

MANAGING BEHAVIOR VS. LEADING PEOPLE

Evidence-Based Lessons to & Sustain an Injury-Free Work Culture

By E. Scott Geller

FOR BEST PRACTICES IN OSH, it is beneficial to distinguish between safety management and safety leadership: managing behavior versus leading people. This article reveals 17 evidence-based leadership lessons that can bring the best out of a talented and committed workforce. Managers are assigned their position and influence safe productivity by holding people accountable for their behaviors and performance outcomes. On the other hand, any employee, including managers, can be a leader by inspiring others to be self-accountable for OSH and go beyond the call of duty for human welfare and well-being. These employees enjoy their work, as do the members of their work team, and they try to do their best for the OSH of the organization that employs them. They work in an empowering and enriching culture that activates and supports the best qualities of themselves and others. How can such a work culture be cultivated? The answer is self-motivated OSH leadership from everyone in the work culture.

Leadership vs. Management

Although many safety professionals use the terms “leadership” and “management” interchangeably, the author has distinguished between these terms in several publications (Geller, 1998, 2000, 2001c, 2002, 2016a, 2020). Simply put, managers hold people accountable while leaders inspire people to be self-accountable. In other words, managers motivate *other*-directed behavior, typically with monetary rewards for desirable behavior and penalties for undesirable behavior, whereas leaders establish interpersonal relations that enable or facilitate self-accountability or *self*-directed behavior. This could involve the personal application of positive or negative consequences, which have been shown to be effective in self-management (Watson & Tharp, 1997).

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Managers are assigned their position and hold people accountable with extrinsic or external consequences or contingencies.
- Leaders inspire people to be self-accountable by promoting and supporting individual choice, perceived competence and interdependency.
- This article elucidates 17 leadership principles that anyone can practice to cultivate an injury-free culture.

Leaders also help people interpret instructions that direct behavior and consequences that motivate behavior in ways that activate perceptions of choice, personal control, ownership and empowerment. The 17 leadership lessons explicated in this article operationalize these critical person-states and suggest ways to achieve and support them.

Behavior-based safety (BBS) is essentially a behavior management process, whereby workers develop a checklist of safe behaviors to perform and at-risk behaviors to avoid performing on a particular job (e.g., Geller, 1997, 2001a, 2001b; Krause et al., 1996). Subsequently, the workers use this behavioral checklist to observe and record their coworkers’ safe and at-risk behaviors during brief peer-to-peer observation sessions. Later, the results of these behavioral observations are entered into a data analysis program for objective evaluation and group comparisons.

When the BBS process includes the recommended one-to-one behavioral feedback conversation between the observer and the worker who was observed, some of the leadership qualities identified here are needed for optimal impact. In other words, BBS interventions that omit this interpersonal feedback component are simply managing behavior, whereas an effective peer-to-peer feedback or coaching process benefits human dynamics beyond behavior. The author has termed this process “people-based safety” (Geller, 2005, 2008), which involves the leadership qualities detailed in this article.

The following distinctions between managers and leaders are not intended to belittle management, nor to suggest that less management is needed. We perform many of our daily behaviors because someone, such as a manager or a supervisor, is holding us accountable, often by controlling relevant and meaningful consequences. However, we are often in situations where no one but ourselves can control the relevant consequences. In addition, some readily available motivating consequences are linked to undesirable behavior, such as when recreational and risky behavior offers more soon, certain and positive consequences than the more productive and safer alternative.

By applying the following 17 evidence-based leadership principles, safety leaders can help people delay immediate and certain behavioral consequences for more remote and more important outcomes. These leadership lessons are relevant for em-

BEHAVIOR LE Achieve Workplace

employees at all levels of an organization. In fact, most people have opportunities to lead others, even if their direct or indirect control of motivating contingencies is minimal. Managers become leaders whenever they use more than extrinsic consequences, such as rewards or penalties, to bring out the best in people.

1. Leaders Help People Appreciate Intrinsic Consequences

The magnitude, frequency, quality and immediacy of *extrinsic* (external or extra) consequences under managers' control determine their potential impact on employees' work behavior and performance outcomes (Goltz & Hietaperto, 2003). On the other hand, leaders help people appreciate the *intrinsic* consequences of a task. What are intrinsic consequences?

There has been much confusion in the literature and in public discourse with regard to the term "intrinsic." Many authors discuss "intrinsic motivation" as if it comes from inside a person as a cognitive mechanism or disposition (e.g., Deci, 1975; Deci & Ryan, 1985). In contrast, behavioral scientists do not put "intrinsic" inside people where it cannot be observed, measured and directly influenced. Instead, they define intrinsic as "inherent to the ongoing task." Intrinsically motivated behavior leads naturally to external consequences that support the behavior (as supportive feedback) or provide information useful for improving the behavior (as corrective feedback).

Most athletic behavior, for example, is followed by natural or intrinsic consequences that provide supportive or corrective behavioral feedback. These consequences, intrinsic to the task, inform athletes immediately about their current skill at swinging a golf club, shooting a basketball or throwing a football. The performers see the effect or outcome of their behavior. Such intrinsic consequences can motivate participants to keep trying, often without receiving an additional extrinsic consequence.

Extrinsic consequences are extra consequences (i.e., rewards, penalties) added to the situation to direct, support or redirect a target behavior. For example, when professors offer students extra credit points for volunteering to participate in an experiment, they are using extrinsic consequences to motivate behavior. While there is no disagreement in the research literature on the meaning of "extrinsic," there has been substantial confusion regarding whether such consequences help or hinder

self-motivation and related performance (e.g., Cameron & Pierce, 1994; Carr et al., 1995; Flora, 1990; Kohn, 1993).

While managers are quick to motivate with the extrinsic consequences under their control, leaders focus first on consequences that are intrinsic to a task and under the participants' personal control. Sometimes people do not see the intrinsic positive consequences of their work behavior; or if they do perceive those natural consequences, they might not appreciate them. Leaders help people believe their particular job assignment is important, which makes intrinsic consequences invaluable as indicators of personal success and directives for continuous improvement. Thus, before giving employees an extrinsic financial bonus for achieving a certain level of excellence, leaders point out the beneficial consequences that result naturally from the desirable behavior observed: "Thank you. Your daily actively caring reminders to use appropriate PPE will someday save someone from a serious injury."

2. Leaders Focus on the Process

Managers for OSH are typically held accountable for outcome numbers; in turn, they use those outcome numbers to motivate others. The outcome numbers for OSH are based on the relatively rare occurrence of an injury. Such numbers are reactive, target the avoidance of failure, and are not diagnostic for injury prevention. In contrast, safety leaders recognize employees for performing proactive process activities that can prevent harm and lower injury rates. When employees feel appreciated for the proactive safety-related behaviors they perform in a work process, they develop a sense of personal responsibility to contribute to the ongoing improvement of OSH.

Our culture seemingly promotes and supports an outcome perspective. Starting in kindergarten, the focal point of our schooling is often on the final result rather than on the process by which the students achieve that outcome. For example, students in the author's university classes appear obsessed with their grades, and they apparently lose sight of the important long-term purpose of their education. Rather than attending to the critical-thinking and problem-solving processes related to a particular theory or research method and results, students memorize the facts and formulae needed to perform well on a

multiple-choice exam. Moreover, rather than helping students think creatively about a set of circumstances and explore various solutions to a problem, many teachers just lecture. Final grades are calculated and received; students receive the short-term outcome/consequence.

Safety leaders hold people accountable for performing process-related behaviors that contribute to preventing personal harm and lowering injury rates. When people see improvement in the process numbers, they feel rewarded for their efforts and develop a sense of personal responsibility for continued contribution and never-ending improvement. By focusing on the process, leaders help people perceive the personal control they have over the ongoing, intrinsic consequences of their jobs.

A process-focused leader asks, "How did they do that?" rather than, "What did they do?" It is not about an organization's total recordable injury rate, but about what employees are doing or not doing every day to keep people safe from an unintentional injury. When an outcome such as removing an environmental hazard or substituting at-risk behavior with safe behavior is viewed as an achievement of a successful process activity or "small win" (Weick, 1984), people's sense of personal control is enhanced. They see the outcome as hard-won through their ongoing involvement in the OSH process.

With continued support of people's attention to the process, leaders can continuously improve the quality and the safety of production. Thus, while managers track outcomes, leaders activate and support discussions of the ongoing processes needed to reach optimal results. Conversations about an ongoing process keep people aware of what they need to continue doing to maintain control of the intrinsic and extrinsic consequences within their "circle of influence" (Covey, 1991).

3. Leaders Rely on the Competence Motive

Humans are naturally motivated to learn, to discover, to explore possibilities, to understand what is going on and to be in personal control of worthwhile consequences (Kaplan, 2000; White, 1959). In other words, people want to participate competently at achieving worthwhile goals.

How can competence be improved? Does practice make perfect? Practice increases fluency, but without appropriate feedback, simply repeating a behavior does not improve it. The most powerful feedback is that which is intrinsic or natural to the task. Such feedback is most immediate and most valid. Leaders help people see the power of natural/intrinsic consequences for increasing their competence (leadership lesson 1).

Of course, intrinsic consequences are often not readily available nor sufficient, especially for safety-related behavior. Therefore, behavior-based feedback needs to be delivered extrinsically through:

- a. one-on-one coaching conversations (Geller, 1995, 2001c, 2020);
- b. periodic performance appraisals that focus on behavior (Drake, 1997; Geller, 2002); and
- c. group data graphs that display a work team's level of safe performance, sometimes comparing the injury-prevention behaviors of one work group with those of another (Williams & Geller, 2000).

4. Leaders Make Feedback a Positive Experience

Sometimes BBS consultants discuss behavioral feedback as if it were naturally accepted and applied. They seem to imply that involving employees in the development of a behavioral checklist and posting safe behavior percentages are all that is needed to maintain an effective BBS feedback process. It is presumed that

people look forward to receiving feedback about their performance. This might be the case with the posting of group percentages of safe behavior, but posting such percentages for individuals can promote a win/lose mindset and stifle teamwork or win/win interdependency. Relatedly, many companies avoid the critical one-to-one feedback conversation component of BBS.

How do you feel when someone asks, "Can I give you some feedback?" Do you expect a positive experience? Most people do not expect to enjoy an interpersonal feedback session. Based on a lifetime of experience, people often link feedback with criticism or a reprimand rather than praise. Therefore, leaders do not expect people to look forward to receiving one-to-one behavioral feedback.

Leaders understand the importance of the context of a feedback conversation. The nature of the interpersonal conversation or group discussion regarding the results of a behavioral observation session determines whether this process is appreciated, supported and sustained. Leaders also consider that many people will not look forward to their initial feedback meeting because they expect to be corrected, perhaps even criticized. They realize that "constructive criticism" is an oxymoron (i.e., criticism is neither appreciated nor informative and is rarely constructive). Therefore, leaders try to make their first feedback session with an individual positive and constructive. They might give only positive or supportive feedback without reference to a behavioral deficiency or a need for improvement.

5. Leaders Educate Before Training

A college or university class is considered "education," even "higher education," but consultants who teach are usually considered "trainers." Colleges and universities have "centers for educational excellence"; industries have "training centers." Thus, it seems colleges and universities educate, while industries train. What is the difference?

Many people use these terms interchangeably, as if they have the same meaning. However, education and training are not the same. Do you want your teenager to receive "sex education" or "sex training?" Are you satisfied if your teenager receives only "driver education," or do you prefer some "training" with that education?

A focus on training reflects the mission to teach participants exactly what they need to do to complete a particular task effectively and safely. Behavior-based feedback is usually necessary for effective training. With a training mindset, however, managers can come across as demanding a certain activity because "I say so," rather than because "This is the best way to do it."

Education involves explaining the principles or the rationale behind a particular set of procedures, thereby enabling listeners to understand why they need to follow a particular protocol. With proper education, people can develop personal commitment and responsibility for an action plan, rather than doing something a certain way because a manager is holding them accountable.

Pertinent education of principles can also inspire creative customization and ownership. In other words, when leaders offer a reasonable rationale and relevant examples rather than only a policy directive, individuals or work teams can select procedures that best fit their situation. In the process of refining a set of procedures, people assume ownership and follow through from a self-motivated or personal-responsibility perspective. This is obviously a powerful way to increase worker satisfaction, enrich an organizational culture, and inspire engagement in achieving and sustaining an injury-free workplace.

6. Leaders Elevate Self-Efficacy & Response-Efficacy

Two belief-states influence the impact of a training session. Specifically, *self-efficacy* refers to the belief that the participant can handle the procedures taught in a training session. Having *response-efficacy* means the person believes that learning and following the training protocol or process are useful in accomplishing a particular objective or purpose (Bandura, 1997). This usually requires education: an explanation of the relevant theory or rationale and perhaps the presentation of pertinent outcome data.

These two belief-states have applications and ramifications beyond training. For example, both of these belief-states must be addressed and enhanced for goal setting to be most effective (Geller, 2002, 2018, 2020), as well as for scare tactics to motivate appropriate behavior change (Hale & Dillard, 1995; Witte & Allen, 2000). Whenever you want to persuade an individual or group to participate in a certain activity, it is critical to develop sufficient self-efficacy and response-efficacy.

How much efficacy is enough? Only the recipients of an assignment can answer that crucial question. Therefore, leaders ask, “Do you believe you can do this?” and “Do you believe this assignment is relevant to our mission to prevent injuries and will help to achieve our vision of an injury-free workplace?” A “no” response to either of these questions leads to the open-ended question, “What would it take to elevate your belief that you can perform this task effectively and safely (self-efficacy), and that your performance will help to cultivate an injury-free workplace (response-efficacy)?”

7. Leaders Inspire Empowerment

In the management literature, empowerment typically refers to delegating authority or responsibility (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). When managers say, “I empower you,” they usually mean, “Get ‘er done.” In contrast, leaders first determine whether the empowered person feels empowered—“Can you handle the additional responsibility?” This involves asking three questions to assess self-efficacy, response-efficacy and outcome expectancy.

As introduced in the preceding leadership lesson, answering “yes” to the empowerment question, “Can you do it?” reflects self-efficacy, acquired through training. A “yes” answer to the empowerment question, “Will it work?” reflects response-efficacy, obtained through education. The third empowerment-assessment question, “Is it worth it?” targets motivation. In other words, this question asks whether the expected outcome is worth the effort. People are motivated to perform an empowerment-relevant behavior when they believe their behavior will achieve a positive consequence or avoid a negative consequence.

8. Leaders Set SMARTS Goals

To make goal setting empowering, the author proposes the following SMARTS acronym: specific; motivational; attainable; relevant; trackable; and shared. The last “s” is added because sharing a behavioral goal with others enlists social support. Friends and colleagues can provide interpersonal reminders and behavioral support to facilitate goal achievement. Related to the previous leadership lesson, a SMARTS goal is empowering because it is motivational (“It’s worth it”), attainable (“I can do it”) and relevant (“It will work”).

Although goal setting and empowerment precede the occurrence of goal-directed behavior, each reflects the impact

of motivational consequences. Feeling empowered means the individual has answered “yes” to the motivation question, “Is it worth it?” and is activated to work toward achieving a given goal. If the goal setting was SMARTS, the “m” for motivational implicates one or more consequences. Feeling empowered implies the individual is ready or activated to work toward achieving a designated goal, which reflects the potential achievement of a particular consequence. Similarly, a self-motivated individual is anticipating or has received a consequence (e.g., recognition, supportive feedback) that supports self-directed rather than other-directed behavior.

9. Leaders Listen First

Under pressure to get a job done, managers often speak first and listen to concerns or complaints later. This is a reasonable strategy for efficient action. Managers are challenged to make things happen according to an established plan, and this requires specific directives and a method of consequence control to motivate compliance. After describing an action plan and an accountability system, managers answer questions from workers who want to accomplish their assignment correctly.

In contrast, safety leaders take time to learn the other person’s perspective before offering direction, advice or support. Empathic listening is key to diagnosing a situation from the participant’s perspective before promoting change for continuous improvement. Although this approach to getting a job done is not most efficient, it is usually most effective. It requires patience and a communication approach that asks pertinent questions before giving advice. In this way, an individual or work team can personalize an action plan or process for achieving a particular goal or outcome, and thereby feel a sense of ownership.

10. Leaders Promote Ownership

When managers direct by edict, they might get efficient transfer of an action plan, but they might also stifle internal motivation or self-accountability (Aronson, 1999). Behaviors performed to comply with a prescribed standard, policy or mandate are other-directed (Watson & Tharp, 1997). Such behaviors are performed to satisfy someone else, and they are likely to cease when compliance cannot be monitored. This happens, for example, when employees use PPE at work but not at home for similar or even riskier tasks.

When the development of an action plan involves those who are expected to carry out that plan, ownership for both the process and the outcome can develop. In other words, when leaders give a reasonable rationale for a desired outcome, then offer opportunities for participants to customize methods for achieving that outcome, they facilitate a special kind of motivation. This motivation comes from within the individual, and it is commonly referred to as internal or self-directed motivation. In this person-state, people participate because they want to, not because they have to. They feel empowered to do the best they can for their work team and their organization (Barling, 2014; Geller, 2016b, 2020).

11. Leaders Encourage Choice

The advantages of giving people the perception of personal choice or a sense of autonomy is well documented (e.g., Geller, 2001b, 2016b; Langer, 1989; Steiner, 1970). Having more opportunities for personal choice increases both self-motivation and a sense of personal control. Moreover, the greater people’s sense

of personal control, the more likely they are to participate in efforts to improve OSH and the overall welfare of others. In other words, people who perceive personal control are more likely to actively care for the safety and well-being of other people (Geller, 2001a, 2001b, 2018).

Langer (1989) reported a series of field studies that support the value of giving people opportunities to make choices. In one seminal research project, Langer and Rodin (1976, 1977) gave one group of elderly nursing home residents the opportunity to care for a houseplant and to make minor decisions about their daily routines. A year and a half later, these residents were more cheerful, alert and active than a similar group of residents who were not given those choices. These residents were also given a houseplant, but the nurses took care of it. The most remarkable result of this choice manipulation was that after a year and a half, less than half as many of the residents in the choice group had died as those in the other group.

Similarly, Olsen et al. (2011) observed significantly more compliance with behavioral self-monitoring when the participants chose their target behavior. Moreover, Ludwig and Geller (1997) only observed response generalization (or a spillover effect) among pizza deliverers who had selected their percent-safe goal for complete stopping at a particular intersection. Specifically, while all drivers achieved the 75% complete-stopping goal, only those drivers who had participated in selecting that goal evidenced an increase in both buckling their seat belt and signaling a right turn when leaving the store parking lot.

Langer (1989) suggests we can become more aware of personal control and enhance our self-motivation by becoming more mindful of our numerous choices during ordinary activities. For example, we choose when to get up in the morning, what to wear, what to eat for breakfast and how to travel to work. The routine might seem familiar and similar every morning, and therefore it is easy to become mindless about personal control. Langer advises us to consider that there are many alternatives for each set of behaviors, and we willingly select an option. This mindset can increase our sense of autonomy, personal control and self-motivation.

Thus, besides giving people more choices, leaders can help them become more aware of how they already shape their days. This can increase their perception of personal control and their self-motivation. Helping people see their options can also give them pause to consider other alternatives that could be more useful, productive and safe. Hence, when leaders help others become more observant of their everyday choices, they not only increase people's awareness of personal control, they also set the occasion for more effective and safe decision-making.

12. Leaders Set Expectations

Most voluntary behavior at a worksite starts as other-directed, meaning it is performed because someone asked for it (Watson & Tharp, 1997). Such behavior remains other-directed or advances to a self-directed or self-motivated state (Geller, 2001a, 2001b, 2016b) depending to some extent on how the behavior was requested. A behavioral request that comes across as a top-down mandate or an absolute will likely stay other-directed. This is often the management approach to

When leaders help others become more observant of their everyday choices, they not only increase people's awareness of personal control, they also set the occasion for more effective and safe decision-making.

OSH, as illustrated by regulatory compliance issues and the once-common slogan, "Safety is a condition of employment."

Leaders can facilitate a shift from other-directed to self-directed behavior by initiating a process or action plan with an expectation rather than a mandate (Foti & Boyd, 2016). What is the difference? Both approaches specify desirable outcomes and establish the need for certain behaviors as process activities, but an expectation infers some choice. While an expectation implies that a certain outcome is anticipated, there is room for individual and group decision-making regarding achievement methods and procedures.

When people realize what is expected of them and perceive some personal control in how to reach a designated goal, they are more likely to own the process and transition from an other-directed to a self-directed mindset.

13. Leaders Look Beyond the Outcome Numbers

Managers focus on the outcome numbers; in safety, that means injury records and workers' compensation costs. When the author has discussed a particular application of psychological science for OSH with managers or supervisors, he has inevitably been asked the question, "What's the ROI or the return on our investment?" Managers want to know how much the new process will cost and how long it will take for the numbers (as in total recordable injury rate) to improve. This outcome-focused approach to OSH is likely inspired by the popular management slogan, "You can only manage what you can measure."

Leaders certainly appreciate the need to hold people accountable with numbers, but they also understand that you cannot measure everything (Deming, 1991, 1992). There are some things you do and ask others to do because it is simply the right thing to do. For example, leaders believe it is important to increase self-esteem, self-efficacy, personal control, optimism and a sense of belonging throughout a work culture.

The author discussed those five intangibles as person-states that influence people's tendency to actively care or go beyond the call of duty for the safety and well-being of others (Geller, 1996, 1998, 2001a, 2001b). Leaders do things on a regular basis to inspire these positive dispositions in others, but they do not worry about measuring the impact of these intangibles on OSH. They have faith in the intuitive and research-supported theory that promoting these person-states is important. Relatedly, people take vitamin pills and nutritional supplements regularly without noticing any measurable effects.

Now and then, it is a good idea to assess whether certain actions are influencing people's person-states or subjective feelings in a desirable direction. This can be done informally through personal interviews, unaided by a scorecard. Moreover, certain interpersonal and group activities are beneficial, but their effects are not typically measured. For example, genuine one-to-one recognition increases interpersonal trust and feelings of importance; behavior-based goal setting builds feelings of empowerment; and group celebrations facilitate a sense of belonging and interdependency (Geller, 1996, 2001b, 2020). Leaders perform and support these sorts of activities without expecting to see an immediate change in profits, production or

workplace injuries. They do not need a monitoring scheme to motivate their attempts to help people feel valued and part of an interdependent team effort. Such self-motivated leadership inspires self-motivation in others.

14. Leaders Make More Distinctions Between People

We often give people global labels, such as student, patient, homosexual, union representative, safety professional, athlete or homeless person. Each label activates a particular image and a set of individual characteristics. The generic category we give people influences how we view them, judge them and react to their communication with us. This is the kind of confirmation bias or “premature cognitive commitment” (Langer, 1989) that leads to stereotyping, prejudice, interpersonal conflict and sometimes even hate crimes.

To combat prejudice, educational efforts teach people to consider everyone equal and to stop putting people into different categories. To decrease prejudice and its accompanying problems, we are told to stop discriminating. However, categorizing people and things according to discernable characteristics is a natural learning process; it is how we come to know and understand people and their surroundings.

Indeed, the key to reducing prejudice is to make more rather than fewer distinctions between people. This is a key principle of humanism (Maslow, 1943, 1954) and the foundation of humanistic therapy (Rogers, 1942). When people become more attentive to the many differences among individuals and how those differences vary according to the environment or an interpersonal context, it becomes increasingly difficult to place people in generic categories. It becomes impossible to view people and their behavior as black or white, normal or abnormal, masculine or feminine, productive or nonproductive.

Leaders put people’s attributes and skills on a continuum. They do not consider employees good or bad, skilled or unskilled, safe or unsafe; they observe workers’ behavior to assess a particular degree of competence or skill. Moreover, an employee’s quality level for a certain attribute can fluctuate dramatically from one situation to the next. Accordingly, leaders make more distinctions between people, and make fewer global generalizations or stereotypes. This enables objective and fair linkages between people’s talents and their job assignments, and fosters the kind of interpersonal trust needed for an enriching total safety culture (Geller, 1995, 2000).

15. Leaders Express Gratitude

Considerable research has demonstrated that perceived gratitude, the person-state of feeling grateful, significantly increases subjective well-being or life satisfaction (e.g., Emmons & Crumpler, 2000; Wood et al., 2010). More specifically, research has shown that feeling and expressing gratitude enhances positive emotions and activates a sense of interpersonal belonging while decreasing distress and depression (Emmons, 2007; Emmons & McCullough, 2003; Seligman et al., 2005). In fact, people are more likely to help others—perform prosocial or actively caring behavior—when they feel grateful (Emmons & Mishra, 2011).

How can we increase perceptions of gratitude and thereby experience the beneficial effects of this person-state? You know the answer: Offer sincere statements of personal appreciation for another individual’s desirable behavior. Indeed, when you thank someone for following a safe operating procedure and setting a safe example for others, you increase the probability of

that behavior recurring, and you enhance subjective well-being.

When one person thanks another for an observed desirable behavior, who experiences a boost in subjective well-being? Obviously, the individual who receives the recognition appreciates the positive interpersonal exchange and likely experiences a boost in subjective well-being, competence and self-motivation, and feels a positive connection with the benefactor, the person who expressed gratitude.

How does an expression of gratitude affect the benefactor? You know the answer because you have been there and experienced the reality of the expression, “It’s better to give than to receive.” Giving recognition or showing appreciation enhances the benefactor’s person-state of gratefulness and subjective well-being. For example, seminal research by Seligman et al. (2005) demonstrated a potent way to increase personal gratitude and subjective well-being: Write someone a thank-you letter, then read it to that individual.

16. Leaders Promote & Support Self-Transcendence

The hierarchy of needs proposed by humanist Maslow (1943) is likely the most recognized theory of human motivation. Maslow presumed that categories of needs are arranged hierarchically, and individuals do not attempt to satisfy needs at one stage or level until the needs at the lower stages are satisfied.

People first attempt to fulfill their physiological needs: to have enough food, water, shelter and sleep for basic survival. After satisfying these needs, people want to feel safe and secure. The need for social acceptance is next: the desire to have friends and feel a sense of interpersonal belonging. When these needs are gratified, human concern shifts to self-esteem: the belief of worthiness or personal success that typically results from the approval of others. At the top of this hierarchy is the need for self-actualization: the belief that one has reached their full potential. However, Maslow (1971) revised his renowned hierarchy of needs shortly before his death in 1970, and he placed self-transcendence at the top, above self-actualization.

Self-transcendence implies going beyond self-interest to actively care for others. It may seem intuitive that various self needs require satisfaction before self-transcendent or actively caring behavior is likely to occur. However, individuals do perform various actively caring behaviors before satisfying all their personal needs. Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela and Mother Teresa are notable examples.

Note that safety leaders reach the top of Maslow’s revised hierarchy of needs every time they act on behalf of another person’s safety or health. In addition, doing this helps to satisfy a leader’s lower-level needs that never get completely satiated: social acceptance, self-esteem and self-actualization. Consider this: Achieving self-transcendence is the ultimate outcome and is self-reinforcing because it naturally satisfies other high-level needs. The more employees who experience and teach others the reciprocal positive effects of self-transcendent OSH behavior, the closer they come to achieving an injury-free workplace.

When climbing Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, individuals reach need levels that implicate consequences linked to self-motivation. For example, consequences that boost one’s sense of relatedness with others satisfy the need for acceptance or social support, and consequences that certify a person’s belief in personal competence to accomplish worthwhile work are associated with self-esteem and self-actualization. In other words, behavioral consequences that foster perceptions of personal competence, interpersonal belongingness or perceived

choice also facilitate self-motivation, and, thus, are likely to have more long-term impact than consequences unrelated to these personal beliefs or person-states. Moreover, it is intuitive that reaching beyond self needs to help others stay safe and healthy can contribute to satisfying one's needs for social acceptance and self-esteem, and even self-actualization.

17. Leaders Build & Maintain Momentum

It is quite fitting to end an article on OSH leadership with a brief discussion of momentum. In fact, when the leadership principles reviewed here are applied, momentum is usually initiated and maintained. Three interdependent "a" words are relevant to increasing and maintaining momentum: achievement of the participants, atmosphere of the culture, and attitude of the leaders.

Achievement of the Participants

Success inspires more success. Good performance is more likely after a run of successful behaviors than failures. In sports, a succession of winning plays or points scored creates momentum (Mace et al., 1992). Knowing the score creates excitement if the team is performing well or a sense of urgency if a loss is inevitable without improved performance. This kind of observable and equitable appraisal gives the team motivational feedback. It improves subsequent performance and increases the probability of more success and continued momentum. Leaders consider and report ongoing objective and impartial measures of performance that enable regular evaluation of progress and motivate employees to participate in an achievement-oriented process.

Atmosphere of the Culture

In sports, home field advantage means having fans available to help initiate and sustain momentum. By packing the stands and cheering loudly, fans create an atmosphere that can motivate the home team to try harder. Similarly, the atmosphere surrounding a new safety improvement intervention or process influences the quantity and quality of participation. Are the employees optimistic about the new initiative, or do they view the process as just another "flavor of the month"? Do the workers trust management to give adequate support to a long-term OSH intervention, or is this just another quick-fix reaction that will be replaced soon by another priority?

When the injury prevention process of a work team is shared optimistically with the entire workforce, people are likely to buy in and do what it takes to support the safety mission. When this happens, interpersonal trust and morale build, along with a winning spirit or mindset. People do not fear failure but expect to succeed, and this atmosphere fuels more achievement from the process team.

Attitude of the Leaders

The coach of an athletic team can make or break momentum. Coaches initiate and support momentum by helping both individuals and the team recognize their accomplishments. This starts with a clear statement of a vision and behavior-based SMARTS goals to get there. Then the coach enthusiastically holds individuals and the team accountable for achieving those goals.

A positive coach can even help members of a losing team feel better about themselves and give momentum a chance. The key is to find pockets of excellence to acknowledge, and thereby boost self-confidence and self-efficacy. Then specific corrective feedback will be accepted as key to becoming more competent

and building more momentum. It does little good for leaders to reprimand individuals or teams for poor performance, unless they also provide a method the participants can use to perform better. Of course, leaders explain and support an improvement method with confidence, commitment and enthusiasm.

For momentum to build and continue, support means more than providing necessary resources. It means looking for success stories to recognize and celebrate. This helps to develop feelings of achievement among those directly involved (the team), as well as an optimistic atmosphere from others (the work culture).

Conclusion

This article discusses the critical role of leadership in the achievement and maintenance of an injury-free work culture by illustrating 17 evidence-based qualities of effective leaders, some of which imply real-world distinctions between management (i.e., managing behavior) and leadership (i.e., leading people). In most organizations, people are assigned certain management roles and, for the most part, these individuals are necessary for OSH success. However, everyone in an organization can be a leader and influence more safety success and culture enrichment by empowering others and bringing out the best in a workforce. In other words, leaders come from all ranks of an organization and use more than consequence control to empower others to be self-motivated and to actively care for the safety and welfare of their coworkers.

To be sure, the distinctions between management and leadership discussed here can be readily operationalized into specific behaviors relevant to individuals in a particular work setting. However, these are guidelines rather than prescriptions; they are generic research-based principles rather than behavioral directives. They can be applied today to enrich a culture and improve the quality and safety of work life, while also increasing the quantity and quality of daily safe production. Relatively few individuals are assigned to manage, but anyone can choose to lead. **PSJ**

References

- Aronson, E. (1999). The power of self-persuasion. *American Psychologist*, 54(11), 875-884. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0088188>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman and Co.
- Barling, J. (2014). *The science of leadership: Lessons from research for organizational leaders*. Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, J. & Pierce, W.D. (1994). Reinforcement, reward and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(3), 363-423. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543064003363>
- Carr, C., Mawhinney, T., Dickinson, A. & Pearlstein, R. (1995). Punished by rewards? A behavioral perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 8(2), 125-140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.1995.tb00675.x>
- Conger, J.A. & Kanungo, R.N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471-482. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258093>
- Covey, S.R. (1991). *Principle centered leadership*. Simon and Schuster.
- Deci, E.L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. Plenum.
- Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.
- Deming, W.E. (1991, May). *Quality, productivity and competitive position* [Workshop]. Quality Enhancement Seminars Inc., Los Angeles, CA.
- Deming, W.E. (1992, Jan.). *Instituting Dr. Deming's methods for management of productivity and quality* [Workshop]. Quality Enhancement Seminars Inc., Los Angeles, CA.
- Drake, J.D. (1997). *Performance appraisal: One more time*. Crisp Publications Inc.

E. Scott Geller, Ph.D., alumni distinguished professor and director for the Center for Applied Behavior Systems at Virginia Tech, has just completed his 51st year as a faculty member in the Department of Psychology at Virginia Tech. He is a cofounder and senior partner of Safety Performance Solutions Inc. He has authored many books, chapters, magazine articles, training manuals and more than 300 research articles addressing the development and evaluation of behavior-focused interventions to improve human welfare. He and his daughter, Krista S. Geller cofounded the teaching and consulting firm GellerAC4P Inc. (www.ac4p.org) to spread actively caring for people principles and applications worldwide. Geller is a professional member of ASSP's Star Valley Chapter.

- Emmons, R.A. (2007). Gratitude, subjective well-being and the brain. In M. Eid & R.J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective well-being* (pp. 469-489). Guilford Press.
- Emmons, R.A. & Crumpler, C.A. (2000). Gratitude as a human strength: Appraising the evidence. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 19*(1), 56-69. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2000.19.1.56>
- Emmons, R.A. & McCullough, M.E. (2003). Counting blessings versus burdens: Experimental studies of gratitude and subjective well-being in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(2), 377-389. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.2.377>
- Emmons, R.A. & Mishra, A. (2011). Why gratitude enhances well-being: What we know, what we need to know. In K.M. Sheldon, T.B. Kashdan & M.F. Steger (Eds.), *Designing positive psychology: Taking stock and moving forward* (pp. 248-262). Oxford University Press.
- Flora, S.R. (1990). Undermining intrinsic interest from the standpoint of a behaviorist. *The Psychological Record, 40*(3), 323-346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03399544>
- Foti, R.J. & Boyd, K.B. (2016). Leadership, followership and AC4P. In E.S. Geller (Ed.), *Applied psychology: Actively caring for people* (pp. 273-294). Cambridge University Press.
- Geller, E.S. (1995, July). Safety coaching: Key to achieving a total safety culture. *Professional Safety, 40*(7), 16-22.
- Geller, E.S. (1996). *The psychology of safety: How to improve behaviors and attitudes on the job*. The Chilton Book Co.
- Geller, E.S. (1997). *Practical behavior-based safety: Step-by-step methods to improve your workplace*. J.J. Keller and Associates Inc.
- Geller, E.S. (1998). *Beyond safety accountability: How to increase personal responsibility*. J.J. Keller and Associates Inc.
- Geller, E.S. (2000, May). Ten leadership qualities for a total safety culture: Safety management is not enough. *Professional Safety, 45*(5), 38-41.
- Geller, E.S. (2001a). Behavior-based safety in industry: Realizing the large-scale potential of psychology to promote human welfare. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 10*, 87-105.
- Geller, E.S. (2001b). *The psychology of safety handbook*. CRC Press.
- Geller, E.S. (2001c). *Working safe: How to help people actively care for health and safety* (2nd ed.). Lewis Publishers.
- Geller, E.S. (2002). *The participation factor: How to increase involvement in occupational safety*. ASSP.
- Geller, E.S. (2005). *People-based safety: The source*. Coastal Training and Technologies Corp.
- Geller, E.S. (2008). *Leading people-based safety: Enriching your culture*. Coastal Training and Technologies Corp.
- Geller, E.S. (2016a, June). Leadership lessons for OSH professionals: How to nurture engagement for injury prevention. *Professional Safety, 61*(6), 63-71.
- Geller, E.S. (2016b). The psychology of self-motivation. In E.S. Geller (Ed.), *Applied psychology: Actively caring for people* (pp. 83-118). Cambridge University Press.
- Geller, E.S. (2018). *Life lessons from psychological science: How to bring the best out of yourself and others*. Macmillan.
- Geller, E.S. (2020). *Life lessons from psychological science: Understanding and improving interpersonal dynamics*. Cognella Academic Publishers.
- Goltz, S. & Hietaperto, A. (2003). Using the operant and strategic contingencies models of power to understand resistance to change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 22*(3), 3-22. https://doi.org/10.1300/J075v22n03_02
- Hale, J.L. & Dillard, J.P. (1995). Fear appeals in health promotion campaigns: Too much, too little or just right? In E. Maibach and R.L. Parrott (Eds.), *Designing health messages: Approaches from communication theory and public health practice* (pp. 65-80). Sage Publications Inc.
- Kaplan, S. (2000). New ways to promote proenvironmental behavior: Human nature and environmentally responsible behavior. *Journal of Social Issues, 56*(3), 491-508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00180>
- Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise and other bribes*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Krause, T.R., Hidley, J.H. & Hodson, S.J. (1996). *The behavior-based safety process: Managing improvement for an injury-free culture* (2nd ed.). Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Langer, E.J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. Perseus Books.
- Langer, E.J. & Rodin, J. (1976). The effects of enhanced personal responsibility for the aged: A field experiment in an industrial setting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34* (2), 191-198. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.2.191>
- Langer, E.J. & Rodin, J. (1977). Long-term effects of a control-relevant intervention among the institutionalized aged. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(12), 897-902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.35.12.897>
- Ludwig, T.D. & Geller, E.S. (1997). Assigned versus participative goal setting and response generalization: Managing injury control among professional pizza deliverers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(2), 253-261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.253>
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370-396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Maslow, A.H. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature*. Viking.
- Mace, F.C., Lalli, J.S., Shea, M.C. & Nevin, J.A. (1992). Behavioral momentum in college basketball. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 25*(3), 657-663. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.1992.25-657>
- Olson, R., Schmidt, S., Winkler, C. & Wipfli, B. (2011). The effects of target behavior choice and self-management skills training on compliance with behavioral self-monitoring. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 25*(5), 319-324. <https://doi.org/10.4278/ajhp.090421-QUAN-143>
- Rogers, C. (1942). *Counseling and psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Seligman, M.E.P., Steen, T.A., Park, N. & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist, 60*(5), 410-421. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.5.410>
- Steiner, I.D. (1970). Perceived freedom. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 5). Academic Press.
- Watson, D.L. & Tharp, R.G. (1997). *Self-directed behavior: Self-modification for personal adjustment* (7th ed.). Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- White, R.W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66*(5), 297-333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040934>
- Williams, J.H. & Geller, E.S. (2000). Behavior-based intervention for occupational safety: Critical impact of social comparison feedback. *Journal of Safety Research, 31*(3), 135-142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4375\(00\)00030-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4375(00)00030-X)
- Weick, K.E. (1984). Small wins: Redefining the scale of social problems. *American Psychologist, 39*(1), 40-49. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.39.1.40>
- Witte, K. & Allen, M. (2000). A meta-analysis of fear appeals: Implication for effective public health campaigns. *Health Education and Behavior, 27*(5), 591-615. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019810002700506>
- Wood, A.M., Froh, J.J. & Geraghty, A.W.A. (2010). Gratitude and well-being: A review and theoretical integration. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*(7), 890-905. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.03.005>

Cite this article

Geller, E.S. (2022, April). Managing behavior vs. leading people: Evidence-based lessons to achieve and sustain an injury-free workplace. *Professional Safety, 67*(4), 30-37.