DRIVE
Interpretation Guide

ABOUT

This manual has been written by the psychologists of the AssessFirst Science and Innovation team. It presents the different approaches taken to develop the DRIVE motivation questionnaire. It also covers the psychometric qualities of the questionnaire. Finally, this manual gives clear definitions of the ideas contained in the DRIVE results.

We regularly revise and update all our questionnaires. As such, we can't guarantee that this manual will always contain the latest updates.

For any requests or questions related to the information contained in this manual, we invite you to address them to the following email: si@assessfirst.com

The Science & Innovation team

INTRODUCTION

Appearing in the last century, after those relating to intellectual abilities and personality, the evaluation of motivations is now a major topic in work psychology: what drives a person to engage in an action? The first renowned researchers on motivation competed to develop a universal model of motivation. This was the case with Maslow (2004), McClellan (1961) as well as Herzberg (1968).

Further research has shown that motivation cannot be explained by a single factor, but is in fact multi-facetted. Latham and Pinder (2005) developed an excellent overview of works on the subject, arriving at the following conclusions:
- Satisfaction at work is closely linked to performance (Judge et al, 2001)
- Motivation at work reduces the desire to quit a job (Williams, Konrad, Scheckler, Pathman, Linzer, McMurray, Gerrity and Schwartz, 2001)
- Motivation at work reduces absenteeism and increases commitment to a position (Wegge, Schmidt, Parkes and van Dick, 2007)

AssessFirst's intention in developing DRIVE was to take advantage of the knowledge revealed by this research, and to put it in service to businesses and individuals with the goal of helping them to better understand individual motivation, and to use it to make better decisions. DRIVE was designed with the objective of identifying the determinants of the satisfaction and commitment of a person in a professional context.

DRIVE was developed by the Science & Innovation team at AssessFirst starting in 2014, and was commercialized at the start of 2016. It is the result of a significant work of literature review, studies of existing evaluation tools for motivation, and research into the distinctive factors of committed people who are successful in their role.

Developed after the SHAPE and BRAIN tests, DRIVE has inherited AssessFirst's know-how in terms of the relevance of the evaluated criteria, the simplicity of taking the test and exploiting the results, as well as its psychometric power and algorithmic technology.

DRIVE is a questionnaire that evaluates 20 motivational factors using a list of 90 binary forced-choice statements. It is primarily used to recruit (checking if a candidate will succeed in a given position) and to guide (exploring the positions and roles in which a person can thrive).

THEORETICAL BASIS

The study of motivation has been a critical focus in the last fifty years of research in work psychology. We have been able to draw inspiration from theoretical reflections and field studies conducted on the subject. Some particular works have caught our attention by aligning closely with our primary objective: to identify the main factors of satisfaction and commitment at work. Below is a short summary.

Theory of self-determination - Deci and Ryan

Deci and Ryan's theory of self-determination is one of the key inspirations for the DRIVE questionnaire. The work of these researchers is now considered authoritative in work psychology. Their theory postulates people cannot be motivated by extrinsic incentives over the long term – they must find intrinsic sources of motivation to maintain their commitment to a task.

This theory refers in particular to the fulfillment of 3 basic needs: the need for competence (being capable of doing what is asked), the need for autonomy (being able to independently overcome any difficulties faced, using our creativity) and the need for belonging (being surrounded by people who can be counted on and who will provide support).

This theory can be found in DRIVE in two different ways:
- Of the 20 dimensions that make up the test, 18 are dimensions that refer back to intrinsic motivation. We have kept 2 extrinsic dimensions because the meta-analysis of Cerasoli, Nickin & Ford (2014) highlighted that these can also have a positive impact of certain workplace situations.
- DRIVE integrates the 3 fundamental needs expressed in the theory of self-determination.

However, while this model is well-suited to auditing the current level of motivation of a person, it is not necessarily suited to the aim of exploring the different factors for a person to thrive.

THEORETICAL BASIS

Motives Values Preferences Inventory (MVPI) - Joyce and Robert Hogan

This inventory, developed by Joyce and Robert Hogan, was an important benchmark in the development of DRIVE, insofar as these two doctors of psychology investigated and synthesized 80 years of research on the subject. Almost 20 years later, their work still has an excellent reputation because their model is transverse to the theories and experimental research conducted in the field, and it is particularly well-suited to a professional or workplace context (it was designed with this in mind).

The 10 MVPI dimensions can thus be found indirectly in DRIVE.

Multidimensional Theory of Person-Environment Fit

Our research on the work carried out over the last few years led us to investigate deeper into ways of understanding the notion of motivation, particularly through the modeling of different levels of "fit" between a person and their working environment.

The bulk of the research on satisfaction and commitment at work reports the impact of the links between a person and their working environment. The research of Edwards and Billsberry (2010) indicate the different levels of "fit" linked to the satisfaction and commitment of people in professional contexts. They particularly rely on the model created by Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006) which identifies 5 types of fit:
- The "person-vocation fit"
- The "person-organisation fit"
- The "person-group fit"
- The "person-job fit"
- The "person-person fit"

These levels of fit influence three major indicators: commitment, desire to quit a position, and satisfaction at work.

We developed DRIVE with a clear view of promoting these three indicators. This also required us to assimilate existing models to achieve our objective.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEST

We developed DRIVE based on four fundamental principles:

1 – The motivating factors evaluated must have a scientific basis and must have been the subject of conclusive studies.
2 – These factors must correspond to the reality of the current nature of workplaces and be exploitable in tangible situations.
3 - The questionnaire must be accessible and easy to complete.
4 – The results must be easily interpreted and analysed by users.

These principles have allowed us to develop a test that aligns with what businesses want, and is suitable for any type of profile.

Choice of dimensions

Starting with our research into scientific publications, models developed by businesses, existing tools, professional success stories, and our fundamental principles outlined above, we were able to identify 25 motivating factors that met our criteria. For almost all of the selected motivating factors, we found both scientific and empirical evidence.

We found that most existing tools seeking to measure motivation were too short, testing less than 10 criteria. This approach is only able to check the fundamentals of a person's motivation, without being able to precisely specify individual needs. We can draw a parallel with the BIG5 personality model – it is a strong evaluation structure, but its generalised nature needs to be refined to be able to make a detailed assessment of personality.
On the other hand, we also saw the emergence of much more comprehensive tools, evaluating more than 30 criteria. These tools are more exhaustive in determining motivating factors but are also more difficult to interpret and analyse. This constraint goes against one of our fundamental principles, which is to make all results easy to interpret and analyse by users.

The 25 factors we initially selected seemed to be a good compromise between an overly narrow analysis and an exhaustive but difficult-to-assess tool. We have further developed the exact definitions of each of these factors to give them a precise and independent meaning.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEST

Writing of statements

Starting with the selected factors and their definitions, our statements were independently written by 5 occupational psychologists. Their instructions for the writing process were as follows:

- Ensure the statements can be easily understood by all
- Use language that leaves no room for ambiguity
- Formulate propositions that are relevant to real workplace situations.

The statements were also written with two other considerations in mind: some were rewritten to better describe a certain concept, and others to describe the opposite. This comes from the research of Brown and Maydeu-Olivares (2012), who noted a substantial improvement when questions are designed to evaluate a concept in both positive and negative terms (negative in the sense of opposing the positive version).

Around thirty statements were produced for each motivating factor; around 750 in total. To ensure their quality, they were checked by 20 independent observers who hadn't participated in the writing process. We asked them to match each statement to a motivating factor, to ensure there is a clear link between the statement and the concept, and to ensure that certain statements don't align with multiple factors. They also scored each statement on a scale of 1 (not clear at all) to 5 (completely clear).

Table: Dimension / Total number of statements / Number of statements found / Average clarity of statements

The statements that were correctly matched to their corresponding factor by at least 80% of the observers, and that scored at least 4 out of 5 for clarity, were used to create the first version of the questionnaire.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEST

Stages of development of the questionnaire

Firstly, we validated the statements and carried out a normative version of the questionnaire. They were put online so that respondents could position themselves from 1 (not at all motivating) to 5 (very motivating). Initially, we split the questionnaire in half to make two separate tests of 280 items each, as it was difficult to envisage passing a questionnaire of 560 items without bias from decision fatigue.

Each version of the questionnaire was offered to around 300 volunteers (full-time French workers aged between 25 and 55 years old). These initial results allowed us to carry out a study in the structural validation of the questionnaire (see the results in the validation section).

At this point, we found that not all dimensions were statistically valid for two reasons:
- Some factors lacked consistency, despite the large number of statements used to describe the concept. In these cases, weren't able to identify a sufficiently interrelated group of statements to properly evaluate a single concept.
- Some factors were too close to each other. It seemed that some factors referred to concepts that were too similar (or too dissimilar) to distinguish them and be properly independent. We therefore decided to keep the statements with the best sensitivity for reinforcing other factors, and to remove others.

At the end of this stage, we kept 20 out of the original 25 factors, and 372 statements. We then paired the proposals, balancing their social desirability to create a binary "forced-choice" questionnaire. This choice was in line with our desire to make the questionnaire accessible and simple to complete. In this sense, the binary "forced-choice" version is the most suitable in our experience.

The forced-choice version of the questionnaire is therefore made up of 186 pairs. It was tested online by a panel of 347 people (full-time French workers aged between 25 and 55 years old). Using the results, we were able to measure the balance of the pairs. We were looking for a near-even distribution of responses between the two choices. We tolerated a distribution up to 60% in favour of one choice over 40% for the other.

We then re-examined the statements that fell outside this ratio, and edited them to make them more or less attractive depending on their tested asymmetry. Some of the statements couldn't be sufficiently adjusted without compromising their initial purpose, and were therefore discarded. A new version of the questionnaire containing 166 pairs was again tested by 341 people (a similar sample to the previous versions).

In the final version of the questionnaire we kept the 90 statement pairs that best allowed us to gather psychometric data. The aim of limiting ourselves to 90 questions was to focus solely on the best statements and to guarantee a short duration for the test.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEST

The format of the questionnaire: forced choice

We chose to make the questionnaire a binary forced-choice test for the following reasons:

- A forced choice questionnaire is better able to control social desirability bias (Christiansen, Burns, & Montgomery, 2005; Jackson, Wroblewski, & Ashton, 2000; Martin, Bowen & Hunt, 2001; Vasilopoulos, Cucina, Dyomina, Morewitz & Reilly, 2006). With DRIVE being used primarily in the context of selection or recruitment, it's important that it cannot be gamed by participants.
- A forced choice questionnaire is easier and faster to complete. For an equivalent number of statements, we estimate the test takes 30% less time to complete using a forced-choice as opposed to a normative test.
- We are also better able to avoid extreme responding or neutral responding than a normative version of the questionnaire.

Why call it a "forced choice" and not a "ipsative" questionnaire? We speak of ipsative format when the total score for the test is always the same. The ipsative format therefore may cause some psychometric problems in terms of:

- The relative instead of absolute nature of the score, which is related to a particular norm (e.g., Closs, 1996; Hicks, 1970; C. E. Johnson et al., 1988).
- The co-variance of statements leads to limitations in the validity of the construct (Baron, 1996; Cornwell & Dunlap, 1994)
- The internal reliability of the test is doubtful, and more difficult to compare to that of a normative test (Meade, 2004)

To avoid these issues, we favoured the use of IRT calculation (Item Response Theory) instead of CTT calculation (Classical Test Theory). The work of Brown & Maydeu-Olivares (2012) proved that it is possible to avoid the issues of "forced choice" format by using IRT methodology.

TEST MODEL

The dimensions

Motivations linked to the type of work (what the person wants to do)

Create new things: the need to express creativity at work, to innovate.

Excel every day: the need to be faced with challenging tasks.

Worry about aesthetics: the need to look after the presentational aspects of work.

Analyse data: the need to work on factual elements and manage analysis.

Meet new people: the need to create and maintain interpersonal relationships at work.

Have clearly defined tasks: the need to have set beginnings, goals, and limitations at work.

Worry about quality: the need to produce reliable and precise work.

Relational motivations (how the person wants to work)

Have influence: the need to have power and authority in decisions at work

Have autonomy: the need to have freedom of action and choice at work.

Working in a team: the need to collaborate and share with others at work.

Organisational motivations (in which field does the person want to work)

Making a positive impact on the world: the need to work for a company that has a positive impact on the world.

Working in a fun environment: the need for social interactions and a relaxed atmosphere at work.

Developing in a reassuring environment: the need for a stable environment, and a long-term job.

Working in a disciplined manner: the need to follow rules and established processes.

Maintaining personal balance: the need to have personal time and a work-life balance.

Personal motivations (why the person wants to work)

Receiving compensation: driven by the concept of the reward at stake.

Having attractive remuneration: the need to earn a high salary and improve net worth.

Achieving success regularly: the need for victories and successes in their activities.

Helping others: the need to provide support and help to other people.

Being recognized by others: the need to be valued and admired by others.

TEST MODEL

Definition of the dimensions

For each definition, we describe below the way to interpret high (7-10), medium (5-6), or low (1-4) scores. We also wanted to clarify the professional context that tends to maximize a person's commitment, to better understand the implications of notable scores (high or low).

Create new things

High score:
This person prefers a liberal working environment where they're free to think outside of the box to find new solutions. They like to innovate, and must be given outlets for their creativity at work. If they're not encouraged to think in this way, they may become frustrated by the restrictions on their own ideas.

To maximize their commitment:
- Let them find their own solutions to the problems they face.
- Encourage them to make suggestions.
- Leave them room to develop their own work and produce new things.

Medium score:
This person is confortable in an environment where there is the possibility of finding creative solutions to problems and to overcome challenges. However, this is not a fundamental source of motivation for them.

Low score:
This person isn't interested in thinking up new ideas or improving existing ones. They will tend to follow existing, proven methods to solve problems. They are unlikely to be motivated to create or develop new activities.

To maximize their commitment:
- Place this person in well-established activities with clear processes.
- Give them everything needed to do their work (speeches, templates, documents, …).
- Avoid asking them to innovate.

TEST MODEL

Excel every day

High score:
This person needs to take on ambitious challenges. They always seek to push themselves. They love to relentlessly push themselves to overcome difficulties. Simple and easy tasks will tend to demotivate them: they must have the bar set high to get the best out of them.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them ambitious goals.
- Allow them to stand out due to their achievements.
- Stimulate them with regular challenges.

Medium score:
This person appreciates having clear challenges to achieve, but this isn't their principal motivation. The majority of their objectives must be realistic.

Low score:
This person sees challenges as a source of needless stress. They don't feel comfortable with difficult objectives. They prefer to stay in their comfort zone to work at their best.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them realistic objectives.
- Avoid putting them under pressure.
- Give them work that adheres to a regular rhythm.

TEST MODEL

Focusing on aesthetics

High score:

It is essential for this person to be avoid to spend time and effort improving the presentation of their work. They need to be encouraged to create new visual styles and to have enough time to polish their work. They particularly like personalising what they do to create a unique style.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them freedom to present their work however they prefer.
- Value the importance of the appearance and aesthetics of their produced work.
- Give them the time to be able to polish their creations.

Medium score:

This person appreciates being given the time to polish the presentation of their work, but it isn't a principle source of motivation for them. They like being able to take part in the visual and aesthetic aspects of work, but at a secondary level.

Low score:

This person prefers to work on the content of their work than the presentation. They don't want to spend time on the visual aspects of their work, they find it a waste of time.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them models to follow.
- Avoid making expectations on the visual presentation of their work.
- Value the content rather than the presentation of their work.

TEST MODEL

Analyse data

High score:

This person is interested in rational and logical data. They need to rely on facts instead of their intuition to make decisions. Being able to drive studies and analyses, and to understand situations based on given information are their main interests.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them a position where they can work with studies and analysis.
- Argue against their ideas using supporting data and numbers.
- Prioritize rational decisions ahead of intuitive ones.

Medium score:

This person likes reasoning using data and bare facts without this being their primary motivation at work. They need to be able to analyse problems using a logical, rigorous approach but also need to be able to listen to their intuition.

Low score:

This person has little interest in science and technology, and prefers an intuitive approach to work. They will be less involved in fields where analysis and reasoning from data is the norm.

To maximize their commitment:
- Avoid giving them positions involving the study of numerical or editorial data.
- Accept that they make decisions based on their intuition.
- Give them room for their subjective views.

TEST MODEL

Meet new people

High score:
This person needs a work environment rich in interpersonal relations. Contact with different people is important for them to be able to thrive in their activities. Effectively, they profit from new professional encounters.

To maximize their commitment:
- They must meet new people on a regular basis.
- They must have a role based on relationships with other people.
- Allow them to regularly exchange ideas with other people.

Medium score:
This person feels that the relational sphere of their work is important, but it isn't a major need of theirs. They simply appreciate being able to produce work that involves other people.

Low score:
This person is content with a small relational circle, and doesn't seek to spend time on interpersonal relations. Developing new relationships is not a priority for them. They prefer to focus on the task rather than interpersonal exchanges.

To maximize their commitment:
- Avoid exposing them to too many relationships in their tasks.
- Let them have stable and established relationships.
- Let them concentrate on their projects instead of relationships.

TEST MODEL

Have clearly defined tasks

High score:
This person needs clearly defined tasks to complete, with a set start and end. They invest themselves in work where they can easily see the results of their efforts. They need to be able to measure the progress of their work.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them precise objectives to achieve.
- Give them specific timeframes and deadlines to adhere to.
- Break down their tasks into multiple short stages.

Medium score:
This person needs a clear overall framework, with clearly stated objectives and processes. However, they are satisfied with big-picture guidance and don't necessarily need their work to be precisely delineated.

Low score:
Working with concrete quantifiable goals is not a priority for this person. They appreciate working on long-term projects. Following a plan that is too strictly defined risks demotivating them.

To maximize their commitment:
- Don't seek to define precisely what they have to do.
- Leave them flexibility within their deadlines.
- Give them long-term objectives and projects.

TEST MODEL

Focusing on quality

High score:
This person needs to present high-quality work where every detail has been checked. They seek to achieve perfection in everything they do. They need to spend time on everything they do to make their work beyond reproach.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them enough time to do the work to their satisfaction.
- Avoid asking them to compromise on quality.
- Value their conscientious character.

Medium score:
This person likes to achieve a high standard of work, and likes to deliver results with as few errors as possible – but this motivation is less important than others, and they can tolerate compromise on the quality for other reasons.

Low score:
This person doesn't focus on quality, and doesn't find that the details are important. Polishing and checking their work is a tiring activity for them, because they don't feel like they're moving forward.

To maximize their commitment:
- Avoid having them finalise their tasks.
- Don't reproach them for occasional mistakes or errors in their work.
- Check their work, or have it checked by others.

TEST MODEL

Having influence

High score:
This person needs to have power and authority when it comes to decisions. Holding a strategic position in an organisation is a source of motivation for them. They appreciate having their point of view valued and considered by others.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them responsibility.
- Let them organise projects that concern them directly.
- Let them have their say on collective decisions.

Medium score:
This person needs to participate and be heard on project organisation. They like having an influence on their work, above all on subjects that concern them directly. They won't be frustrated if they aren't consulted on more general decisions.

Low score:
This person doesn't need to play a key role in decision-making. They appreciate sharing points of view with others, and will accept them. Having power or authority isn't a source of motivation for them.

To maximize their commitment:
- Avoid giving them sole responsibility for a task or project.
- Give them support for decision-making.
- Don't hold them accountable for the outcomes of their decisions on others.

TEST MODEL

Having autonomy

High score:
This person needs the freedom to decide how to do their work. They perform best when they have freedom of action in the managements of tasks. They like being able to decide their own time management.

To maximize their commitment:
- Let them do their work however they want to.
- Let them decide their own time management and organisation.
- Let them choose their own methods and tools at work.

Medium score:
This person appreciates being given the choice of how to do their work. A certain freedom of action can be a source of motivation for them, but equally they need certain structures and limits: they will accept when told to follow a particular process or timeframe.

Low score:
This person needs to work in a structured environment where they can follow clearly defined processes. They appreciate having a workflow process to follow to best perform at work. They like having clearly defined limitations and being told what is expected.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them a process to follow.
- Tell them exactly what is expected of them.
- Regularly ensure that they are clear about what they have to do.

TEST MODEL

Working in a team

High score:

This person needs to work in collaboration with others. Working as part of a team is indispensable for them, and they expect a lot of interactions with others. They appreciate knowing that there is support available if they need it.

To maximize their commitment:
- Encourage communication between team members.
- Share ideas regularly in the group (projects, new ideas…)
- Let them work in a pair.

Medium score:

This person needs to work individually as well as collectively. They like having part of their work to themselves. They can also invest in collective projects, but working as a team is not a particular need for them.

Low score:

This person needs to work alone to be efficient on their tasks and projects. It's possible that they feel constrained and unfocused if they must progress with others. They appreciate their independence in managing their work.

To maximize their commitment:
- Let them progress solo in their work the majority of the time.
- Limit the number of meetings and brainstorming sessions.
- Avoid involving them in collective goals.

TEST MODEL

Having a positive impact on the world

High score:
This person considers it important that their work is beneficial to society in general. They need to be able to perceive the contribution they make beyond the tasks themselves. They are sensitive to discussions about the responsibility of the business and its global mission. They are susceptible to feeling ill at ease in an environment that focuses solely on material goals.

To maximize their commitment:
- Promote the cause that their work contributes to.
- Explain why they are asked to do particular tasks, and the importance these have in the global mission.
- Regularly reaffirm the business' mission.

Medium score:
This person prefers to feel that at least part of their work has a positive impact on society. They're not completely satisfied doing work without understanding the cause it benefits and how they contribute to it – but this is not the heart of their motivation either.

Low score:
This person doesn't need to feel that their work has a positive impact on the world. They focus on the work they are asked to do, but don't worry about the bigger picture: they could happily do the same thing in another context. They're not sensitive about the business' mission.

To maximize their commitment:
- Avoid big speeches, stay concrete in the explanation of their role.
- Don't rely solely on the importance of their mission to justify the expectations of them.
- Focus on the material reality and its opportunities when describing the business.

TEST MODEL

TEST MODEL

Working in a fun environment

High score:

A fun and relaxed working environment allows this person to thrive professionally. They appreciate working in a convivial atmosphere, where it's possible to make jokes without attracting complaints.

To maximize their commitment:
- Have them work in a relaxed and informal atmosphere.
- Avoid environments that feel too serious or impersonal.
- Create a convivial feeling where each person has the opportunity to express themselves.

Medium score:

This person needs a serious atmosphere to manage certain tasks, but a fun environment suits them just as well. The opportunity to have fun at work is appreciated by this person; even though it's not the most important source of motivation for them.

Low score:

This person favours a serious environment, to be able to stay focused on what they need to do. They don't want to work in a noisy or disorganised environment: for them, the workplace must be formal and professional.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them a workplace that is calm and free from distractions.
- Limit relaxed and convivial situations at work.
- Let them stay focused on their work.

TEST MODEL

Working in a reassuring environment

High score:
This person needs to work in a reliable organisation where they can benefit from professional stability. They prefer situations where they have a strong sense of security. They try to project themselves over long timeframes at work. They can feel anxious in unforeseen circumstances, and threatened during changes that are out of their control.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them visibility on their career development pathways.
- Reassure them on the reliability of the organisation.
- Avoid periods of high uncertainty about the future of the organisation.

Medium score:
This person has a moderate need for stability and security at work. They can tolerate a certain level of insecurity without it being a problem for them. They will, however, favour a workplace where they have security and visibility.

Low score:
This person needs a fast-moving environment. They enjoy working in a changing workplace. A constant routine at work is not stimulating for them, and can lead to disengagement. They seek organisations that are forward-looking and that take risks.

To maximize their commitment:
- Give them a workplace in rapid development.
- Favour boldness more than safety in decision-making.
- Avoid static contexts where everything is set in stone.

TEST MODEL

Working in a disciplined environment

High score:
This person needs to work in an environment that encourages a certain level of discipline. They prefer that everyone follows the rules laid down. It's also important for them that everyone is treated in the same way if they break the rules.

To maximize their commitment:
- *Make sure that everyone follows the rules.*
- *Don't leave any room for exceptions.*
- *Formalize what is allowed and forbidden in the organisation.*

Medium score:
This person needs to have general principles to follow, without going as far as having a strict environment. Having rules to follow is important for them, even if it's not a critical prerequisite for their motivation.

Low score:
This person needs an environment that allows them to be free and without too many constraints. They will take it poorly if they find themselves reproached for some transgressions (for example following set hours). They prefer to find themselves in an environment that allows for some rule-bending, instead of following the rules to the letter.

To maximize their commitment:
- Avoid having too many formal rules, and favour implicit agreements.
- Talk about accountability instead of punishments for certain behaviours.
- Tolerate their occasional bending of the rules.

TEST MODEL

Maintaining personal balance

High score:

This person needs time for themselves outside of work and a good work-life balance. They prefer having clear boundaries between their professional and personal lives. They must be able to have other interests outside of work, and disconnect from work when not physically present.

To maximize their commitment:
- Limit their working hours.
- Avoid contacting them outside their working hours.
- Allow them to completely disconnect when they're not working.

Medium score:

This person needs a certain level of work-life balance. They tolerate the demands of their work within the normal timetable. They appreciate being able to completely disconnect themselves from work when at home.

Low score:

This person likes to be devoted to their work. They consider work to be a priority above all other engagements. They can make concessions in their personal life and spend personal time working without negatively impacting their motivation.

To maximize their commitment:
- Let them work even if it's not expected of them.
- Don't reproach their personal investment in their work.
- Be careful not to normalise the behaviour.

TEST MODEL

Being rewarded

High score:

This person needs to be rewarded for their successes. They prefer activities where it's certain they'll be compensated. They are enthused by the idea of having a reward at stake. They are frustrated when their efforts do not result in a tangible reward for them.

To maximize their commitment:
- Link their objectives to personal benefits.
- Show them that their success will lead them to progress in the organisation.
- Give them beneficial treatment when they succeed.

Medium score:

This person prefers activities where they are rewarded. They appreciate being compensated when they make an effort, but it isn't their first motivation for doing a task.

Low score:

This person doesn't expect particular compensation to be invested in their work. They don't give any particular importance to rewards, or at least that's not what pushes them into action.

To maximize their commitment:
- Don't think that rewards by themselves will be enough to maintain their motivation.
- Avoid placing them in a workplace focused on the material.
- Value the meaning of their efforts.

TEST MODEL

Having attractive remuneration

High score:

This person needs the opportunity to earn a lot of money. They are motivated by positions with higher levels of remuneration. They seek to show off their success through the acquisition of material goods. Having a job that doesn't allow them to accumulate these things is likely to discourage them.

To maximize their commitment:
- Allow them to be remunerated above the average level for their role and position
- Link their goals to bonuses.
- Give them a clear understanding about the possibilities for salary increases.

Medium score:

This person likes earning a lot of money. Accumulating money or material goods plays a role in their motivation at work, but it's not the only one. Other needs are more likely to be important to give them a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment at work.

Low score:

The accumulation of money is not a priority for this person: they consider it important, but not important enough to determine their career choices or to lead them to quit a job. They favour the aspects of a job that allow them to develop personally.

To maximize their commitment:
- Delink financial rewards from goals, and prioritize a fixed salary.
- Motivate them with the personal development and satisfaction they can gain in the position.
- Avoid recognizing their contribution in purely financial terms.

TEST MODEL

Seeks competition

High score:
This person is strongly motivated by their ability to regularly achieve victories in their workplace. They get a strong sense of accomplishment from being perceived as a successful person. It's important for them to excel in their field, and to be the best at what they do.

To maximize their commitment:
- Let them compare themselves to others
- Value them as a different and exceptional person in what they do.
- Position them in a competitive workplace.

Medium score:
This person is interested in the opportunity to do better than others in the same role or position as them. They will seek to achieve successes in their workplace, but it's not their primary motivation – they will not seek this above all else

Low score:
This person is more confident in an environment where they are not in continuous competition. It's not important for them to be the best at what they do, they derive their sense of accomplishment in other ways. Their motivation can suffer if they are compared to others too frequently

To maximize their commitment:
- Offer them a workplace that is more collaborative than competitive.
- Avoid comparing them to others.
- Allow them to not always be the best (the right to make mistakes).

TEST MODEL

Helping others

High score:
This person favours activities where they can help others, which gives them a sense of satisfaction and encouragement at work. Being available for their colleagues is a fundamental principle for this person. They prefer activities where the aim is to help others and therefore be available if needed.

To maximize their commitment:
- Develop them in a working environment where altruism is important.
- Entrust them with activities where they help others.
- Encourage them to share their experience, give advice to others…

Medium score:
This person places a certain value on altruism in their career: they appreciate being able to help others in need, but it isn't the most important factor in their motivation.

Low score:
This person doesn't consider helping others as the reason why they engage in an activity, and they don't seek to be altruistic through their actions. They appreciate doing their own tasks and being responsible for themselves, and they are not naturally inclined to help others in their work

To maximize their commitment:
- Allow them to work for themselves before others.
- Avoid asking them to help others too frequently.
- Develop them in a workplace that is more individual.

TEST MODEL

Being recognised by others

High score:
This person needs to feel valued and respected by their organisation. They like being congratulated for their work, and they seek the validation of others. Without this kind of feedback from others, they can feel unappreciated and therefore significantly less motivated.

To maximize their commitment:
- Value their actions and initiatives.
- Give them regular feedback (preferably positive) on their work.
- Make sure that they get on particularly well with their manager.

Medium score:
This person is motivated by having a certain level of recognition by others. However, they are not dependent on receiving positive feedback from others in order to stay motivated.

Low score:
This person doesn't need to be recognized and valued, they are impassive about the opinions of others. They don't worry about what others think about them. This is perhaps due to their confidence in their own abilities, and thus don't seek external validation.

To maximize their commitment:
- Avoid giving too many compliments: staying simple is enough to motivate them.
- Engage them by other means than emotional investment.
- Maintain a certain distance with them, and stay factual in any compliments about them.

TEST MODEL

The fit with activities

DRIVE analyses the attraction for 9 types of activities. These activities were inspired by Belbin's team role model. His research highlighted that these roles define what can be expected of a person at work. They are applicable across all activities. In this way, we can measure the attraction of a person towards different facets of a job.

We have defined 9 roles divided into 3 sections:
- Activities linked to reflection: Design / Assess / Analyse
- Activities linked to action: Organise / Boost / Perfect
- Activities linked to interaction: Coordinate / Promote / Support

These activities allow us to situate a person's centres of interest, and to identify the aspects of work in which they will succeed.

The fit with leadership styles

Each person's relationship with their manager is crucial for their satisfaction and commitment at work. DRIVE provides information in two ways to facilitate this employee-manager relationship:

In the first part, the report describes the ideal working environment for the person. This allows their manager to understand what the person needs in terms of organisation and structure to find their feet in the workplace.

In the second part, DRIVE quantifies the compatibility of people with 6 styles of leadership (according to Goleman's theory). In this way, it's possible to see which leadership style will bring out their best, and which style will tend to frustrate them.

The fit with workplace culture

Finally, we find a report describing the ideal workplace culture for the person. The modeling in this section is inspired by Schwartz's universal value theory. It concerns whether a person has values oriented towards results or relationships. The second axis shows their need for either control or flexibility.

The diagram showing the cultures includes 3 additional indicators to further define the workplace culture in which the person is most likely to thrive.