UNIT 7  MOTIVATION
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7.1  INTRODUCTION

Managers often ask two questions about motivation of employees: "What motivates people?" and "How can I motivate people?" Implicit in the first question is the notion that motivation derives from the person, or is a state that originates within that person. In the second question, the emphasis is placed on what the managers can do to elicit motivation.

In one sense, the first question is broader than and includes the second question. By asking about the source of motivation one is asking for an understanding or explanation of what is known psychologically about the tendency of people to expend their energies. By asking how to motivate others, a manager is assuming (a) that one can affect another's behaviour and (b) that one's effect can override other effects on another's behaviour.

Motivation as a factor inflecting human behaviour started getting attention from the beginning of nineteenth century. It became an area of increasing importance
after second world war to fulfill the imperative need of more and more production. Motivation, concerned with all importance human inputs, assumes crucial importance when a system is confronted with challenges of development or any crisis situation.

Who is responsible for motivation? Is the individual worker expected to provide his own motivation or is motivation a function of management? Answers to these questions are not simple. Some authors see motivation as being contained within the individual. Others view it arising from sources outside the individual. It is now evident that both the points of view cannot be considered independent of each other especially in the organizational context. Motivation in an organization encompasses forces both within and external to the individual member.

### 7.2 EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT OF MOTIVATION

Motivation is a difficult but a very challenging concept in understanding and changing human behaviour. The study of motivation attracted some attention in the early part of the 19th century. However, it became popular only with the work of William McDougal and Sigmund Freud, and later with the development of theories of learning, it came to occupy a central position. When psychology began its application to the field of education and industry, it became evident that the motivation as a process is highly significant in teaching and learning and for that matter doing any work and achieving excellence. However, inspite of the relevance and popularity of the concept and its theories, there seems to be a lot of ambiguity around motivation and its applicability till McClelland published his work way back in 1953. McClelland's unique contribution lies in the fact that he extended the relevance of motivation from the theoretical understanding and limited application in animal laboratories or context dependent studies, to a general applicability in 'industry, education and a wide range of areas and contexts. McClelland not only identified on particular motive, i.e., the achievement motive, but also developed a general theory of motivation and method of measuring the same. For him, motivation consisted in the learned anticipation of a goal as arousing positive or negative emotional reaction. Goals previously known to arouse pleasure are approached and those that produce pain are avoided. Later, his associate Atkinson (1954) reaffirmed the same by explaining motivation in terms of strength of its readiness and two kinds of perception of situations: (a) the expectancies of goal-attainment and (b) the incentive value one attaches to the goal presented. He proposed the equation around motivation = F (Mx Ex I).

McClelland not only identified the achievement motive but also developed a method for measuring it. The historical circumstances and the social situation after the devastation of the second world war, demanded the emphasis on motive for achievement. Even today, the significance of the role of achievement motivation cannot be denied. McClelland's ideas generated the ever increasing significance of the entrepreneurial roles in society vis-a-vis organization, especially so in economic development.

A year later Maslow (1954) developed a new concept of motivation and proposed a hierarchical order in the structure of human needs. In the Maslowian paradigm five needs identified were: Psychological, safety/security, social, self-esteem and self-actualization. This theory is based on assumption of internal-motivation--the needs, wants and desires which exist within an individual and influence the person by determining his thoughts, which in turn lead to his/her behaviour in a particular situation. For example, a student who desires good grades in a course will consider how he can fulfill the requirements for the grade. After he/she has thought it through, his behaviour will probably reflect what he perceives to be the
correct behaviour to receive the grade-paying attention in class, taking good notes, studying hard, doing outside reading, writing good terms papers and so forth. This example points out several factors concerning internal motivation. First a person's specific needs, wants, and desires are uniquely his or hers. Other person may attempt to influence him, but in the end, the decision concerning what he/himself wants or needs rests with him alone. The student's parents or friends may want him/her to work for the desired grade, but the student's decision to work for it is determined solely by his wants or needs. Second, a person's needs, wants and desires are also unique because they are determined by the factors that form his/her personality, a biological and psychological make-up and his/her learning experiences. If the student has received desired grade in similar courses before, it is reasonable for him to believe that by applying himself/herself as he/she had previously, he/she stands a good chance for getting the desired grade. But the needs and desires differ for another student who has made poor grades in foundation courses and wants only to pass an advance "required" course. Finally, a person may perceive his/her needs and wants differently at different times. Studying may be neglected while socialising is emphasised during holidays and weekends. But when time for final exams are near, studying will become the topmost priority.

The underlying assumption of Malow's theory is that individual motivation depends on urgency and potency of the needs. As the lower order needs are satisfied, the higher order needs take precedence over them. (The detailed picture of Maslow's theory will be provided later).

Herzberg (1959) sought a different answer to motivation and propounded a bi-model theory of motivators and hygienes. The motivators reflected the internal dynamics residing within the individual and hygienes reflect the power of contextual factors like money, work conditions, etc. which shape the motivation of the individual. Herzberg's theory is especially relevant as he is one of the pioneers to discuss effectiveness of the domain of motivation within organizations and other work spheres.

Herzberg's motivations described human beings relationship to what he does, that is the content of the job. And the hygienes on the other hand reflect the situation in which he does the job.

Quite contrary to the assumption of Maslow and Herzberg, McGregor (1967) worked entirely on different hypothesis and sought an answer to motivation in the nature of man. Theory X and Y reflect McGregor's efforts in understanding human motivation vis-a-vis the nature of the person. 'Theory X' and 'Theory Y' are quite different, almost poles apart and have different sets of assumptions. Theory X assumes the human being as lazy, idle and indolent. Such a person is averse to any effort and would like to avoid any kind of responsibility. They prefer being directed and avoid being independent decision maker. They only work under direct control and threat of punishment. McGregor puts forth the assumption of the animal nature prevalent in the mankind. The theory 'Y' is in contradiction with theory 'X'. Theory 'Y' projects the human being as a creative, open-minded and energetic person for whom the work is as pleasant and natural as play. Responsibility is a welcome concept and such people seek self-regulatory behaviour. The higher order needs of Maslow are dominant in such people.

Argyris (1962, 64) shifted attention from individual to organizations and blames the latter for the designs they have. He claimed that the stiffness of the organizational designs impose such a tight control on human creativity that it thwarts the development and maturity of the individual. He clearly exposes as to how a worker is expected to act in immature ways in 'the organization and is purposively kept away from maturing himself as an adult. The worker is given minimal control over the environment and is encouraged to be passive, dependent
and subordinate. Argyris, however, was of the opinion that the tendency to keep people restricted to limited maturity is inbuilt into the very nature of the formal organization. These organizations have been created basically to achieve certain goals or objectives. It is this very strategy, which becomes the priority and not the people. Argyris concludes by saying that the concept of formal organization leads to assumption about human nature that are incompatible with the proper development of maturity in human personality. He finds a definite incongruity between the needs of a mature personality and formal organization.

**Likert** (1961-1967) deliberated on different styles of management and their impact on employee's motivation and behaviour. He depicted the management styles on a continuum starting from system-I to system-IV. The argument behind Likert's approach lives in the reality that effectiveness of management style depends on manager's as well as organizations need and strategy to include participation of subordinates in decision making and action orientation starting from the emphasis on arousal of fear and threat of punishment in harnessing the individual worker to work activities and a denial of any kind of participation for choosing a pathway to a complete confidence, and trust in the subordinates competence and establishment of a wide spread involvement in decision making process, Likert brings forth a theory of motivation which is comprehensive and action orientated. The journey from system-I which projects the organization as a task orientated, highly structured and authoritarian establishment to system-VI which is completely democratic, people oriented and emphasising a participative management style, interspersed with two intermediate stages system two and three where Likert shows definitive relations between superior and subordinates with varying trust, and confidence, Likert has shown the significance of manager's orientation (style) affecting the behaviour (participation-involvement) the employees and in the ultimate run the effectiveness of organizational behaviour.

The difference that one can observe in the realm of motivation is that how researchers, practitioners and theorists have dealt with the paradigm. In the initial stages, the psychologist was concerned with finding the different factors their levels and intensity and how they can be fitted to explain human behaviour or even shape it. People like McDougal, Maslow, Skinner, Frued, and others reported the domain specificity of needs and motives and emphasised their ability to fill in the vacuum in human life. However, when it was felt that context and content both are important for deliberation on the topic of motivation, people like Herzberg, McClelland, Argyris and many others brought the notice to the fact that there are many complexities around the concept and without addressing those complexities, the understanding of motivation remains incomplete as well as inadequate. Thus the later sixties and early seventies we observe the deliberations take a different approach. The differences between academicians and practitioners become evident and a constant struggle to reduce that difference begins with added efforts to bring the motivational constructs closer to application and create a facilitatory ground for human as well as organizational development. Many a time one encounters the crisis and a dearth of new ideas leading to distraction from realistic purposes and strategies. Hence we have seen the multi repetitions and erroneous conclusions being arrived at by many researchers devoid of any possibility of application.

**Victor Vroom** (1964) looked at effective motivation not in terms of either fixed set of human needs or as uniform configuration of external motivations. He emphasised the instrumental and operational contents and understanding of one's skill/abilities in the reality. Vroom related the concept of motivation to reward . and need satisfaction and contended that people are motivated to do things which they feel have a high probability of leading to rewards they value. According to Vroom. when a worker says he is satisfied with his job, in fact he is, saying that
his needs are satisfied. The individual motivation thus depends on "particular wed as reflect in the goals toward which that person is moving and his understanding is that the usefulness of his productivity oriented behaviour reflects as a path of attainment of these goals.

Schein (1969) gave a composite approach towards understanding human motivation in the organizational context. He talks about four sets of assumptions regarding people in organizations. These are: (a) rational economic man (b) social man (c) self actualizing man, and (d) complex man. The rational economic man is basically motivated by economic incentive. He is a passive agent to be manipulated, motivated and controlled by organization". His emotional nature is irrational, it is the job of the organization to neutralize and control his feelings.

The social man is driven by the assumption derived from Hawthorne studies and the socio-technical systems. This type of employee is motivated by interpersonal relations and is more responsive to social forces. The self actualizing man is constantly struggling with the alienation arising from the stiff and rigid industrial culture and its control mechanism. There is an inherent need and creative urge to give expressions to his thoughts for self actualization vis-a-vis performance.

The assumption of the complex man arises from the belief that none of the theories can exclusively explain the why of human behaviour. Man is much more complex than being just a rational economic, social or self-actualising person. Man's complex abilities of learning perceptions, performance, etc. makes it an impossible as well as unwieldy proposition to comprehend the human behaviour in an encapsulated form.

In the late sixties and the period thereafter, the concept of motivation expanded its horizon and in that process lost some of its sharp focus on human needs but in no way lost the significance for organizations and their members. The emphasis shifted from study of motivational notions ns to such fields as job enrichment, quality of work life, meaning of work, organizational climate and to a very broad spectrum of organizational culture. There has been a paradigm shift in understanding the relevance and contribution of motivation vis-a-vis organizations. The enmeshing of individual identity with his motivation is being given a wider but well defined boundaries of social/organizational context. This may have caused some haziness in understanding and application of the concept. The psychological understanding likes to put a premium of individual, however, the organizational strategist would like to focus on the collective. There is a continuous struggle to find a target-do we take the individual perspective on the collective. Both have their advantages and disadvantages, a middle path is always confusing and the common ground for understanding the motivation is still elusive. It is, however, important that there must be participation in the efforts to address the issues and one can come to some time relevant conclusion. Since each organization is unique in its boundaries and contextual parameters, so is the unique individual. The concept of motivation and its complexities help us to understand and create a unique relationship of the two.

7.3 SOME IMPORTANT THEORIES OF MOTIVATION IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

Maslow's theory is based on the following proposition:

1. Man's needs are arranged in a hierarchy of importance, ranging from the lowest need-physiological-to safety, love (social), esteem (ego), and finally, self-actualization. This hierarchy of "prepotency" or urgency of satisfaction means that the most urgent need will monopolize the individual's attention
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while less prepotent needs are minimized, even forgotten. Maslow's hierarchy is shown as Figure 1.

![Maslow's Hierarchy of Need Theory](image)

Figure 1: Maslow's Hierarchy of Need Theory

Maslow viewed an individual's motivation as a predetermined order of needs. Physiological needs are the most imperative ones, but the psychological need for self-actualisation is highly important to each individual.

2. Man is continually wanting, therefore, all needs are never fully satisfied. As soon as one need is satisfied, its prepotency diminishes, and another need emerges to replace it. This is never-ending process, which serves to motivate man to strive to satisfy his needs.

3. Once a need is fairly well satisfied, it no longer motivated behaviour. Man is then motivated by the next higher level of unsatisfied need, but he can be motivated in a reverse direction if a lower-level need is threatened.

4. The needs are interdependent and overlapping. Since one need does not disappear when another emerges, all needs tend to be partially satisfied in each area.

**Physiological Needs**

As mentioned before, physiological needs must be satisfied in order to sustain life. Included on this level are air, food, water, sleep, elimination, mating, and temperature regulation. These needs take precedence over other needs when frustrated. A person who lacks food, safety, love and esteem would probably seek food more strongly than anything else. When a man is dominated by a certain need, his thoughts for the future also tend to change. For an extremely cold man, his ideal can be defined as a place that is warm. He may think he would be perfectly happy and never want anything else if he were guaranteed warmth for the rest of his life. He defines life itself in terms of warmth. Everything else is considered unimportant.

All physiological needs have certain characteristics in common: (1) they are relatively independent of each other; (2) they can usually be identified with a specific location in the body (for example, thirst can be identified with the throat); (3) in an affluent society such as ours, these needs are unusual rather than typical motivators; (4) in order to remain satisfied, they must be repeatedly within relatively short periods or time (a person's drive oxygen must be met at least twelve times a minute); and (5) they require some conscious provision for their future satisfaction.

**Safety Needs**

When physiological needs are relatively well satisfied, needs at the next higher level emerge to dominate man's behaviour. These are the safety needs, expressed as desires for protection against danger, threat, and deprivation. What has been
said of the physiological needs also holds true for these needs. Since every industrial employee is at least partially dependent upon his employer, safety needs, expressed as a desire for security, can also be very important. Desire for security takes the form of quests for economic security (saving account and a job with tenure and protection); preference for the familiar rather than the unfamiliar; desire for an orderly, predictable world; and knowledge of the limit of acceptable behaviour.

Social Needs

When physiological and safety needs are relatively satisfied, social needs become the major motivation of man's behaviour. It is a feeling of accomplishment and attainment, and of being satisfied with one's self.

Classical theorists may disagree with some of the concepts of need theory since they think that money is the primary motivator of the worker, and contend that the worker is motivated primarily by intrinsic rewards which are provided by the worker himself. These theories possibly may be reconciled in a way suggested by McDermd. Charles D. McDermind has suggested that money could be used to help satisfy all the need level in Maslow's hierarchy of need theory. According to McDermid the initial meanings of money is to satisfy the basic physiological needs-food, clothing, and shelter. Only after these fundamental needs have been relatively well satisfied can any major amount of money be directed toward the satisfaction of other needs.

McDermid saw safety needs expressed as a need of financial security. Money serves as insurance against physiological want and against the high costs and financial drain of poor health, old age, and unemployment. Money can also assist in the satisfaction of the social needs but only indirectly. For example, membership in a country club can be purchased, but there is no guarantee that friendships will result. Perhaps, the major benefit of money at the social level is that it relieves the individual from the continuous demand of his physiological and safety needs so that he can pursue his social wants.

In the case of the esteem needs, McDermid saw money becoming the measure of status and achievement. An individual not only measures others on the basis of their financial ability, but also his self-concept depends on the amount of money he makes. To many persons, their salary is an indication of their worth.

Man will aspire for a place in his own group and will strive to achieve it. Attaining such a place will become the most important thing in the world to him. Inspite of knowing of these needs, managers often incorrectly assume that these needs and the resulting informal organizations represent a threat to the objectives of the formal organization. By fearing hostility and opposition from informal organizations, some managers attempt to direct and control employee relationships in ways that frustrate the nature groupings of their employees. These employees may then react by being resistant, antagonistic, and uncooperative. This behaviour is often a consequence and not a cause of the manager's actions, as will be seen later in this chapter.

Esteem Needs

Esteem or ego needs-next above the lower-level needs of physiological, safety and social-do not become motivators until the lower-level needs have been reasonably satisfied. Unlike the lower-level needs, these are rarely completely satisfied. But once these needs become important to an individual, he will continually seek satisfaction of them. The typical industrial organizations, however, offers only limited opportunities for the satisfaction of these needs at the lower levels of employment.
Esteem needs consist of both self-esteem and the esteem of others. Self-esteem needs include self-confidence, self-respect, competence, achievement, independence, and freedom. Satisfaction of these needs leads to feelings of worth, capability, strength, and being useful and necessary in the world. Frustrating them leads to feelings of inferiority, weakness, and helplessness. Need relating to the esteem of others include needs for status, recognition, appreciation, importance, and prestige.

**Self-Actualisation Needs**

The emergence of self-actualisation needs comes only after all other needs have been satisfied. Self-actualisation needs include the realisation of one's potentialities, self-fulfillment, continued self-development, and being creative in the broadest sense of that term. Even if all lower-level needs are satisfied, a person may experience discontent and restlessness if he is not doing what he is best suited for. What a person has a potential to be, he or she must seek.

The form that these needs takes varies from person to person just as a human personalities vary. Self-actualisation needs can be satisfied through one or any combination of athletics, politics, academics, the family, religion, hobbies or business. A creative state is involved in the sense that creativeness is realising one's own potential to the fullest degree, whatever it buys, but also for that it means in judging one's self and others. Money has little importance for McDermid at the level of self-actualisation needs. It can merely remove the obstacle to self-actualisation. Here money is used to satisfy other needs so that the individual is free to devote his time and efforts to realising the potential.

**McClelland's Achievement Motive**

Another important concept for motivation theory which is based on forces which exist within a person is the achievement motive. In his research on achievement, David McClelland found that businessman, scientists, and professionals all rate above average on achievement motivation. An achievement-motivated businessman does not desire profits solely for the sake of profits. He wants them because he has a strong desire for achievement. Profits are simply a measure of how well the job was done. They are not necessarily that goal itself.

McClelland suggests that a person with high needs for achievement possesses certain characteristics which allow him to work better in some situation than in others. These characteristics of an achiever are:

1. He prefers tasks in which he can take personal responsibility for the outcome.
2. He sets moderate goals and takes "calculated risks".
3. He wants precise feedback concerning his successes or failures.
4. He prefers co-workers who are competent despite his personal feelings about them.

In evaluating these characteristics it can be inferred that without personal responsibility, the achiever would get little personal satisfaction for the successful achievement or the goal. By taking on only moderately difficult tasks, he is most likely to maximize his sense of personal satisfaction. On the other hand, if he takes on extremely difficult tasks, he will probably fail and therefore derive no satisfaction at all. Only by taking moderate risks is he most likely to compile a steady record of successes. Without feedback, he does not know whether the decisions he made were right or wrong. Therefore, he prefers and works best in situation which gives him feedback. In business, this feedback takes the form of costs and profits. As mentioned before, the achievement oriented businessman is
not interested in profits for their own sake, but as a measure of success. By preferring competent co-workers without regard to his personal feelings about them, he is increasing the probability that the outcome of the task will be successful.

McClelland's theory is important to the study of motivation because he maintains that the achievement motive can be taught to underachieving groups and nations. His research seems to indicate that the achievement motive can be acquired through training by teaching a person to think and behave in terms of the achievement motive.

External Motivation

The internal motivation theory considers the forces which exist within individual-his needs, wants, and desires. External motivation theory does not negate internal motivation theory but builds on it. External motivation theory includes the forces which exist inside the individual as well as the factors controlled by the manager, including job context items such as salaries, working conditions, and company policy, and job content items such as recognition, advancement and responsibility.

Since employees react either positively or negatively to everything their manager does, it is therefore essential for the manager to use external motivation which generates positive responses from employees. These positive responses will indicate that his subordinates are working for the benefit of the organization. A manager can use either positive or negative external motivation. Positive motivation rewards acceptable performance. Negative motivation emphasises punishment or the threat of punishment if performance is unacceptable. Both can be used by almost any manager everyday.

Purpose and Need for External Motivation

Persons find that organizations allow them to achieve goals that they cannot achieve alone. This may imply a large degree of self-motivation or internal motivation on the part of each individual. But many persons do not realise that by working toward the organization's goals they are also achieving their own goals. Such people are seldom self-motivated to share in the organizational goals and usually just want job with salaries that will pay the bills. Therefore, managers must use external motivation to get these people to work toward organizational goals. Thus, is a definite need to understand the function of both internal and external motivation within their organization to develop and apply their skills.

McGregor's View-The Self-Actualising Person

One theory of motivation which incorporates both internal and external motivation is that of Douglas McGregor. In this theory, external motivation is manifested in the assumption the manager makes regarding the attitudes of his subordinates. That is, how a manager feels about human nature determines which leadership style he uses.

It should be emphasised that the manager's assumption are the course, and not the effect, of his employees' behaviour. This phenomenon is known as the self-fulfilling prophecy, in the operation of the self-fulfilling prophecy, something is assumed to be true. Based on this assumption, action is then taken. Reaction to the original action takes place. This reaction is observed and is taken as verification of the original assumption. If the manager assumes that the workers are indifferent to organisational goals, and they are treated as if they are, then they will be indifferent. But if he assumes that the employees are in the best
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position to direct their own efforts towards organisational goals, then general supervision could replace close supervision, thereby allowing employees to achieve their own goals while working toward organisational objectives.

McGregor set forth alternative views of the nature of man. The first he called theory X. It was used to illustrate what he considered to be the "traditional view of direction and control". The assumptions of theory X are:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.
2. Because of the human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organisational objectives.
3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all.

As the self-fulfilling prophecy has shown, theory X may be true and may work simply because managers believe it to be true and act as if it were true. McGregor felt that theory assumption were used in most industrial organizations, but that they were inadequate for the full utilization of each worker's potential.

McGregor's other view of the nature of man, theory Y, contains assumption which he believed could lead to greater motivation and increased fulfillment of both individual needs and organizational goals. The assumptions of theory Y are:

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organisational objectives.
3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.
4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but seek responsibility.
5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.
6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized.

The main foundation of theory Y is integration—the establishment of an environment in which employees can best achieve their own goals by committing themselves to the organization's objectives. In doing so, employees are expected to exercise a large degree of internal motivation. Theory X and theory Y can well be thought as extremes on a continuum or range of assumption. Rarely, if ever, is theory X or theory Y used in its pure form, instead, workable operational theories are developed using various amounts or degree of the assumption of each.

A word of caution is in order concerning theory Y. The heavy emphasis on internal motivation implies that all employees will be motivated by self-esteem and self-actualisation needs while on the job. This is not always true. Some people are uncomfortable with too much freedom. Even if all workers did desire complete individual freedom, this desire may not be compatible with organisational goals. In some cases it may be in direct opposition to them. In addition, it can be suggested that it is erroneous to assume that workers seek to satisfy their esteem and self-actualization needs on the job. Many people find enough satisfaction in raising a family, participating in community projects, or passing the time with a hobby. Hence, theory Y proponents must be cautioned.
against imposing their will on employees, just as they criticised theory X proponents for doing so. Managers must remember that each of their employees is unique and should be understood and treated as such. Therefore, external motivation should be flexible enough to accommodate each unique person in the organization. People should not be forced to fit into a rigid theory or into one manager's viewpoint.

**Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

The theory of motivation advanced by Frederick Herzberg and associates has been referred to as the motivation-hygiene (M-H) theory, the motivation-maintenance theory, and the two-factors theory. It is a theory of external motivation because the manager control the factors which produce job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The data of the original study were gathered from interviews with over two hundred Pittsburgh accountants and engineers. These interviews sought to determine factors in the job which were present when the employees felt exceptionally happy or exceptionally unhappy with their jobs. From these interviews, a two-factor hypothesis was developed.
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**Figure 2**. The factors to the right, if present, can lead to employee satisfaction and motivation. Those factors to the left, if absent, will lead to employee dissatisfaction.

1. The factors that were present when job satisfaction was produced were separate and distinct from the factors that led to job dissatisfaction.

2. The opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction-not job dissatisfaction.

3. Similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job satisfaction-not job satisfaction.

The conclusion drawn from the interviews was that, in the majority of cases, reports of feeling happy were not brought about by the absence of the factors that cause dissatisfaction, but instead by the presence of the factors that cause dissatisfaction, but instead by the presence of the factors the researchers classified as "satisfiers", "motivators", or "intrinsic factors". As seen in Figure 2 some factors may serve as both satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

The satisfiers relate to the content or nature of the job and describe the employee's relationship to what he does. These factors that lead to satisfaction include achievement, recognition, the intrinsic characteristics of the work itself, responsibility, and advancement. When these factors fall below an acceptable level, they contribute very little to job dissatisfaction. If job does not offer an employee advancement, challenging work, responsibility, recognition for a job well clone, or the opportunity to complete a task successfully, he will not necessarily be dissatisfied with it, but neither will he derive any satisfaction from it. Conversely, when feelings of unhappiness were reported, they were not brought about by the absence of the satisfier factors, but by the absence of "dissatisfier", "maintenance", or "extrinsic" factors. Herzberg called these factors "hygiene" factors "because they act in a manner analogous to the principles of mental hygiene. Hygiene operates to remove health hazards from the environment of man. It is not curative; it is rather, a preventive." Hygiene factors describe the employee's relationship to the context or environment in which he/she performs his/her work. Therefore, satisfiers relate to what an employee does, dissatisfiers to the environment in which he does it. Dissatisfiers include company policy and administration, technical supervision, salary, interpersonal relations with the supervisor, and working conditions. When the hygiene factors fall below what the employee considers an acceptable level, he becomes dissatisfied. However, at or above the acceptable level, dissatisfaction is removed. This absence of dissatisfaction leads only to a neutral state, not to any degree of satisfaction. An employee who considers his job to have satisfactory supervision, interpersonal relations, company policy and working conditions will not be dissatisfied with it, but neither will he necessarily be satisfied with it.

In summarising the major findings of the original Herzberg study, it is the hygiene factors that affect job dissatisfaction and the motivators that affect job satisfaction. Hygiene factors help man avoid unpleasantness, whereas, the motivator factors make people happy with their jobs by serving man's need for psychological growth. Herzberg's theory implies that managers should be concerned with two views of their employees' job attitudes-what makes them happy-and quite distinctly-what makes them unhappy. The traditional assumptions of motivation theory that wage incentives and improved interpersonal relations and working conditions would lead to increased productivity and lower absenteeism and turnover is an error. All these factors can do is to remove dissatisfaction and prevent problems. They cannot lead to positive attitudes but can only eliminate negative attitude. Only the motivator factors can lead workers to perform as their managers desire.
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In spite of the over forty studies criticizing Herzberg's theory, it is still significant because it separates motivators from hygiene factors. This separation has led to the concept of "job enrichment". Using Herzberg's terminology, job enrichment seeks to provide jobs with more motivational factors than they had before. But before these motivational factors can be increased, the hygiene factors must be maintained at a high level in order to neutralize dissatisfaction. If the hygiene factors decline, the employee's dissatisfaction will increase, and he will become less responsive to the company's attempt to enrich his job. Since it seeks to bring more motivational factors to the job, job enrichment attempts to increase the employee's responsibility and recognition, while it offers increased opportunities for challenging work and advancement.

Relationship of the Theories of Maslow, McGregor and Herzberg

The theories of Maslow, McGregor and Herzberg all seem to approach motivation from a differently perspective. But when these theories are compared in Figure 3, it can be seen that they all emphasize similar sets of relationships. Maslow views the rarely satisfied higher-level needs as the motivating force being a worker. Herzberg sees "satisfiers" as motivating after the hygiene factors have neutralized dissatisfaction. McGregor approaches motivation through his theory Y which is based on assumptions concerning the motives of workers. Therefore, all three theories are relevant to studies of motivation and particularly external motivation.

The three lower-level needs in Maslow's hierarchy of need theory, physiological, safety, and social, are all relatively satisfied in our industrial society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maslow</th>
<th>Herzberg</th>
<th>McGregor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-level needs:</td>
<td>Motivators:</td>
<td>Theory Y:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualization</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Satisfaction of esteem and self-actualization Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Imagination and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Self-direction and self-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-level needs:</td>
<td>Hygiene factors:</td>
<td>Theory Y:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Company policy and administration</td>
<td>Security above all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Direction preferable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Threats of punishment needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Self-direction and self-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: The relationship of the theories of Maslow, McGregor and Herzberg emphasize similar sets of relationships

Esteem and self-actualization are rarely satisfied and therefore act the same as the motivators conceptual by Herzberg.

McGregor's theory Y can be compared to both Maslow's and Herzberg's theories of motivation. Theory Y assumes that the employee desires satisfaction of his esteem and self-actualization needs, desires responsibility, exercise self-direction and self-control, and is imaginative and creative. Maslow's higher-level need and Herzberg's motivational factors make the same assumptions. Therefore, a manager may choose higher-level needs, motivational factors, or theory Y assumptions to motivate his employees. All emphasize the same set of relationships.
Motivation

Criticism of the Self-Actualising Person Theory

External motivation based on the self-actualising theories of Maslow, McGregor and Herzberg has not gone without criticism. Based on the findings generated by his research, Dubin concluded that "work is no longer a central life interested of workers". This leads to the conclusion that it is erroneous to assume that all workers seek to satisfy their esteem and self-actualization needs on the job. Many workers view the job as a means to an end and seek fulfillment off the job. Thus some of the authors strongly feel that external motivation based on self-actualizing theories will not lead to desired results. It should be considered as an ethical concept than a physiological reality. This, however, is a very strong view and cannot always be accepted.

Vroom Model-A Contingency View

Victor Vroom looked at effective motivation not in a uniform configuration of external motivators. Instead, motivation is the result of three major factors.

1. The first are the goals a person wants to achieve—that is the main emphasis and not the internal state. No judgment is made about what needs may create the desire for these goals.

2. The second major factor affecting productivity is a relationship a person perceives between productivity and personal goal achievement can high productivity lead to one's goal achievement. If yes, then high productivity will be seen as desirable and valuable.

3. A final factor must also be considered, however. To what extent can a person influence his or her own productivity? If an individual believes that there is a little or nothing he can do to influence his output, his attempts to do so may be weak or nonexistent. Again, it is his perception of ability to affect his productivity that counts.

Putting these factors together provides the basis of the Vroom model. An interpretation of the model is shown in Figure 4. It illustrates that all three factors are determinants of an individual's level of productivity, and it emphasizes the likelihood of differences in motivational states among different persons.

![Figure 4: Vroom Model](image)

Like the Vroom model, the stimulus-response approach makes not judgment concerning a person's needs and feelings. Instead it converges rewarding desired behaviour.

Behaviouristic Influence-The Skinnerian Approach

'Somewhat related to the Vroom model is the approach of group of psychologists called behaviourists. Although many have contributed to the thinking surrounding this collection of ideas, the most notable has been B.F. Skinner, perhaps best known for his work in the training of pigeons to perform complex tasks through stimulus-response techniques. His work and that of others has, however, been extended to include human beings as well.
His theory is represented as

\[ S \rightarrow O \rightarrow R \]

Apart from stimulus and response behaviour is caused by external stimuli. Therefore, behaviour can be changed by changing the environment in which one functions. This is called operant conditioning. By rewarding desired behaviour and punishing or ignoring undesirable behaviour, an individual or group can influence others in a desired direction.

The following steps an organization should take to use the behavioural approach effectively:

- Avoid using punishment as a primary means of obtaining desired behaviour.
- Positively reinforce desired behaviour, and where possible, ignore undesirable behaviour.
- Minimize the time lag between desired response and reinforcement, or bridge the gap via verbal mediation.
- Apply positive reinforcement frequently, preferably on a variable ratio schedule.
- Ascertain the response level of each individual and use a shaping procedure to obtain a final complex response.
- Ascertain contingencies which are experienced as positive and/or negative by the individual.
- Specify the desired behaviour in explicitly operational terms.

Porter and Lawler's Model

A common misconception which was held to be true through most of the neoclassical era was the employee satisfaction directly affected productivity. Managers believed that this cause and effect relationship existed. They consequently instituted external motivation methods which they thought would lead to increased satisfaction and to its resulting effective-increased productivity. Much of the external motivation trends was unsuccessful, because managers were unaware of later research findings showing very little relationship between satisfaction and productivity. Porter and Lawler developed their model to explore the question of managerial motivation. The Porter and Lawler model of motivation is based on the assumption that rewards cause satisfaction and that sometimes performance produces reward. Therefore, they hypothesize that the relationship between satisfaction and performance is linked by another variable rewards. They see good performance leading to reward which lead to satisfaction, as shown in Figure 5. This concept is opposite the neoclassical view of motivation which held that satisfaction caused performance.

![Figure 5: Porter and Lawler's Theoretical Model](image)

*Source:* Edward E. Lawler, III and Lyman W. Porter, "The effect of Performance on Job Satisfaction".
The model shows performance leading to rewards. Porter and Lawler distinguish between two types of reward—intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic rewards are given to an individual by himself for good performance. They include feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction of higher-level needs as defined by Maslow. In the model, intrinsic rewards are connected to performance by a semiwavy line because Porter and Lawler believe that intrinsic reward are directly related to good performance only if the job structure is varied and challenging so an individual can reward himself if he feels he has performed well. Extrinsic rewards are given by the organization and satisfy mainly lower-level needs. They include such things as pay, promotion, status, and job security. Porter and Lawler feel that extrinsic rewards are weekly connection to performance; they indicate this on their model by a wavy line. This means that at times extrinsic rewards are not related to performance. It should be pointed out that to be considered a reward by an individual, he must positively value it. Otherwise, it would not be considered a reward.

In the model, rewards are linked indirectly to satisfaction through perceived equitable rewards. This variable refers to the amount of rewards an individual feels he should receive as a result of his performance. This variable can also be expanded to include the amount of rewards an individual feels should be attached to a particular position within the organization. Therefore, Porter and Lawler view satisfaction as deficiency measure. Satisfaction is determined by the difference between actual rewards and perceived equitable rewards. If actual rewards exceed perceived rewards, then satisfaction results. If the opposite occurs, dissatisfaction results. The degree to which a person is either satisfied or dissatisfied depends on the size of the difference between the actual and perceived equitable rewards.

By including internal motivation in the form of intrinsic rewards and external motivation as extrinsic rewards, the Porter and Lawler model implies that both the individual worker and the organization are responsible for motivation. But despite the organization's influence, the vast majority of the responsibility for his motivation rests with the individual worker. Hence, his motivation or satisfaction depends on his performance as it is affected by the value he places on rewards; the probability that effort will result in rewards; his effort; his abilities and traits; and his role perceptions. Porter and Lawler do not claim that their model is the final word in motivation theory or that it totally explains the relationships between job attitudes and performance. Their objective was to identify some of the important variables and the relationships though to exist between them.

As performance is influenced by a person's effort and abilities. A person may exhibit a great amount of effort but perform very poorly if the individual does not have a satisfactory level of ability. Similarly, a person may have a great deal of ability but perform poorly if the individual does not try hard enough. (Fig 6)
Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are seen as consequences of performance. The broken line means that there may not be a clear, direct relationship. That is, a person may perform well but be rewarded poorly. This situation is very common in industry since techniques of linking rewards to performance are not well developed with the exception of a few jobs such as that of a commissioned salesman. To briefly review, intrinsic rewards refer to positive feelings workers give themselves for performing well the job itself. Feelings of mastery, competence, personal achievement, dignity and self-esteem are examples of intrinsic rewards. Extrinsic rewards come from the environment in which a job is performed. Pay, fringe benefits and supervisory praise are some extrinsic rewards. One task of managers in using this as well as other models is to find out which rewards are important to their subordinates. It makes no sense to reward a person highly for a good performance with a reward of no value to the individual.

The Model in Figure 6 represents one work cycle. For example, picture a student writing a term paper. The student expends high efforts and has adequate abilities and understands how to conduct a thorough library search. Performance on the term paper should be high. Imagine that the student receives a grade of C on the well written and factually correct paper. Satisfaction with the reward (the grade of C) will probably (

As mentioned earlier, rewards come in many forms: Some workers value co-worker interacting as an important reward from work: others consider interaction with a supervisor as a more important reward. The guiding principles for properly rewarding workers to increase job effort are:

1. Tie valued and important reward to performance.
2. Reward high performance better than low performance and make these rewards visible to all to see.

The first principle directs managers to reward workers with something of value to them. Some workers would rather have time-off or an extended vacation rather than a salary increase or bonus. Other workers perform effectively only to have favourable supervisory attention directed toward them. Still others work hard only to feel a sense of efficacy of competence from doing a good job.

A manager must not only reward workers with valued rewards but must insure that workers associate these rewards with effective task performance. The timing or schedule of rewards is important—the dictum of "rewarding worker immediately after they perform well" is supported by a wealth of psychological evidence. Industry commonly distributes year-end bonuses with the intention of stimulating worker effort. What seems to occur is that employees associate the bonus more with job attendance or tenure than with job performance. The closer rewards can be linked to performance the more effect the rewards will have on task effort.

The second principle suggests that the ineffective workers acknowledge that the effective workers are being rewarded handsomely. Only in this way will the ineffective worker clearly realize that rewards are actually tied to performance in the organization. A common error in organizations involves the inequitable distribution of a blanket salary or "across the board" increase or bonus. For instance, in a secretarial pool of eight employees, three are of high performance, three are of average, and two are of poor performers. A blanket salary increase
Motivation is awarded to all eight secretaries. Equity theory would predict that the high performing secretaries will reduce both work quality and work quantity in order to attain equity and to reduce tension caused by feelings of underpayment. The task performance of average and poor performers will be reinforced, resulting in continued poor performance because behaviour which is reinforce tends to be repeated.

It is important, of course, to know what "motivators" people are most interested in. What is valued by a particular individual is dependent upon the motives that directly depends on person's behaviour. Everyone has some mixture of the motives that are directing that person's behaviour. Everyone has some mixture of the motives identified:

- The need to achieve'
- The affiliation need
- The need of power

However, it appears that effective managers and leaders have motives that are somewhat unique.

Motivation in the Overview Model (Gibson, 1980)

From a managerial viewpoint, and using overview model as a guide, where does "motivation" fit in, and what causes it?

A manager's interest in motivation, either someone else's or his or her own motivation, comes about because of an interest in some result. The result may be strictly work-related matter, such as whether a particular order will be filled or a diagnosis of why sales fell below budget. It may also be concern for other organizational outcomes, such as the satisfaction and well-being of employees, or a concern about turnover, or it may be a personal concern, such as one's own reputation as a manager.

Their concerns over results should lead to a number of other questions pertaining to work behaviour and perspective: what behaviour, and by whom, is the cause of or potential cause of the results in question? And then: what is the perspective of the individual or individuals whose behaviour has been pinpointed? It is here, as part of the diagnosis of perspective, that the concept of motivations fits into the model.

For example, let us say a computer programmer has missed an important deadline for completing a particular programme. Does this evidence mean the programmer's motivation is low? Obviously it does not necessarily mean this. It may be that the person is generally poorly motivated at this time, for reasons such as health or personal anxieties. On the other hand, the person may be working very hard, and be highly motivated toward programming work, but may be so involve in the intrinsic rewards of the kind of work that the need for meeting the deadline has become less important in his or her perspective. There are still other possible explanations for the missed deadline.

What they are?

The point of this illustration is the diagnosing a state of work motivation a manager is dealing with an invisible world the perspective of the person. As such, the manager must use evidence of behaviour (past and present) to infer what that person's perspective is. In order to be useful for action, this inference-drawing or model-building process must recognize the total competing motivation is the other's perspective.

As suggested in the above illustration about the computer programmer's missed deadline, a diagnosis stimulated by a concern for results may or may not
terminate with the conclusion that an individual's work motivation is the problem. Rather, in carrying out the diagnosis, once some tentative analysis of perspective has been formulated, the diagnosis proceeds back further in the overview model to include the emergent group and inputs of the inner environment, outer environment, and the makeup of the individual people themselves as these elements may affect perspective. Note, for example, that the problem with the missed deadline may have been inadequate project management, direction, and incentives toward the result of on-time delivery and not work motivation of the programmer. In other words, more careful direction and channeling of the motivation by virtue of clearer organizational inputs may have been the problem. (Fig.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Variables</th>
<th>Emergent determinants of behaviour</th>
<th>behaviour</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology, tasks</td>
<td>Physical layout</td>
<td>Emergent relationship</td>
<td>Reward Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business strategy and formal organization structure</td>
<td>Management Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards offered</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback of Individual outcomes of the individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual's Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value inherent in personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Offered</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Path-goal Theory of Motivation

Different perspectives can be analysed by inferring what assumptions, perceptions and feelings an individual apparently holds. These same concepts may be applied to motivation. More particularly, one stream of research has developed the "path-goal theory" of motivation (House and Mitchell 1974). The concept of this theory represents more specific notions of assumptions, perceptions and feelings as they apply to motivation.

The path-goal theory of motivation may be summarised as a formula:

\[ M = V \times E \]

where M is an individual's motivation to behave in a certain way; V is the value a person holds for a reward or outcome which may come as the result of the behaviour (his or her assumption or belief about the reward), and E is the expectancy (a combination of assumption and perception) that the reward will be
achieved if the behaviour is carried out. The expectancy part of this formula for motivation can be thought of as the probability that the person implicitly places on the event that the reward in question will be forthcoming.

Thus, according to the path-goal formula, high motivation depends both on a person holding a potential reward or outcome high in his or her beliefs and on believing the reward will be forthcoming.

An individual's perspective of perceptions and assumptions regarding the value or certain rewards as outcomes for himself or herself and the expectancy of those rewards being forthcoming are a function of the expectancy of those rewards being forthcoming are a function of two things. First, they are functions of the individual's personal value system, or the goals which he or she values. In terms of our overview model, this comes in part from the personal inputs to perspective. Second, they are functions of the situation or context in which the person finds himself or herself, or the potential path to the goal. This is represented by the inputs from the inner environment, including what rewards are available in compensation system, from other people, and from within the individual and how well the availability and linkage of these rewards are communicated, particularly by the management styles of the boss. This discussion of motivation and the path goal theory in terms of the overview model is illustrated in Figure 6.

Schien's Approach

Historically and psychologically there are several answers to this. Schein (1970) has outlined these in description of "management assumptions" about people. There are three primary sets of assumptions, each of which includes assumptions about what rewards will motivate others, and then a fourth set which is conceptually and philosophically different from the first three. Let us approach the answer to "what motivates people?" by a paraphrasing of Schein's set of managerial assumption about people.

Assumption set I: People are motivated by material reward

The first set of assumptions is basically that people are motivated for their expectation of material or economic reward. People are viewed as essentially rational in their behaviour, in that they will respond with more work effort if there is promise of greater pay. Other potential influences on perspective, such as peer group pressure, praise, or a need for control and mastery over their work, are seen as secondary and unimportant compared to people's needs to maximize material gain.

These basic assumptions about what motives lead to other managerial assumptions and to policies and normative styles for managerial behaviour towards employees. The notion that people respond only to material rewards and in proportion to the amount of such rewards has as its complement the proposition that unless the rewards of pay are offered, people will not work. Thus, people are viewed as inherently lazy, like machines which must be fueled by pay and which will do productive work only under those conditions. Similarly, employees must be carefully programmed and guided; they are seen in this set of assumptions to prefer the known to the unknown and to resist any change in familiar patterns.

The implications for organizational and managerial practices of these rational-economic assumptions are straightforward. Assuming people are motivated primarily by rational-economic factors organizations must be designed to deal with essentially unimaginative noncreative perspectives of employees. This means a tops-down, bureaucratic structure, supplemented with extensive rules to cover every conceivable contingency. Elaborate incentive schemes, including a high percentage of bonus based on performance, are called for.
The type of management style or the pattern of behaviour for a manager, which would elicit motivation from an employee who valued these rewards would be a directive, authoritarian style in which the manager closely plans, directs, and controls the work of subordinates:

Most practicing managers quickly recognize the limitations and oversimplifications of the rational-economic assumptions. At the same time, the experienced manager (and many inexperienced young managers trained in the modern equivalents of scientific management) in fact behave as though these were their assumptions about motivations. And, in many instances, these managers get results. That is, employees do sometimes respond to strictly economic incentives, show no interest in new and higher levels of responsibility, seek direction and control, and resist any innovation or change.

Despite a great deal of research, not to mention common sense and insight, which suggest that people do not exclusively seek economic rewards, any full explanation of what motivates people must allow for the continuing partial validity of the rational-economic assumption as reasonable explanations of what occurs in practice. We shall return to this later.

**Assumption Set II: People motivated by social rewards**

The basic assumption here is that people are essentially social animals and as such are motivated by their need for human relationships. If people are demotivated or anti-management, these assumptions suggest that they have not been communicated with, have not been listened to and provided the opportunity of human contact, of that some other relationships, such as may be provided by an effective union or a strong emergent group within the organization, are fulfilling the basic need for relationships. The assumption is that people with social support and encouragement can adapt to change and be creative in developing new solutions to problems. It follows that management's role is to structure the work environment so that social contact is possible. Examples would be to structure the work environment so that social contact is possible. Examples would be to structure work so that it can be done by groups, to provide supportive human contact between superiors and subordinates, and to establish open-door policies, counseling services, and the like.

The social rewards assumption imply a management style that is, in many ways, diametrically opposed to that implied by the economic rewards assumptions. The latter relegates people in organizations to the status of machines and places emphasis on getting the job done, while assuming people will be satisfied with pay. The former emphasized the human element as most important and assumes that a happy worker is a productive worker. The dichotomy between these two basic types of management styles has deep roots. The rational-economic person emphasis is on production, task, things, clarity and predictability and the sacrifice of the human element to larger institutional goals. The social person emphasis is on people and human relationships, on the importance of meaning in terms of the relative point of view of the individual, and flexibility of organization to human needs. The two basic dimensions of task-oriented behaviour and relationships oriented behaviour are the underlying emphasis of each distinct style.

Despite its over simplifications and obvious limitations, management style based on the social motivation assumptions is, that like based on the rational-economic assumptions, alive and well. Sometimes it works, not only in leading to satisfied employees but also in getting other results. Then again, sometimes it doesn't. The inadequacies of both these approaches suggest the need to look further for the valid underlying set of assumptions and a management style which exhibits them in a leadership behaviour.
**Assumption Set III: People are motivated by intrinsic rewards**

The third set of assumptions is labeled by Schein (1970) "self-actualizing man". The basic assumption is that the most important motivating force is a need to achieve feelings of mastery in activities and the full realization of one's potential. The assumptions continue that if the work environment does not provide the appropriate challenges and opportunities, people can lose interest and be demotivated. It follows from this that individuals will welcome change if it promises to enrich their experiences and give them additional opportunities for self-fulfillment. Management's role, then, is to structure work and relationship to provide challenge an opportunity for learning and to encourage the participation of subordinates in decision which affect them. The classical management-by-objectives approach, in which superior and subordinate jointly set objectives and the subordinate is given wide leeway in deciding how to reach these objectives, is a direct off shoot of this set of assumptions.

The self-actualisation assumption correspond to McGregor's (1960) Theory Y, to Likert's (1967) System IV, Blake and Mouton's (1964) "9,9" style and to communication that are "Adult to Adult" in the terminology of transactional analysis (Harris, 1969). In the Human Side of Enterprise, McGregor (1960) pointed out that earlier "theories" about motivation were not so much wrong as they were dated. People may have been motivated primarily by money and the need for material comforts in our society at the turn of the century, but he argues that this is no longer the case. Maslow's (1954) "Need hierarchy" applies to the three sets of assumptions. The lowest order needs are those for food, shelter, and the basis of subsistence, that is, for at least some minimum level of material necessities. Once these are attained, their function as a motivator gives way to social needs. When those are satisfied the higher order need for ego gratification and self-actualization become salient and motivating. Thus, as individuals and societies mature, argue Maslow (1954) and McGregor (1960), they eventually come to be motivated, by the highest order of needs. Herzberg (1966) also points out that rewards, aimed at satisfying economic and social needs are really motivators for employees, but what he calls 'satisfiers" or "hygiene factors". They are extrinsic in nature, whereas true motivation comes from within the person and is intrinsic in nature. Conditions which can release intrinsic motivation include restriction jobs, promotions, and granting autonomy and control to an employee over his or her own work.

Like the earlier sets of assumptions, self-actualization has its adherents in organizations and manifestations in styles of managers. Sometimes people are very responsive to setting which permit and encourage self-actualization. But sometimes they are not.

Thus, we have reviewed three common sets of assumptions about what people value as rewards for work behaviour. In each set we have referred to how the set fits with the 'writing of theorists in human motivation. We have also noted how each set, if held by a manager with respect to subordinates leads to a different management style and to different organization structures and policies for getting results.

**The Complexity of People**

No single set of assumption about a single type of rewards will predict what will motivate everyone or even the same person all the time. By looking at the motivation formula from the path-goal theory, M = V x E, the reason for this become clear. First of all, people differ in what they value, and what they value may change over time, In a way, each individual has his or her own M = V x E formula. A person who has fallen heir to a fortune or won the grand prize in a lottery would probably have little motivation to work on an incentive pay basis. More realistically, while financial rewards can never be entirely dismissed from
most people's valued goals, it should be recognized that money may be important up to some minimum threshold, but not thereafter. Moreover, money is often valued as a symbolic indicator and measure of ego and self-worth rather than exclusively as a means to further material gain. Thus, money may be valued or not, even by a well-paid employee, depending on its meaning and the special circumstances in his or her life at given time.

Furthermore, people may have certain long-term valued goals but different short-term ones. Thus, a young professional considering new jobs may wisely give up the highest paying job for one which will provide greater learning opportunity in the short run, or an older employee may forego some income for the assurance of a secure job.

These and many other examples simply point out that people value different things and that people are too complex to be categorized as valuing only one type of work reward. In his discussion of the sets of assumptions about what motivated people, Schien (1970) refers to a fourth set of assumptions about "complex man" as those recognizing this complexity. Recognizing that people are complex, that their valued rewards vary, is the first rule for the manager who would motivate others. As we have suggested, that the diagnostic process can follow the guides of the overview model, and when motivation is the problem, the path-goal theory can suggest steps to managerial action.

Path-goal theory suggests another difficulty with a straightforward application of what people value as leading directly to motivation. That is, even if a person did value highly a particular reward, say social relationships with respected others, the situation of the work may not be perceived by the individual as leading to that reward. In another words, his or her expectation of achieving the reward may be too low for its presence to create a high level of work motivation.

On the whole, then, what motivates people is in part a function of what they bring to the work place as assumptions about valued rewards. Porter (1973) has provided a useful list of the kinds of rewards which can be valued by employees and which can be provided by organizations. His list of rewards and their typical organizational, sources is given in Figure 8. Note that the categories of reward types are approximately the same as Schein's (1970) three categories of assumptions of valued reward, with Porter adding a fourth, "development", which may be thought of as an outgrowth of intrinsic of self-fulfillment rewards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward Type</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Emergent group</th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wages</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe benefits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Status</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recognition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Friendship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Intrinsic to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Completion</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Achievement</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Energy expenditure</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. skill acquisition</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. personal growth</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* X = Direct source; (X) = Indirect Source.

Source: Adapted from Porter (1973).

Figure 8: Porter's list of rewards and their organisations sources
Motivation

Up to now, the emphasis in this section has been on what motivates people in terms of a way of conceptualizing motivation in the context of the overview model and in terms of the path-goal theory, and with emphasis on what assumptions of values people hold about different rewards. We have laid a basis for managerial understanding of motivation. Now let us elaborate on action managers can take to facilitate motivation.

7.4 HOW CAN I MOTIVATE PEOPLE?

A common answer to the question, "How can I motive other people?" is "You can't. Motivation only comes from within the other person".

To some extent this is true. As we have seen, motivation is a state of a person's perspective. As such, it lies within that person and is a function of a particular assumptions and perceptions which determine that person's valued rewards and expectancies of achieving those rewards. This has been discussed in the beginning of this lesson.

However, a manager most definitely can affect the level of motivation of another. He or she can work to provide the appropriate reward and can work on the values and expectancies of employees. In general, this is done through exercising one or all three of the forms of influence towards others described earlier.

Specific actions to motivate others

Managerial action, in general, can take four forms:

1. Provide more of the valued rewards to the person.
2. Change the values of the person toward the rewards which are available.
3. Improve the person's perception of the behaviour-reward linkage.
4. Improve the reality of the behaviour-reward linkage.

The first two of these deal with actions which affect the goals which people value as outcome for their work; the latter two deal with their expectation of whether the paths available to them will lead to those rewards. Let us see how each of the three forms of influence may be used to achieve one or more of these four forms of action.

With respect to individual motivation, and in the context of the path-goal theory, managerial action which constitutes indirect influence is aimed at arranging the appropriate strategies, structures and policies to encourage and support motivated people to achieve organization goals. This includes, for example, establishing incentive and reward system which will be valued by employees. Indirect influence also includes selecting and employing people who have necessary skills and who value the kinds of rewards available in the organization. Finally, indirect influence includes developing in oneself and others the managerial skills, particularly the management style of pattern of behaviour in dealing with subordinates, which will have the effect of creating higher motivation. We shall say more about the selection and development of management style for an individual manager below, for it is an element of organizational input for indirect influence and face-to-face direct influence as well.

Semidirect influence, it will be recalled, is exercised when a manager acts to affect an individual through his or her social relationships at work. The emergent group has a strong effect on what its members value and what their expectations are with respect to the outcomes from behaviour. A good example of this is a case of Data Terminals Corporation (Solomon, 1979). In 1977 and 1978 president, Robert Collings, offered all his employees free vacation trips, one year
to Disneyland and the next year to Italy, if company scales and earnings doubled each year. They made it both years. Apparently, this group reward not only appealed to what most employees valued, but served as a highly visible symbol of the need for intracompany cooperation as well.

Direct influence on the individual involves communications and the personal, face-to-face relationship. A manager who attempts to increase the level of motivation through direct influence is typically trying to do the second and third actions mentioned above with respect to that person's value and expectations. Thus, the manager may work overtime to convince an employee to value more highly the rewards already existing and available in the organisation. This may be particularly difficult in times of major social change, as occurred at least temporarily in the United States during the late 1960s. At that time, young employees were not particularly attracted to the long-term rewards which result from loyalty to organizations, such as promotion and higher pay.

The other form of action for direct influence is to improve the employee's perception of the linkage between behaviour and reward. This might involve, for example, personal conversations about what can result from certain levels of performance, such as promotion, bonus, or greater responsibility.

As important as what to do to motivate others is the question of how to do it. We turn now to a closer look at a manager's behaviour required to motivate others. To do this, we discuss management style and leadership.

In working relationships with others, and particularly in direct influence in motivating others, a manager exhibits one or more characteristic styles of behaviour. We may define management style as the pattern of a manager's behaviour in working relationships with other over time. This definition is relatively loose being more a concept than a precise variable. In order to be more precise, we need to set up one or more categories of behaviour characteristics where employees for the one reason or another see their work only as a means to economic rewards. A second style is a supportive, people-oriented, humanistic style, which may be appropriate for employees who value social rewards. A third is a participative, mutual goal-setting style in which the manager works with subordinates who value autonomy and are rewarded by self-fulfillment.

In a way, then, we say that a manager who holds one of the three basic sets of assumptions about what motivates others should exhibit a style which is consistent with those assumptions in order to provide the appropriate means to exercise direct influence. In other words, managers need to understand what rewards subordinates value, and behave in a pattern which will fit with that understanding as one part of providing a consistent environment for the employee.

The manager who believes, as a part of his or her perspective, that people are complex is in a conceptual sense going above and be beyond the three operational sets of assumptions about valued rewards. The "complex person" assumptions imply that a manager will have no fixed and beliefs about what motivates people in general or what style to employ in all situations. Rather, the manager will attempt to understand the particular subordinates, the particular situation, and ideally, select a style to fit the situation. Thus, recognizing that people are complex and that a diagnosis with a goal as a path-goal theory must be performed before employing a style. The manager cannot have one particular style for all situations. Rather, the manager must be able to choose an appropriate style for a situation and then a change that style if necessary. One may call this approach a "contingent" management style, but it is important to note that it refers to the process of diagnosis and choice of managerial behaviour rather than to the pattern of behaviour itself.
What is it that motivates managers to become successful in running a large organization? Among other things it is their need to have an impact to be strong, and to influence the behaviour of others for the organizational good. What separates good managers from poor managers is the "need for power" according to Dr. David McClelland, a recognized expert on the power motive.

What they need is a special kind of power. It is not dictatorial, nor is it power for personal goals. It is not a crude kind of power, or power used impulsively. It can be referred to as altruistic power, meaning the power to influence people for the good of the organization for which they work. It also may be called socialized power, meaning power which is tempered by a large dose of self-control and perspective.

When a large number of executives are grouped according to their success in running large, complex corporation, the profile of the effective manager looks like this:

*The top managers of a company must possess a high need for power, that is a concern for influencing people. However, this need must be disciplined and controlled so that it is directed toward the benefit of an institution as a whole and not toward the manager's personal benefits. Moreover, the top manager's need for power ought to be greater than his need for being liked by people.*

A good manager is not primarily motivated by the need for affiliation. The affiliation need refers to the desire to be liked and accepted by other people. People with strong affiliation need to not typically do well in management positions. To maintain a high morale and productive environment, policies must be applied universally and consistently. A manager concerned with developing friendly relationships may make too many "exceptions to the rule" for certain subordinates, thereby upsetting subordinates not receiving special favour. A manager motivated by the affiliation need may create poor teamwork and low morale. This, of course, would be inadvertent, as such an individual would not purposefully do anything to upset the relationships in the work group. It would occur most likely because of the failure of the manager to focus on the task to be accomplished.

Likewise, the need for achievement is not extreme among effective managers. The need for achievement means a desire to do things better and to attain personal accomplishment means a desire to do things better entrepreneurs for example, are high in the need to achieve. This is understandable since people high in this need try to do things better themselves and want constant feedback on their performance to see how well they are working. While good managers may be high in the need to achieve, it is usually not greatly out of balance when compared to the power and affiliation motives.

A manager with an usually high need to achieve would probably be characterized by the inability to delegate authority. Managers are required to get things done with and through other people. They must delegate authority. The manager must get others to do things through influence or through persuasion. By definition, then, one aspect of a manager's job is to help others perform their jobs better, rather than trying to better perform the many short-term projects alone.

A mature, self-controlled need for power will help create a good manager who *helps subordinates feel strong and responsible, who rewards them properly for good performance and who sees that things are organized in such a way that subordinates feel they know what they should be doing. Above all, managers should foster among others a strong sense of team spirit, of pride in working as*
part of a particular team. If a manager creates and encourages this spirit, his subordinates) certainly should perform better.

The actions of managers can be measured along two dimensions—a concern for people and a concern for productive output. A strong power need combined with a weak need for affiliation does not conflict with being people-oriented or democratic toward subordinates. Power is a motive while being people-oriented is a behaviour or an action. Motives are internal; behaviour is external, in the words of David McClelland.

Management is an influence game. Some proponents of democratic management seem to have forgotten this feet, using managers to be primarily concerned with people's human needs, rather than with helping them to get things done.

Effective managers, in their efforts to influence subordinates to get work done, express their strong power needs in democratic, people-oriented ways. Research on power in organizations indicates that the managers who were strong in power needs were also rated strong on the people-oriented supervisory style by their own subordinates.

### 7.6 SUMMARY

Motivation is defined as "a process governing choices, made by persons or lower organisms, among alternatives forms of voluntary activity". As such motivation is concerned with (1) the direction of behaviour, or what a person chooses to do when presented with a number of possible alternatives, (2) the amplitude, or strength of the effect once the choice is made and (3) the persistence of the behaviour, or how long the person continues with it. Choices behaviour refers to, decisions directed toward occupational preference, choices, organization choices, job attendance, self-training, creativity, spontaneity and job termination.

Almost all workers are motivated to have a high level of self-esteem in the work situation. Often when a person is not in a work situation providing high self-esteem the person will be "fighting back"-actively or passively like a slave-with all sorts of sly counter measures. People do not want to be pushed around misunderstood, unappreciated, mistreated, controlled or laughed at. All these things cause low self-esteem. The individual does not want to expect success to be active to be respect to exercise self-control and to be self-starting.

Factors within the job (intrinsic factors) are usually effective motivators and can help awaken the urge to accomplish and to be self-starting. Such factors include feelings of achievement, recognition and responsibility among others. These feelings sometimes "surprise" workers and in so doing inspire and encourage high motivation jobs not providing for intrinsic motivation are low in "cultivation" or stimulation. Some form of job redesign is suggested for this type of job.

Whether or not management will spend the time and money-redesing jobs is in part dependent upon their overall managerial philosophy. Three philosophies of management were discussed along with their implications on motivational styles. The three philosophies include the traditional, human relations, and human resources models. Each of these philosophies influence the climate for motivation which is caused in part by the thought and actions of the managers at the very top of organizations. These managers will have certain assumptions about how people relate to work and subsequently develop policies and practices from these assumptions. The "motivation climate" will have a strong impact upon the one-on-one motivational techniques tried in the lower level of organizations.
The new motivational model includes many of the earlier theories of motivation examined in the chapter. The direction of influence in this model is as follows:

effort - performance - reward - satisfaction. The factors of effort and level of ability influence performance. Rewards can be either intrinsic or extrinsic and should be closely linked to performance. Satisfaction with rewards is moderated by a person's perception of equity of rewards.

It is suggested that high task performance result when (1) employees are able to use their valued abilities and skills in becoming task competent, (2) employees perceive valued and equitable rewards to be linked to task performance, and (3) employees acknowledge a differential reward system based on performance within the organization:

Finally, it should be remembered that the power motive is important to effective managers. This need is not for dictatorial power or crude impulsive power but rather socialized power and the power to influence people for the sake of the organization. While some balance of motives is usually present within most individuals a high need for power seems to be critical to a person's ability to function as a manager.

Motivation is a complex problem in organization because the needs, wants, and desires of each worker differ. They differ because each worker is unique in his biological and psychological makeup and in his learning experiences. Motivation is either internal or external, depending on where the action is initiated. Internal motivation originates within the individual and was explained by Maslow's, hierarchy of needs theory of McClelland's achievement motive.

External motivation builds on internal motivation and depends on the motivational assumptions and techniques used by the manager. They are explained by the theories of McGregor and Herzberg. It was shown that the theories of Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg, Vroom, and Skinner approach motivation from a different perspective, but they all emphasize similar sets of relationships.

Porter and Lawler hypothesize that performance leads to satisfaction via rewards and place the major responsibility on the individual for his motivation. Although many contributions have been made, a definitive theory of motivation remains to be developed. Certain aspects of motivating people have been discussed.

7.7 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Case 1

The procedure manual of Naidu Enterprises stated that backorders should be filed numerically by the invoice number appearing on Naidu's purchase order to its suppliers. But one morning Hariharan spent several hours refilling the backorders suppliers. When a customer called to check on an item that was backordered, it was time-consuming for Ram to locate the order was written up after it had been determined that the item was not in stock. Consequently, the customer had no idea what the invoice number of its backorder was. Hariharan was proud of what he had done and wanted the opportunity to show off his system to the branch manager, John Rowlings. After lunch that same day, Mr. Rowlings needed a backorder invoice to answer a question a customer had about his order. It was no problem for Ram to find the invoice since it was filed alphabetically under the name of the account. Mr. Rowlings told Joe that although the invoice had been easily located, his filing system for backorder invoices did not conform to company procedures and they would have to be refilled by invoice number before the branch's semiannual inspection next week.

Hariharan was depressed that he had to conform to company procedures even when they were inefficient. He spent the entire afternoon refilling the invoices by number, not caring that he didn't get anything else done.
Questions:

1. Will Hariharan be motivated to try other methods of improving the efficiency of the job in the future? Explain.

2. Which of Maslow's needs had been satisfied before Mr. Rowlings told him to conform to company procedures? Which type after?

3. Discuss this case in Herzberg's, Vroom's, and Skinner's terms.

Case 2

Jeevan was the first repair manager to be hired at Chawla Supply. He was a field repairman for another company before he took a position. In the past, the repair department had operated without a manager, the repairman, Nandi Kishore and George Brown, simply divided the work between themselves in whatever manner they wanted. There was always a backlog of work, but I was finished on time.

When Arun came, he decided to divide the work load into repairs for company and individual accounts and to assign certain types of repairs to each man. He had to check all repairs before they were returned to the customer, and he wanted all problems discussed with him before action was taken on them. He started holding meetings with the repairmen to discuss problems the section was having. At first, meetings were held during working hours, then after work, and finally on Saturdays. During these meetings, the increasing number of problems were discussed, but no solutions were ever offered. In the meantime, the work load was getting greater and some of the work was not being finished on time. It seemed that Nandi Kishore and George were spending most of their time getting Arun's approval on their work so they could have it shipped back to the customer. Arun then decided that the repair department should start working overtime.

Questions:

1. Discuss this case in terms of job enrichment.

2. Is anyone to blame for the increase workload, or could it be just an increase in business?

3. Do you believe that the repairmen should be motivated to increase their productivity because they now have their own manager?

4. Discuss morale in terms of the relationship of satisfaction to productivity.
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