

- Jana: [00:00](#) So could we start, could we start with you just uh, and your title and the institution that you're associated?
- Jana: [00:07](#) Yes. So my name is Jana Gallus. I am an assistant professor of strategy and behavioral decision making at UCLA Anderson.
- New Speaker: [00:16](#) Well, welcome.
- New Speaker: [00:17](#) Thank you.
- Speaker 1: [00:18](#) So, so, uh, so tell us a little bit about the kind of work that you like to research. What are the things that are topical for you?
- Jana: [00:27](#) Yes, so I've focused most of my research on studying symbolic non-financial incentives. And with that I mean specifically studying awards and the power of recognition when it works and when it might even backfire. And I usually do so using field experiments though where I really randomly assigned the treatment in the field to really find out, disentangle cause and effect and really estimate what the effects are of award schemes and different award schemes. And I sometimes also compliment that with laboratory experiments to understand a little bit more of why awards have the effects that they do have. What are the psychological mechanisms?
- Jana: [01:09](#) Can you help our listeners understand what you mean when you say award scheme?
- Jana: [01:12](#) Yes. Explain that. Yes. So for instance, I mean awards are really intriguing topic because we observe them everywhere in the U S specifically, there is no institution without awards and even beyond the boundaries of single institutions who of course have awards at the national level and state level and in all industries across industries, across public, private and voluntary sector, across countries.
- Jana: [01:41](#) And in fact, world history, we know the *Legion d'Honneur* for instance, right? Which is a famous case of a state honors. And at the same time, the research on awards really started out perhaps 10 years ago only. And it's a challenging research because it's very different, difficult to find out whether the awards actually have any effect because usually we just observe that the best get awards and they stay the best. And so they could have even decreased their performance and still be better than the people you'd compare them to. So it's very difficult. And, and normally award giving institutions are reluctant to allow you to randomly assign who gets the award and who

doesn't. Believe me, I've tried convincing award giving buddies. And that's very difficult because that's like the gold standard, right? Ideally you'd want to randomly assign the treatment who gets a given type of award and who doesn't.

Jana: [02:39](#) And so that when afterwards you compare the different groups, the treatment group with the control group that you are able to tell, they didn't differ on any dimension except for that one group randomly happened to get the award and the other didn't. So if afterwards after the treatment you observe differences and those are statistically significant, it has to be the award because there was no other dimension along which shows.

Jana: [03:00](#) So if you're not getting companies to, to be able to randomize this, how are you teasing out this cause and effect? Or are you lucky enough to find a few now and now?

Jana: [03:10](#) I am. But I can tell you as a PhD student that was more difficult. So my first experiment was really with the community of Wikipedia. Wikipedia, you may know there are millions of people voluntarily contributing to Wikipedia writing those articles, but it goes way beyond that discussing the content, improving on other's work, even establishing the rules behind that community.

Jana: [03:33](#) It's a fascinating community and it's really, there's no money involved, right? People operate under pseudonyms, so you wouldn't even know that in this online community. My pseudonym is let's say economist one, two, three, right? And so there's no offline ramifications from contributing and at the same time that community faces a challenge that many organizations face, which is attrition and newcomer retention of high potentials, for instance. And so that was intriguing to me to observe and I thought that this would be great and excellent in fact, environment to study some Bolick awards because if I were to, we're able to hand out awards there and ideally randomized who gets the award and who doesn't, that would be a purely symbolic award because it's just tied to a pseudonym online, right? That cannot be any career benefits from this. There is no money attached to this. It's purely symbolic.

Jana: [04:30](#) And so then I was lucky enough that the community in particular, this Swiss speaking community of Wikipedia, and they saw promise in this idea because they were having this really pressing problem of newcomer retention and so they were willing to collaborate on this. So I was collaborating with those really intriguing and great individuals going to round

tables with Wikipedia and getting to know them more, becoming like an undercover economist. And then you know, setting up this award scheme, which, which was very much like a national honor scheme and was actually even given from a national sub buddy in Wikipedia to really sounded like a national award. And in fact, even the symbol which I had designed, like I draw drew that that award, it was called the eight or wives' award. It was given from the Swiss national portal with senior community members on board.

- Jana: [05:27](#) And then I would every month give that award to 115 newcomers whom I had randomly selected out of a out of a pool of newcomers who would have all deserved an award. And so then I could, after more than 11 months, I compared to the treatment and the control group who again didn't defer on any dimension, the award was randomly assigned. And I found that the award is purely symbolic recognition in fact increased the retention rate by 20% that's significant.
- Jana: [05:57](#) And there is no money, no money. There's, there's not even a plaque or they only get a little digital bug that you drew around edelweiss.
- Jana: [06:08](#) I wouldn't want to believe that it looked professional.
- Jana: [06:13](#) It was like a flower and their pseudonym would be listed. I mean, I really modeled this award on national award schemes. And so as that, those were my examples. And so, and there was an award webpage and on Wikipedia, one of the millions of pages on Wikipedia would be this Edelweiss award page and their, their pseudonym would be listed. But again, not even my real name, right. It would be some student who chose.
- Jana: [06:42](#) nobody in the world unless I told them that I was economist one, two, three would have any idea that it's me, but it's this component. So what's the underlying? So, so looking at that, have you looked at the why that is so impactful? What is, what is it about the symbolic award that drives that increased engagement? The increased retention component?
- Jana: [07:05](#) Yes. So that is a really interesting question and which is difficult to, it's, it is difficult to untangle in particular using such a field experiment where I could only have two groups at treatment and a control group.
- Jana: [07:21](#) But there is, I do have some anecdotal evidence also from this Wikipedia experiment and then going beyond because that was

as so often, right. You start out with a project are fascinated by that one question and then you get an answer to it, but it opens up a whole different question, which is what good research is about. Yes, it is. It is indeed. It is just a great journey to be on. So yeah. So, but with that data, because the award recipients were able to in fact respond to the award on those Wikipedia pages, some, I would actually even be able, the data on Wikipedia is great because you can even see communication among editors. Right? Which is unheard of in a corporate context where you'd really have to listen in on what people are talking about. And so in this context I would see newcomers who got the award would go on and to thank their mentor for helping them get this Edelweiss award because otherwise they would have never been able to achieve this.

Jana: [08:25](#) And one of them, I love that quote said, you know, in that sense a petal of the Edelweiss belongs to you because without you, I would assume never. Yeah, some people were really, I mean emotions play a big role here even though it's in a digital environment, but it is a real world environment, right? It is just digital. So that future of work. And coming back to your question about the mechanisms behind this effect, there seems to be on the one hand ink, but that's again something that we have to go and do more research on. On the one hand, what seems to be at play as an increased identification as a community member now I am an Edelweiss award recipient. So you have this label and I'm a part of this community.

Tim: [09:08](#) So it's an inclusive thing, right? Pretty much. I don't want, I'm going to use a term that might just be overused, but is there a certain amount of tribal identity that goes with this?

Jana: [09:18](#) Possibly. Yes. So along the lines of identity as being in Wikipedia as they refer to themselves (a wikipedian) that sounds very tribal identity. Like actually a wikipedian and that seems to be on the one hand can be a mechanism and another mechanism is a potentially. And then I did a lab experiment to follow up on that with a coauthor. Um, um, it would be increased confidence as well. And um, so in the Wikipedia case, I found that indeed even the trajectory of their work anecdotally, right. This is um, seems to have shifted also, at least for some where they had started out doing minor corrections, which is an important contribution to Wikipedia, right? I mean checking and correcting mistakes that were done on previous by other authors on articles. But then they would even go on to the next stage, if you will, which is to contribute an own article to Wikipedia, which is really challenging nowadays because almost everything already has an entry and there are people who feel too, yeah,

they're, there are different reasons why it's becoming increasingly challenging to really get a foothold in the community and contributing an article.

- Kurt: [10:36](#) So is that confidence, and again, I know you probably don't have some of the data on this, but is it around self efficacy about their own beliefs of their, their self efficacy or is it just the fact this competence gets increased through because of that component? Hhave you even looked at that?
- Jana: [10:52](#) So I do think so. Here there are new, they are newcomers, right? And it difficult to tell how valuable your contribution is to the community. And so now at this critical early stage where they don't get to have a lot of inflammation about the value that they also adding, they are getting this social recognition for their valuable contributions. And so that is potentially increases or or amplifies their beliefs and their own ability to contribute. And that what they've been doing is actually have you.
- Tim: [11:26](#) Um, so that's, that's a great example of a symbolic recognition, but you've also done some work comparing, um, monetary rewards and non-monetary rewards.
- Jana: [11:36](#) So yes, but that is always a difficult issue because also already.
- Tim: [11:41](#) why, why is it so difficult?
- Jana: [11:43](#) Yes. And so on the one hand, when you run experiments, right? Um, and you start handing out randomly assigning some to the monetary condition and others to the non-monetary condition, that's trouble. It is, it is difficult and you want to prevent contamination, right across conditions. So in this Wikipedia case, it was great because it was this online community and non recipients were unaware of the awards of existence. Now if you start running experiments within non-virtual organizations in particular, um, and start assigning monetary incentives to some and a non-monetary to others, that is highly challenging. You almost have to take it to the lab. I mean, in order to prevent contamination. So I have not yet been able, I would be very interested in studying what happens when you either assign a nonmonetary incentive or that's another really interesting question, is the interaction right between the symbolic components and the pecuniary tangible components off awards.
- Jana: [12:46](#) I have a currently at also at paper with a Sandy Campbell who's now at UC Berkeley, a PhD student and Uri Gneezy at UC San

Diego, where we also look at those different dimensions behind the effects of awards. And we basically outline three main dimensions, which is the tangibility, the social signals. So here I am receiving this award. I seem to be, you know, pro social person or a smart person and the self signal as well. Um, you know,

Tim: [13:16](#) Tell us about that. We've, I've seen work on, uh, tangibility and the importance of, of that, um, what you call it, um, trophy value. It's kind of a lay term, right? And then the social side of course is, is, is big, but tell us about this other self identity.

Jana: [13:32](#) Yes. So this is a very, so I do have an empirical project with Emma Heikenson who recently graduated from the Stockholm school of economics where we look exactly at this effect of awards on beliefs in my own ability.

Jana: [13:48](#) And I can give you a little bit more context here. It is, um, from also the project with Uri and Sandy. Um, we see we also survey a lot of the literature and that self signaling aspect has received fairly little and not yet as much attention as it as it should because also of course also it is very difficult to, to see how these awards impact people's self image as opposed to you can imagine if you get an award as a genius early on in your career or as a math master, that should impact your identity as a person who, who's good at who excels at math or who's smart. And if you see, coming back to the trophy value, if you see that trophy standing on your desk, on top of your desk, one would imagine that this may have a more long lasting impact then just getting a cash transfer onto your bank account, which I think many people might not even notice or remember.

Tim: [14:47](#) ...or where they spent it, it when they did immaterial.

Jana: [14:51](#) Yes, yes.

Kurt: [14:53](#) So that probably plays into some of the Wikipedia component then too, that you were just talking about.

Jana: [14:58](#) indeed. Yes. So that you, exactly, you perceive the work you're doing that you're doing as being important, but it may also even amplify. But that's again, something with a caveat that I can't now disentangle those mechanisms, but it seems plausible that that receiving this Edelweiss might instill this identity also of being a person, a Wikipedia, and who contributes to Wikipedia, who's prosocial and good at it. Yeah.

- Kurt: [15:23](#) So you spoke yesterday at the conference that we're at, um, on a whole different element on schemas and means and the very difference of of, uh, interpersonal incentives versus, you know, more market components, incentives. And I'm, I'm sort of seeing that up very much here. So help us help our listeners understand a little bit about what the paper that you were talking about yesterday in, in, in the presentation.
- Tim: [15:50](#) And you were talking about the, like the difference between the intimate relationships and the work relationships. You're thinking sort of the, yeah, the what Ariely and Heyman referred to as sort of the, the financial, the money market and then the social work.
- Jana: [16:05](#) Exactly. And they in fact also reference the work by one of the coauthors on this project who was an anthropologist now at UCLA and has been at UCLA for a while, Alan Fisk, professor Alan Fiske who has done work in the structures of social life is his book that, um, is about relational model Syria. Go into that in a moment. And on this project is also a graduate student at UCLA Anderson, Joey reef. And in your community side you see at Chicago booth. And, uh, we are interested in studying how the social relationships influence or even govern the effects of incentives and also how incentives influence social relationships. And here it is important to the first point and what I wanted to emphasize yesterday in this talk is that when we talk about incentives, what are incentives, right? Oftentimes people will go immediately to this distinction between monetary incentives and this broad and somehow loosely defined category of non-monetary incentives.
- Jana: [17:16](#) Me included, by the way, when I'm asked what I study, sometimes in particular when talking to economists, I would say I studied nonfinancial incentives, mainly looking at recognition and then you know, then you have to, it becomes a little more difficult. So we try to offer a taxonomy of incentives that we also still working on currently working on a theory conceptual paper. Um, where we, and when we talk about incentives, they're basically the means which would be the substance, if you will, what, what the incentive is. Um, is it material, is it a fungible currency, money nowadays and Amazon gift card or is it immaterial like the recognition that we were talking about at the extremes, there are of course, many sub dimensions here. And then besides those means, which have received a fair bit of attention, um, are the schemes which are as we argue at least as important, that the means in determining what the effects are of those incentives and schemes. You can think about whether the incentive is pre-specified. You announce it ex Unter

whether it's my precise, exactly what you will get if you do X, you do X, you won't get it. Exactly. Or whether it's, whether it's actually exposed, um, an ex post reward that somebody is given after the fact. Discretionary, sorry. Discretionary incentive also. Right. And um, and then there are other schemes that, because this is audio right now, I won't go into detail too much

Tim: [18:55](#)

You could draw it!

Jana: [18:58](#)

well maybe this is an incentive to then look up

Speaker 3: [19:00](#)

pay for it. Definitely look up the paper routes of audacity.

Jana: [19:07](#)

But so the next point besides establishing these schemes and means, so meaning the structure of incentives being the schemes and the means being what the substance of the incentive, um, we then connect that to Alan's work off relational models theory where you have, there's extensive ethnological and experimental research that suggests that across all the, almost all domains of life people use just four relational models, four modes to coordinate. And those are on the one hand communal sharing where people would form and build friendships, um, to create unity. Then there is um, the, the stock if you will contrast would be market pricing where people exchanged goods on the market to achieve proportionality. That is the motive. And then there are two others, um, which are equality matching. So you can think of siblings for instance, or in some respects perhaps co-founders where it's really about achieving equality that everybody gets the same tit for tat also.

Jana: [20:21](#)

And then the fourth is authority ranking where people create ranks and hierarchy for this. Yeah, to achieve. This motive of hierarchy, having a leader and followers. You see it of course prominently in the military. And now we connect this to incentives. And I see how there are congruencies where a given schemes and means are highly congruent with one relational model in particular or another. Um, and that is when we would expect there to be the intended positive effects on effort and performance on the one hand, but also on perhaps reinforcing that relationship. Um, and then when it's an interesting aspect that arises when they're in congruency. So when somebody for instance is in a communal sharing relationship and then starts offering incentives, schemes and means, but also really importantly, not just money, but in fact using those schemes pre-specifying it, being precise about it. Um, and then we would expect that the incentives backfire as you sometimes call it, they have unintended effects and or shift the relational model from communal sharing to market pricing. And so just a simple

thought experiment would be, and also to make that point that it's not just about money is that, you know, I go to campus and I offer to pay workers \$1 per stuffed envelope. Totally fine. Massive prices.

- Kurt: [21:52](#) Completely reasonable. Yes, very, very generous.
- Jana: [22:01](#) Or even 10 cents, right? It would be expected. And here it's also about beliefs, right? It's expected. It's a market pricing transaction. Perfectly fine. That's the relationship that you have with those people. Indeed. Now I return home to my home and I offer my husband \$1 per stuffed envelope to let's say send out my my birthday cards. Right? Yeah. And that would be unthinkable. Crazy. And even if I offered him \$2, it would still be crazy.
- Tim: [22:34](#) Maybe even crazier.
- Jana: [22:36](#) So because it makes it seem more precise. That's another screen by the way. If so, yes. So there, and then when asked the question why that is and the previously the focus has been on, well because you cannot use money in intimate relationships, but then taking it a step further, it would also be perceived as inappropriate or even provoke outrage on the part of my husband or observers.
- Jana: [23:01](#) If I returned home and told my husband, well if you stuff those envelopes, you will get one piece of candy. So even that or or kiss in a serious manner, offering him one kiss per stuffed envelope is also.
- Jana: [23:15](#) That's lovely, but it's a little weird.
- Jana: [23:18](#) Right. And the point being here it seems it's not about the money. So I'm using the right means, which is a kiss in an intimate relationship. But I use the wrong scheme because I make it, I pre, I pre-specify it, I tell him it'll be one case per envelope. Precisely. Perhaps two. This is just in the thought experiment. This trade, I do also did not try this at home of course sample size isn't it's year one.
- Jana: [23:52](#) So yes, but the point being, again, it's not just about the means, you see that I'm using the right means I'm using let's say a candy or a kiss in an intimate relationship, but I'm using the wrong scheme because I pre-announced it. That's the first pre-specify it. I make it very precise. I say it'll be one case per envelope. And then there are others, actually I'm using a piece rate and

individual piece rate, which, and not perhaps a fixed wage. So those are other schemes that we also have in our, but which we are still refining. That's like a major contribution. So it's really an important issue.

- Kurt: [24:25](#) So again to to to build upon that, write it in a matching scheme that would be congruent. It would be, honey, can you help me with this? He does. He, he stuffs the envelopes. And because you haven't precisely said afterwards, but you gave him a kiss because it was a thank you and the end that is a, a fits the scheme.
- Kurt: [24:44](#) Well and works and it's thing. Yes. But you also talked about the timing of some of this, right? So there's a component of the timing that goes into this.
- Jana: [24:53](#) So this is also tying into this second dimension that we have, which is the precision scheme, right? So if I were to do something and immediately I receive a favor in return or, or a rule in return, right. If immediately I get, sometimes even the thing right after specific interactions you may have with a romantic partner, if you immediately received the thing that's kind of for thanks. Yeah, that's a little weird. So it's exactly this precision is not only in terms of the value saying it'll be \$1 per envelope or one kiss per envelope, one candy per envelope, but also that I immediate that I am very precise as to when that will happen or if if the partner in this interaction is doing something and I immediately reciprocate, loosely defined, then that may also be perceived as weird as wanting as transactional.
- Kurt: [25:50](#) Right? Wanting to do then because I gave you, I gave Tim a careful, let's be careful here, not a kiss. I gave you a gift for a thank you for doing something and then immediately he gives me a gift back and it's like now becomes, wait, I was just thanking you, but now becomes like, okay, I give you a gift. You have to give me a gift. And is that that transact, it becomes less of that relationship and more of a transactional component and then you're going, Oh, his gift was \$5 I only gave him two and now I feel bad. Now I have to give him, you know, another gift in order and now it becomes a very interim or strange kind of element.
- Jana: [26:31](#) So that was also this example, which I'm sure many have encountered nowadays where, well, you send somebody a gift card, I won't go into the specifics now, right. But immediately you get a gift card back and even if the value was higher, there's also some, some really interesting research by, uh, Kim, at all 2018 and was already published where they look at Venmo

transactions. Right? And, and, and so that's, that's exactly because those transactions port almost enforce a specific degree of precision. So sometimes even if the value is higher, it's perceived as it antagonizes me antagonize people.

Speaker 1: [27:14](#) Yeah. I had a conversation with Ron Kivetz at Columbia and, uh, he does a lot of work in incentives and he had been been, uh, editing and making, um, edit editing kind of notes on papers, on peer reviewed papers, uh, for several years for a particular journal. And he oftentimes got a thank you note, handwritten thank you note. And then one time the, uh, the editor of the, of the, of the magazine sent him a \$5 gift card to Starbucks and he, he said, I instantly I picked up, I went to my computer and I wrote up the notes saying, I refuse to do anymore work. Oh, he was, he was so insulted by this, by this terribly small, um, you know, non-monetary award to some degree. Uh, that he just said, no, it totally changed the relationship.

Jana: [28:02](#) Yeah. Gift cards are interesting. It's again, this, um, those means also, I mean that, that said though, there are these instances where, which is again, this point about schemes and means, right. Um, that sometimes the schemes may be even more important than the means. That nature, the nature or substance of the incentive. Because we do observe these contexts where people even in intimate relationships use money as a way of signaling their affection. Also, right. Doing to convey affection. Let me use, convey that term of signaling. And so there, there's great research by the Yana Zealand sea laser, probably I'm mispronouncing her name at Princeton, who has looked at these instances where money becomes almost a totally different currency, right? Where it is used to express affection and we see these instances, um, where for weddings in different cultures for childbirths people do give money but it doesn't backfire. And so this, there's

Speaker 1: [29:05](#) social norm, right? [inaudible]

Jana: [29:08](#) so that's the next question. The social norm. What is the social norm exactly? Yeah. That's something we were also discussing. Um, and but it's also to some extent the scheme, how they are used, right? And so they oftentimes are then given ex-post discretion in the expos discretionary manner, which would be our first scheme. Right? And so for instance, your son graduated and you give him a, um, or your daughter a monetary gift, quote unquote, because gift already implies the scheme has an actually a gift. What makes a gift a gift is the question that I raised yesterday too. And that's, that is one component. One answer to that is this ex-post nature. The other one is that we

do make it deliberately imprecise, even when we could be precise and could say, well, I saw you spend X hours studying, I give you now ex-post

Kurt: [30:04](#) like a piece rate per hour, \$10 an hour for all of those hours. So here's your two bottles of wine because you completed this, this much effort,

Jana: [30:13](#) right? Yeah, exactly. So, so that we don't do, and in fact, even before we show up at the party at the, let's say, what are they called, shower baby showers. Like even before I show up, I would stuff put the money into an envelope. So it's clear I did not put as much money into it as I drank

Speaker 3: [30:32](#) and [laughing]

Jana: [30:35](#) this uncoupling in a way. Um, and then oftentimes those envelopes would be in terms of time wise uncoupling. Right? They are opened only after the parties.

Kurt: [30:46](#) Right. You don't know about the yet with the cash in it while people are there and count the cash that taps into the envelope. Why the other as well? Right? So they're sent for four glasses of orange juice and the two pieces of cake that's worth \$15 and you go your your debt.

Jana: [31:05](#) We deliberately do it in a, in a vague fashion that, but the point is that we can use and we often do use money without it backfiring and then there's understanding why that is and which schemes we're applying. When we do that, even in communal sharing relationships.

Kurt: [31:24](#) But again, it forms to what Tim was saying in some of the social norms on that. Cause again, if I go to my mother-in-law's house for Thanksgiving dinner and if I brought, you know, she serves this wonderful dinner and I have an envelope at the end that was pre done, right, it has \$50 in it, that is still not going to be a good way, will not be well received, well recieved, it will not be well received. And so, but the same thing as you said, a baby shower or a nephew's graduation or one of those components, that's perfectly acceptable.

Jana: [31:57](#) Now, if I may follow up on this and say then

Jana: [32:01](#) discussing at length. Um, one interesting question is why that is right. So it is possible, right? That um, this is because of the, let's say the affordances of money. I don't want to, you know,

venture into another discussion, which is basically money forces a given degree of precision that you can say I use this amount but it's not, it's very difficult to use money in an imprecise manner and at the same time, historically also money has been associated with market pricing transactions. Why it wasn't an invented right to be a fungible currency. And so this question of why it is that it can be difficult to use that means monetary means in these communal sharing transaction. Isn't one an interesting one that we also, I'm intrigued by.

- Speaker 3: [32:57](#) Yeah. That is again, you think about that Thanksgiving dinner, I bring over a really nice bottle of wine and that is perfectly acceptable, right? Even if we don't drink that wine at, at Thanksgiving dinner, that is much more acceptable than that. The \$6 that you would have spent on the model. And though to come also back to the schemes, if you told the person who was inviting you, Oh, if you invite me, I will give you a bottle of wine. It's that precision [inaudible]
- Jana: [33:33](#) yeah, that's the prescription saying if you do this, I will give you X and I think it would have also be very different if I said, Hey, this is a \$47 bottle of wine. You know, I spent a lot on this. Very different as opposed to here's a, here's a nice bottle of wine.
- Tim: [33:49](#) So what do you think about, uh, corporate cultures in the corporate world?
- Tim: [33:55](#) We have both a, a financial world. We have a market transaction. We're being paid a paycheck to get to work every day and do certain things. And there's also a, a social, uh, not intimate, but certainly on non-monetary world of favors and relationships. Um, can those co-exist in a way that, uh, that the, that the social side could be, I'm gonna use the word exploited. I don't mean it in a negative way, but could that be exploited to use non-monetary rewards and means to say, uh, thank you for doing a good job on this work, spending the weekend working on this project. You went above and beyond. Uh, and, and keep that out of the monetary world in a successful way.
- Jana: [34:44](#) Actually coming to my previous research on recognition and interest in longstanding interested in social recognition, which is exactly that in corporate contexts that people, and it's also how those two projects, the schemes and means and the previous work on recognition come together that there is some relational, their relational motives and motivations. Why we come to work, right? We like to work with peers and also be, um, seen and be received their recognition, social recognition from, from those peers who can judge our work, right? Who,

who may be experts in their field. And so perhaps getting to hear from them that what I've been doing is something they consider to be of great value can be a very enforced, a very important signal to me as well. And I think do you observe definitely in so many corporate contexts that they are using recognition schemes, different recognition schemes.

Jana: [35:43](#) And there are so many different dimensions when we talk about recognition and awards, right? It's that much more complex than just looking at in some regards than just at a monetary sum. Right. And but there again, there are different schemes of using those, but with recognition you have recognition that it depends on the audience. Who's in the audience. Um, right. Who sees that I get the this award. It depends on how scarce the recognition is being kept. It depends on who gives the recognition. And this is in fact something that this paper with Sandy Campbell and Orrick Neesy that I was mentioning earlier where we are really looking at this systematically. Another component here is the selection process. Yes. What was that? Was I being nominated by peers? Was it based on a self nomination? Where was there no nomination and just some comity. And what about the status of the giver and that comity that also influences again, the, the value of the award.

Jana: [36:42](#) So, so there are many different dimensions. You do see that companies use one or the other. But I would very much like to see, and that's what I'm doing with co co with companies, many different companies in fact, for instance also with NASA, a field experiment where we are trying to disentangle the effects of these different forms of providing recognition because they can have different effects of course, depending on, for instance, who is the audience. Yes. But we need to find out more, um, how that, how those different types of, of of recognition schemes impact behavior. I do think that many companies still in particular companies still, um, like to tie some tangible components to awards, um, in the belief that there has to be some material, quote unquote value to these awards. So it either has to be a check that comes with the award or, or some, some gift card indeed some, some expensive gift.

Jana: [37:43](#) But you know, if it's well designed at least that, which is in a very different context. But this Wikipedia experiment already and there are other great, um, experiments also that would suggest that even purely symbolic recognition can have its effect. But when you look at in the field it's you don't find formalized recognition schemes that are, you know, on a regular basis institutionalized that are symbolic. Usually this

symbolic recognition happens in a more informal context where peers would spontaneously say you did a great job.

- Kurt: [38:18](#) Very interesting cause I've done some work with field sales people again to this component, that market pricing kind of element. But they won this top recognition and the thing that we found in our interviews with them is
- Kurt: [38:36](#) yes they love the trip that they won and all of that, but the real thing was on their business cards and on they got a special name badge that said that had that symbolic component on it that they, when they were interacting with customers it said that you were part of this President's Club, kind of like the Edelweiss [inaudible]. That's exactly what it was. And that for them was this really meaningful component. Yes, they liked the, they liked the element of having the, the tangible component with it. But really that was this element of saying, Hey I am, I am a whatever the name of the award was. I am that winner for this year. And that drove a lot of the conversations that we had in the assessment of it.
- Jana: [39:22](#) So interesting. And presumably even if that name tag did not have any implications for their next sales deals, they would still appreciate.
- Kurt: [39:34](#) It's the element of, of I'm working with Tim who was a peer of mine and I have it and he, you know, it's this, going back to some of the pieces that you talked about, about that social [inaudible] and the self and probably elements of that that I could see playing out in within.
- Jana: [39:48](#) That is a wonderful quote by Adam Smith who also has had, you know, humans want to be praised and praise worthy. So that's another component. Whether you think something, I still want to investigate that you, there's some research and whether you were praiseworthy, right, and how, how does that shape the effects of an award? Um, and how do those sales self and social signals, again, interact? We,
- Tim: [40:15](#) we need like another five hours. I would just love this, but, uh, one of the things that we always talk about with behavioral groups is music. We always like to talk about things that are, uh, in your life musically. Uh, the kinds of instruments that you play, the number of concerts that you've given in the last year or so. I was just dreaming about that, but why maybe what's on your playlist might be something. And we know that you have, you have children and so I'm kind of curious about how has your,

have your playlist changed with the heavy, you know, triplets around

- Jana: [40:57](#) creating problems for the algorithm said Spotify stay like wait a second. So we observed that you sometimes listen to classical music, but then randomly all of a sudden you turn on children's music, baby shark and baby Mozart or whatever. Yeah. So I had a triplets. In fact last year we had triplets and two boys and a girl. The girl is Adda and Nico and Kian are the two boys. And I like to joke, that was my year in the tails because of all those unlikely events happen. Some others, which that would easily lead into the next five day conversation. I will restrict myself the a, so that said, I will take that as an excuse for not having done it, for not having given any concerts lately with the exception of in front of my children of course. And we like to dance and sing in front of our children. So that's a nice way of offsetting the dinner. We are in a very regimented schedule to increase efficiency and yes. So I did play the piano, but I'm very poor at it, I would say compared to others. And so I hope that at some point I get back to it. I don't have a piano currently at home, so I don't practice. My playlist is an eclectic assemblage of different songs that
- Tim: [42:27](#) well. Okay. So you're a pianist and you mentioned classical music. Are there any particular classical performers or composers that you, that you love that you love to listen to?
- Jana: [42:37](#) Yeah, no, under dog. So I'm afraid that I could now make your listeners curious about, I had my lung, lung period where I would listen to lung, lung over and over again. But uh, it really, it, it varies greatly.
- Kurt: [42:54](#) Okay. Do you listen to music when you work or do you need silence?
- Jana: [42:59](#) I do like to listen to classical music while I work.
- Kurt: [43:03](#) So that's an interesting component. We've asked many of our guests that, and Tim and I have different views on this and there's, there's some science, there's some neuroscience
- Tim: [43:12](#) that has indicated there are some, there are some music, there's some contexts where music is more beneficial than others. Yes. But you, so how, tell tell us more about the kind of classical music that you listen to when you're working it.

Jana: [43:27](#) Well, I have not analyzed it. It's a, it's a more soothing thing and sometimes I will admit I just rely on Spotify playlist. So this is now a good advertisement. There is talking about music one band that I, it's now mostly 2014 15 but I still very much like them, which is Milky Chance. That is a German band. Yes. Yes. So yeah, and I'm originally from Germany. That has nothing really to do, but I very quite quite like their music, stolen dance for instance. And so, um,

Tim: [44:04](#) that's, that's great.

Kurt: [44:05](#) Well Jana thank you so much. This has been as, as Tim said, we could go on for five more hours on this, but we'll come back at some other point. Uh, you know, in a year or two, we'll come back and we'll have another touch. But thank you so much. Thank you. Thank you.