” (#4). Most dealerships agree on the fact that “the prize doesn’t have to be the most important thing, sometimes just the glory is enough” (#4).

The competitions are usually about “selling a lot of cars, or alternatively focusing on something else; like financing a lot, or selling insurances. Things that you can count on in the car industry is what we focus on” (#4). So basically they are about “performance or volume; who sells the most cars, or who makes the most money from selling cars, and pulls in the most money for the company” (#5). Also, “it’s [...] a way to steer the employees” (#3), “one week we might say that we focus on red cars” (#4). “Usually there are competitions concerning who has the most satisfied customers, [and] we get daily reports from Volkswagen with how our customers think and feel about us.” (#5)
4.4.2 Motivating the Salesforce

Most of the Sales Managers believe that the sales competitions do motivate the salesforce. However, they all agree that the motivation varies from person to person, “some people are a 5, and some people might be a 1” (#5) in motivation. Another Sales Manager says that “in [his] sales staff there are seven people and maybe four of them are like: ‘Yeah I’m going to win this’ because they know that they can win” (#2). Most of them agree on the point that “often times those who are the best salesmen get the most motivation from this” (#3). Because there are, of course, different kinds of salesmen in the company, “not everybody can be the person running up top, scoring goals. Some people have to stay behind and guard their own territory” (#2). There is a difference in the amount of motivation received from the competitions, “some find it motivating and others don’t” (#5). This is usually because the salesmen that are not at the top “know that they are not capable of winning the competition, so that’s why they don’t get involved to the same extent” (#2). On the other hand, “the ones who win is of course happy and likes the competitions” (#1). “Some have this drive and are really competitive, and they really like the sales competitions. While others, [...] would have performed the same regardless of there being a competition or not” (#5). The people who are not performing the best “do not get impressed by, and do not go around thinking about, having the most goals in the league.” (#2)

That is why one of the Sales Managers specially mentioned, “when you design [sales competitions] you’ll have to do it so that some people don’t give up, it should motivate everyone” (#4). Relating to that sales competitions don’t pay off quickly enough (chapter 4.4.1), managers specify that “sales competitions should be quite short, and they should be simple to interpret (read), and you should get results continuously [for the salesmen] to get triggered” (#5). “You have to include everyone, and you achieve that through partial goals and maybe focusing on different aspects” (#4). Another thing that is important is “follow-ups if you want any kind of results from a sales competition” (#4). After years of experience the Sales Managers “know the salesmen get triggered by that; simple and a lot of reporting back” (#5). Some Sales Managers “follow up, almost daily, but no doubt weekly with the salesmen to talk about where they are at” (#4). “Troublesome sales competitions with a lot of reporting and no follow-up the salesmen don’t stand very well” (#5). “You need a simple, perspicuous sales competition with good follow ups, and where everybody gets a chance to participate. [...] The idea is to lift the lowest level a step, and everybody else with it.” (#4)
Most Sales Managers believe that the sales competitions contribute to their work. Because of these sales competitions “the climate in the group get better because the energy goes up” (#2). Also, “[they] can see difference in volume. Especially when [they] do sales competitions on kronor earned, the salesmen earn more than usual. They try to get that little extra from the customer” (#5). Also, “[they] initiate a sales competition, when you need people to perform a bit better. And that is proven every time [they] do that” people step up their game (#4). So the sales competitions give results “in volume; you sell another car, you make some extra calls, you try to squeeze some more customers in” (#5).

However, some people find that “the competitions do not give [them] anything in the everyday life” (#1). Furthermore, “today the salesmen get commissions, so they earn their money that way. The more you sell the more you earn. And that is the drive” (#3). Because, as another Sales Manager added; “Money motivates everyone” (#5). Another problem with the sales competitions might be that “some people think that; if we do this little extra thing then we should get the money, regardless if we reach the goal or not” (#5). It is also important “not to have sales competitions often. Because then, the salesmen would wait until there is a competition (to put in a lot of effort)” (#3).

4.5 Questionnaires

Most of the respondents, 93.8%, in the survey were male (Figure 4.5a). This is quite an accurate reflection of the gender ratio for Volkswagen (personal cars) salesforce in Sweden, which is dominated by the male gender. The respondents’ age ranged from 25 to 53, with an average age of 39.3.

**Gender**

Gender (32 svar)

(Figure 4.5a)
As mentioned in chapter 2.2.2 the questionnaires were conducted using Likert’s scale. This is how the employees were asked to respond to the questions. All respondents were asked to which degree they agreed with a statement where:

1 - They strongly disagree with the statement.
2 - They disagree with the statement
3 - They are neutral to the statement
4 - They agree with the statement
5 - They strongly agree with the statement.

**Enjoying sales competitions**

![Chart](image)

(Figure 4.5b)

A majority agreed with the statement (82.3%), and was positive to sales competitions, in the sense that they enjoy themselves during the course of a competition. One employee disagreed with the statement, indicating that the employees generally are neutral or positive.
Motivation from sales competitions

I feel motivated by the sales competitions (34 svar)

(Figure 4.5c)

A majority strongly agreed to the statement that they are motivated by sales competitions. One employee disagreed with the statement. However, some were neutral to the statement, not taking a stance on whether they find it motivating or not.

Demotivation

I am demotivated by the sales competitions (34 svar)

(Figure 4.5d)

Four employees found the sales competitions to be demotivating (Figure 4.5d). However, most respondents strongly disagreed to the statement that the sales competitions are demotivating.
Motivation to sell more

I believe the sales competitions motivate me to sell more cars (34 svar)

Two employees (5.9%) do not agree with the statement that sales competitions motivate them to sell more cars. Nonetheless, most employees (55.9%) strongly agree that the competitions motivate them to sell more. 26.5% are neutral, thereby stating that the sales competitions do not influence their overall sales performance.

Importance of rewards

I believe rewards are the most important thing for sales competitions (33 svar)

45.5% of the employees are neutral to the statement that the most important thing in the sales competitions are the rewards. 42.2% agree or strongly agree, indicating that most people find rewards important or are neutral. However, some of the salesmen disagree that rewards are the most important thing (12.1%).
Success

I aim to be the best salesman in the sales competitions (34 svar)

A majority of the employees, when taking part in the sales competitions, agree or strongly agree with the statement “I am to be the best salesman in the sales competitions” (82.4%). 5.6% of the employees were neutral, and the rest disagreed.

Reward motivation

The reward for winning the sales competition is the primary factor that motivates me (34 svar)

The results for finding rewards to be the primary motivator are very even. An equal number of people disagree, and agree to the statement, whilst 23.5% are neutral.
Recognition motivation

The recognition from winning the sales competition is the primary factor that motivates me

(Figure 4.5i)

53% view rewards as a primary factor of motivation in sales competitions. 20.6% are neutral, and the rest (26.5%) are in disagreement with the statement.

Accomplishment motivation

A sense of accomplishment is the primary factor that motivates me

(Figure 4.5j)

70.6% agree with that a sense of accomplishment is the primary factor that motivated them. 20.6% are neutral and only 8.8% are in disagreement.
Preferences

I would prefer to work in a company that uses sales competitions than in one that doesn't

(34 svar)

A majority of people agrees (79.4%), to different degrees, with that they would prefer to work in a company that uses sales competitions. A few people were neutral, not showing a preference. Two people were in disagreement.
5 Analysis

This chapter will present an analysis of the findings from the empirical study. It will first focus on what was found applying to gamification specifically, then move on to culture, and finish with an all-encompassing analysis of the motivation found in the study.

5.1 Gamification

According to Sarangi and Shah (2015), gamification must contain some sort of game elements and also game mechanics. To analyze gamification, a conclusion on whether or not Volkswagen actually uses it must be made. Therefore, their sales competitions are measured against gamification theory.

In an interview with the Country Manager, he explained how the sales competitions usually work; that “all salesmen get points for each action they take” (Country Manager) and that they are ranked on leaderboards. Also, there are rewards tied to the competitions, these are most often trips but other rewards do exist. These factors are usually called game elements and constitute a part of gamification (Sarangi, Shah, 2015). After that, the game mechanics need to be identified which usually consists of the rules and guidelines of the game (Sarangi, Shah, 2015). For a competition to be gamified, it needs to contain three different kinds of mechanics: rule, setup, and progression (Robson, 2015). In Volkswagen’s case, these would include requiring a certain level of customer satisfaction in order to partake in any rewards: “If you are not average or better in customer satisfaction, you are not welcome on our trip” (Country Manager). This would be a rule mechanic, as it specifies and limits what the players can do (Robson, 2015). So even though a salesman sells a lot of cars, he is limited by the fact that he needs an above average customer satisfaction. This means that he cannot act however he wishes but is limited in how he can act. A setup mechanic, or the environment of the experience (Robson, 2015), Volkswagen considers is the length of their competitions, “the shortest time [they] have used [a sales competition] was a quarter, and the longest a full year” (Country Manager). Another setup mechanic would be that Volkswagen groups their dealerships according to size “in order for the competition to be fair and somewhat equal within the bigger companies […] and cities” (Country Manager). And although the leaderboards are a game element, they are also used as progression mechanics, in the sense that they correspond with a new status or reward a player gets while making their
way through the game (Robson, 2015). Therefore, a conclusion can be drawn, that Volkswagen’s sales competitions are gamified. The game mechanics and game elements are what constitute gamification and what affect the perceptions, situational affordances, and interactional context. These, in their turn, affect the employee motivation. (Sarangi, Shah, 2015).

Mechanics are only the first part of the MDE framework that constitutes gamification. The MDE framework also presents two other factors that are of importance in a gamified system. These are dynamics and emotions. The dynamics are in-game behaviors that arise as an effect of the game mechanics. (Robson, 2015). Without actual observations, it is hard to measure the game dynamics. However, some conclusions can be drawn from the interviews with Volkswagen Sales Managers. Many Sales Managers made comment on how certain people were more motivated than others by the game mechanics, sales competitions. The mechanics of Volkswagen’s sales competitions have led to two different types of behaviors among the salesmen within the competitions. The top salesmen will fight for the top position, whereas the middle-performers “know that they are not capable of winning the competition, so that’s why they don’t get involved to the same extent” (#2).

“Gamification emotions are the mental affective states and reactions evoked among individual players when they participate in a gamified experience” (Robson, 2015, p. 416). This refers to if the player enjoys the gamified experience and if they find it fun. In Volkswagen’s case, 82.3% of the employees agreed that they did enjoy themselves during the sales competitions (Figure 4.5b). Hence, Volkswagen has positive emotions in regards to the sales competitions. In conclusion, Volkswagen has reached all the requirements for a gamified experience, in accordance with the MDE framework (Figure 2, Robson, 2015, p. 416), and the outcome is positive.
5.2 Culture

In Sweden, the Power Distance is at 31, a score that puts Sweden at a low level. This would, according to Hofstede, mean that the employees have greater autonomy, and that they do not value hierarchy (2001). Gamification in Volkswagen does not challenge the employee-employer relationship, nor does an employee’s performance affect the manager’s performance. The employees are solely judged and ranked on par with other employees. Therefore, Power Distance would not affect the usage of gamification.

The score for Individualism in Sweden is quite high. “[I]n individualistic societies, one would expect a stronger tendency to define performance in individual terms, as well as widespread efforts to link personal success with individual compensation” (Pennings, 1993, p.267). This is exactly the case in Volkswagen; the competition is based on individual ranking (leaderboards and point systems), and the compensation is also individual since only the top salesmen get to go on the trip. However, this would not affect motivation from gamification, but rather in which way you wish to compete and receive rewards.

With a low score of 5 in Masculinity, Sweden can be defined as a Feminine culture. A masculine culture is focused on materialism; there is also “the glorification of individual success and achievement” (Pennings, 1993, p.267). This would be a dimension where
motivation is greatly influenced by gamification, since “gamification is the application of extrinsic motivators [and] implementation of these motivators will trigger internal motivation and aid in maintaining it.” (Richter, 2015, p.38). Therefore, the factor that is focused on achievement, materialism and rewards should have a great influence on the motivation from gamification. Also, seeing as masculinity - the drive for such achievements - is this low, it should influence the motivation received from the gamification. Furthermore, achievement in high masculinity cultures is a lot about ego boosting, wealth, and that there is a greater need for recognition. (Hofstede, 2001). A feminine country like Sweden could, according to theory, therefore still be focused on achievement. The achievements should not tie back to ego boosting and wealth (monetary rewards). These two, however, are commonly used factors in gamification.

Sweden has a low score of 29 in Uncertainty Avoidance, meaning that it is a culture that, in general, is willing to take risks. It also means that competition among employees is generally accepted. (Hofstede, 2001). This would influence how employees accept having gamification in their workplace. Gamification is a competition among employees where they are ranked and scored compared to each other, that “show[s] the people that are in the bottom that they should speed up” (Country Manager) or “acknowledge good performance” (Country Manager) for the top scorers. Uncertainty Avoidance should only concern whether or not this method of competition is accepted, not if it is motivational. Seeing as Sweden’s score is low, the competitions, and this method of ranking, should not be unwelcome.

Sweden’s score on Long Term Orientation is 53, which puts them in the middle of the spectrum leaning towards long term rather than short term. However, as mentioned in the theoretical framework, it does not affect the work to a great extent. (Hofstede, 2001).

Indulgence, in which Sweden’s score is 78, ties to whether a society is “a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives related to enjoying life and having fun”. It does not affect the workplace to a great extent, and is more focused on if people within a culture can restrain themselves from impulses and desires. (geert-hofstede, 2016b).
5.3 Motivation

“To be motivated means to be moved to do something” (Ryan and Deci, 2000, p.1). There are two types of different motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic. Although “gamification is the application of extrinsic motivators [...] implementation of these motivators will trigger internal motivation and aid in maintaining it.” (Richter, 2015, p.38). Rewards are a form of extrinsic motivators, and fun can be considered a form of intrinsic motivation; “the value of the experience is the experience itself, rather than the experience being instrumental in achieving something else” (Rigby, 2014, p. 116). In Figure 4.5b, the Volkswagen employees say that they enjoy themselves during the course of a competition. This could be linked to having fun, and shows that the employees are, in some sense, intrinsically motivated by the competitions.

One way to create intrinsic motivation in employees is through internalization. Internalization takes extrinsic motivators and turns them into a form of intrinsic motivation through self-pressure, for example (Rigby, 2014). In Figure 4.5g, one can see that a lot of salesmen have internalized the goals of Volkswagen. 82.4% aim to be the best salesman in the organization. This shows that they have taken the goal of Volkswagen (e.g. selling the largest amount of red cars) and made that their own personal goal so that they can become the top salesman.

In order to maintain intrinsic motivation in individual employees, it is necessary to keep three needs fulfilled; autonomy, competence, and relatedness. (Aparicio et al., 2012). These three factors don’t necessarily have to be fulfilled by the gamification, but rather just fulfilled in general. However, Volkswagen does fulfill two of these factors through their gamification and the last one, outside of their gamification. The competence refers to new challenges (Rigby, 2014), and is fulfilled through creating new goals and partial goals with each competition: “a certain type of car model [they] need to sell more of” (#3), “competitions concerning who has the most satisfied customers” (#5), and sometimes concerning different kinds of financing options (#4). Relatedness is fulfilled when they feel that their individual effort matters (Rigby, 2014). This can be explained as feeling you contribute to the total, and that what you do gets recognized. In Volkswagen the employees feel more motivated to sell cars through sales competitions (Figure 4.5e), and managers can see that the sales competitions give results “in volume; you sell another car, you make some extra calls, you try to squeeze some more customers in” (#5). Most importantly, to “acknowledge good performance” (Country Manager) for top performers is a key reason for
the leaderboards Volkswagen uses, and it also makes sure you get recognized for what you do, and that your individual effort matters. Being a salesman in a Volkswagen dealership gives you autonomy whether or not you are participating in an ongoing sales competition. The managers see competitions as “a way to steer the employees” (#3), indicating that they don’t dictate their employee’s actions, but instead try to guide them. Hence, all three factors are fulfilled and should create a foundation on which intrinsic motivation can grow.

However, not all the salespeople feel motivated by the sales competitions (Figure 4.5d). This is because salespeople are motivated differently. There are three types of salespeople, and different methods to motivate them. (Steenburgh, Ahearne, 2012). When interviewing the Sales Managers it was apparent that not all salespeople felt motivated by the sales competitions. In motivation “some people are a 5, and some people might be a 1” (#5). The people that are a 5 would be called stars. “Often times those who are the best salesmen get the most motivation from this” (#3). Just like Steenburgh and Ahearne (2012) explain, the stars are generally those who are motivated by rewards and bonuses. Then there are the core performers who are not motivated by rewards (Steenburgh, Ahearne, 2012). This is mainly because they “know that they are not capable of winning the competition, so that’s why they don’t get involved to the same extent” (#2), however they are motivated to outperform the average (Steenburgh, Ahearne, 2012). The last group, laggards, is a group that is hard to motivate. Generally, they are motivated by social pressure, and using leaderboards is one way of putting pressure on them. (Steenburgh, Ahearne, 2012). That is also a reason why Volkswagen has chosen to use leaderboards, “[it] is a way to subliminally show the people that are in the bottom that they should speed up” (Country Manager). At Volkswagen, it is hard to “find” the laggards, when asked if they were aiming to be the top salesman 11.8% said they disagreed, and that they did not aim to be the top salesmen (Figure 4.5g). This group would include both laggards and some core performers, seeing as they believe the stars will be the top performers, and therefore aim for an above average, rather than top, position (Steenburgh, Ahearne, 2012).

However, assuming that the American salespeople (from a masculine culture) from the Steenburgh and Ahearne study, and Swedish salespeople (from a feminine country) are motivated by the same things, should not be done. Culture is something that affects the goals and values an individual has, and also how each individual is motivated (Munro, 1997). Achievement motivation should be more prominent in masculine cultures (Hofstede, 2001; Landy and Conte, 2010), and differentiation as well (Khaled, 2014). In the Swedish
culture, “people [may] view markers of differentiation, particularly those focused on achievement, as needless and almost offensive self-promotion” (Khaled, 2014, p. 307) “as they foreground inequalities between individuals” (Khaled, 2014, p.309). The competition dynamic, on which differentiation builds, usually consists of points, levels, and leaderboards, which are some of the most common gamification tools. Although, according to Khaled (2014), these should be unwanted in a culture like the Swedish one, all salesmen are neutral or in agreement with the statement that they find sales competitions motivational (Figure 4.5c). Also, a majority agreed with the statement, and was positive to sales competitions, in the sense that they enjoy themselves during the course of a competition (Figure 4.5b). These could be effects of the high individualism that exists in Sweden, which means that there is a “stronger tendency to define performance in individual terms” (Pennings, 1993, p.267). When looking into the masculine dimension “the glorification of individual success and achievement” (Pennings, 1993, p.267), one can see that although it is true to some extent, few salesmen disagree with the statement that rewards are the most important thing in sales competitions (Figure 4.5f). This indicates that rewards are still of some importance to the salesmen. However, when asked about their personal preferences, most salespeople were divided on the issue of rewards. 38.2% agreed that rewards were the primary factor that motivates them, while 38.2% disagree (Figure 4.5h). Hence, it can be seen that although rewards are important, most people do not value the rewards that highly. The employees therefore believe they are not as motivated extrinsically, by eg. rewards (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Instead, it is a sense of accomplishment that is the most agreed upon as the primary motivator (70.6%), and only 8.8% disagree (Figure 4.5j). A clear pattern can be established; the employees of Volkswagen find the sense of accomplishment, an intrinsic factor (Ryan and Deci, 2000), to be more motivational than the extrinsic factors.

So, although “well-known game elements tend to privilege cultural value orientations of mastery and hierarchy” (Khaled, 2014, p.318), which Hofstede also connects to the dimension of masculinity (Hofstede, 2001), one can see that gamification has a positive motivational effect on the salespeople at Volkswagen. This could be because gamification, although using extrinsic motivators, succeeds to intrinsically motivate the employees at Volkswagen in Sweden.
6 Conclusion

This chapter will present a summary of the thesis, contributions to the field, and will also present suggestions for future potential research, to further the understanding of the topic of gamification.

6.1 Summary

It is said that gamification can work as a motivator in many types of organizations. It is commonly being used in sales organizations, and sales departments. At the beginning of the thesis a research question was posed.

- Does the cultural dimension of masculinity have an impact on the motivation from gamification?
  - Why, or why not?

This thesis has managed to conclude that the motivational impact of gamification both is, and is not, consistent with previous research based on the masculine factor. To come to this conclusion several steps had to be taken.

Firstly, Volkswagen’s sales competitions had to be measured against gamification theory, as to ascertain that they were congruent. Since the sales competitions contained both game elements, and game mechanics (rule, setup, and progression), the conclusion that Volkswagen’s sales competitions are gamified can be drawn. The game mechanics and game elements are what constitute gamification and what affect the employee motivation. (Sarangi and Shah, 2015). Also, that the dynamics and emotions contribute to a positive gamified experience can be concluded.

Secondly, the cultural environment in which the company is being measured had to be evaluated. The analysis of the cultural dimensions concluded that three factors could have an effect on gamification in the company; Individualism, Masculinity, and Uncertainty Avoidance. However, Individualism was more so correlated to the competition method (individual or collective), and Uncertainty Avoidance was correlated to accepting competition between the employees. On the other hand, Masculinity, a factor that is focused on achievement, materialism and rewards, would have a bigger influence on the motivation from gamification. This being because “gamification is the application of extrinsic motivators
implementation of these motivators will trigger internal motivation and aid in maintaining it.” (Richter, 2015, p.38). In conclusion, masculinity would be the primary factor influencing the motivation of the employees in regards to an implementation of gamification.

Thirdly, the gamification in the Swedish cultural environment had to be analyzed. This was done with the help of salespeople’s (culturally coded) opinion and perceived motivation from gamification in Volkswagen. In line with what theory says, rewards are not what motivate the employees the most. Rather, it was a sense of personal accomplishment that was the biggest motivating factor. This is in line with the previous research as it confirms that a feminine culture is not focused on materialism, success and achievement. However, the notion that “typical gamification applications [...] tend to privilege cultural value orientations of mastery and hierarchy at the expense of egalitarianism [and] harmony” (Khaled, 2014, p.313) is not consistent with the results. The results found that, even though Sweden is a feminine country (egalitarianism [and] harmony), and not a masculine country (mastery), the motivational impact of gamification on the employees was still greatly positive.

This thesis has consequently contributed to the field of research by establishing that gamification, in Volkswagen’s case, does have a motivational impact on the employees, even though they belong to a feminine culture. This will help further the understanding of cross-cultural motivation and the implementation of sales stimulating systems. It is relevant for sales managers across the world working internationally or with a multinational team.

6.2 Future Potential Research

There are many possible avenues for future research in the subject of gamification. One possibility is to focus on customer gamification at Volkswagen. Gamification can be applied either to the employees, or customers. In this thesis, the researchers have focused on gamification for employees; it would be interesting to see how the masculinity/femininity aspect of culture affects implementation of gamification for customers in the automobile industry.

Another area of study for future researchers could be to look at some of the other cultural aspects according to Hofstede’s cultural dimensions. The researchers believe that the uncertainty avoidance, and individualism dimensions would be relevant areas to study in gamification, as explained earlier in the Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions section.
A future research possibility that they believe would be relevant for the field would be to do a compare and contrast study between countries with varying levels of masculinity. For example, comparing Sweden with Ireland because Ireland has very similar levels as Sweden in the cultural factors besides masculinity, but they have a high level of masculinity. Therefore, one would be able to study the difference of the impact that masculinity has because the other factors wouldn’t affect gamification, specifically. It would be interesting to see how the two cultures differ instead of just studying how one does in gamification.
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8 Appendix

8.1 Questions: Country Manager

- Name:
- Age:
- What is your current position in the company?
- How long have you worked with this company?
- Tell me about your background in the automobile industry
- Which positions have you held previously?
- What types of sales competitions (leaderboards, challenges, points) does the company use? How are they structured?
- What type of reward does the top salesmen get?
- How did they measure goals before they implemented sales competitions?
- What results have they achieved after implementing sales competitions? (specify more, like numbers?)
- Have they implemented another sort of sales stimulating incentive during the period in which they implemented sales competitions?
- Why did you choose to implement sales competitions?
- Do you believe your salespeople enjoy the sales competitions?
- Do you believe the sales competitions improve motivation in the sales force?
- How many sales competitions have you had the last 12 months? (Monthly, daily, quarterly?)
- Why so often? / why not more?
- Do you believe the sales competitions are a good tool for you to sell more cars?
8.2 Questions: Sales Manager

Name: 
Age: 

• What is your current position in the company?
• How long have you worked with Volkswagen?
• What is your background in the automobile industry?
• Have you used sales competitions these last 2 years?
• Were they national or regional?

The number you put under each statement represents the degree to which you agree to that statement where:

1 - You strongly disagree with the statement.
2 - You disagree with the statement
3 - You are neutral to the statement
4 - You agree with the statement
5 - You strongly agree with the statement.

Please give a small comment or explanation to your answers.

• I enjoy the sales competitions we are running in my company (Answer in 1-5) :
• I am motivated by the sales competitions (Answer in 1-5) :
• I believe our salespeople enjoy the sales competitions. (Answer in 1-5) :
• I believe the sales competitions improve motivation in the sales force (Answer in 1-5):
• I believe the sales competitions are a good tool for us to sell more cars (Answer in 1-5):

8.3 Questionnaire

Thank you for helping us with our thesis by responding to this. The survey is to get an idea of how you perceive the sales competitions in your company. Your identity will remain anonymous, so please answer the questions honestly.

The numbers under each statement represent the degree to which you agree to that statement where:

1 - You strongly disagree with the statement.
2 - You disagree with the statement
3 - You are neutral to the statement
4 - You agree with the statement
5 - You strongly agree with the statement.

Take your time and read the questions carefully.

• Age:
  • I enjoy the sales competitions we run at my company (Answer 1-5)
  • I feel motivated by the sales competitions (Answer 1-5)
  • I believe the sales competitions motivate me to sell more cars (Answer 1-5)
  • The reward for winning the sales competition is the primary factor that motivates me (Answer 1-5)
  • The recognition from winning the sales competition is the primary factor that motivates me (Answer 1-5)
  • A sense of accomplishment is the primary factor that motivates me (Answer 1-5)
  • I believe rewards are the most important thing for sales competitions (Answer 1-5)
  • I aim to be the best salesmen in the sales competitions (Answer 1-5)
  • I dislike the sales competitions we are running in my company (Answer 1-5)
  • I am demotivated by the sales competitions (Answer 1-5)
  • I believe the sales competitions do not motivate me to sell more cars (Answer 1-5)
  • I would prefer to work in a company that uses sales competitions than in one that doesn't (Answer 1-5)