CHAPTER II
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE
ON MOTIVATION
Many research psychologists had assumed that human behaviour is guided by the desire to feel good, or what is called as the Pleasure Principle. This principle says that above all, what people want is to maximize their pleasure and minimize their pain. N. M. Bradburn, the influential Social psychologist, said that the quality of a person’s life can be measured by the excess of positive over negative feelings. According to Bradburn, we are happy when we have more positive than negative feelings and unhappy when the opposite is true. The Pleasure Principle implies that everything people do can be explained by a calculus of Pleasure and Pain. It suggests that people prefer optimism to pessimism because optimism is the more pleasurable of the two outlooks. Similarly, people prefer movies with happy rather than sad endings, even when the happy endings are unrealistic. How does this principle explain the fact that many people work at boring jobs? It implies that working at such jobs is the lesser of the two evils, predicting that people would dislike unemployment even more than they dislike their current jobs. Those who advocate the validity of the Pleasure Principle – variously called Pleasure Theorists or Hedonists- say that nature uses Pleasure and Pain to prod us to do what is necessary for our health and survival. For example, nature uses hunger to tell us when we need to eat and thirst to signal when we need to drink. Since feeling hungry and thirsty are unpleasant, we are motivated to eat and drink when those things are essential for our health and survival. So if everybody is maximizing Pleasure and minimizing Pain, why do workaholics spend little time relaxing, having fun with their families, or taking vacations? According to Pleasure Theory, it is because these people enjoy their work and feel restless when away from it. Pleasure Theorists argue that workaholics are
really doing what for them maximizes positive feelings or minimizes negative ones. Many do believe that the desire to feel good is all that motivates people, and that Pleasure and Pain are the ultimate forces guiding our behaviour. But Ohio State University professor and psychologist Steven Reiss and the author of the book “Who Am I?” believes that behaviour has meaning and value that goes beyond Pleasure and Pain. According to the extensive research he conducted, the meaning, value, and purpose of life cannot be explained entirely in terms of Pleasure and Pain. Pleasure and Pain do not drive our behaviour to anywhere near the extent assumed by many psychologists. Pleasure is the by-product of getting what we desire; it is not the aim of the desire.

According to Plato (427 B.C. – 347 B.C.), the desire for truth (curiosity) is one of the greatest motivators in life, and wisdom is one of the greatest intrinsic joys. Plato put forth the vision of an eternal world of ideas which indicate the essences of all things; when we discover these eternal ideals, we experience the joy of learning. Plato also placed high value on reason, moral duty, and public service.

Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) put forth a very different view of human motivation. He said that, from cradle to tomb, what people want is sex, sex, and more sex. The reason we do not realize this, according to Freud, is because many of our sexual motives are unconscious, which means that they cannot be acknowledged without experiencing overwhelming guilt, anxiety, or embarrassment. Freud later modified his ideas to say that both sex and aggression drive our behaviour. Many psychologists who were contemporaries of Freud, or who came after him, embraced much of what Freud said but differed with him on the importance of sexual motivation. For example, Alfred Adler (1870 – 1937) wrote about the desire for Superiority and Power. Carl Jung (1875 – 1961)
thought that the will to live, a general life force, is the greatest human motivator. Clark Hull (1884 – 1952) and Kenneth Spence (1907 – 1967) developed an influential model of behaviour and discussed human motives in terms of a series of learned and unlearned drives, such as the drive to eat when hungry or the drive to escape from anxiety. This approach gave more emphasis to the energizing functions of motives than to the roles of specific motives in guiding people toward some goals rather than others. The Hull-Spence theory had enormous influence during the period about 1950 to 1975.

Erik Erikson (1902 – 1994) developed a theory of Ego development, or what might be loosely called a desire for human growth. Various schools of behaviourism have expressed different views on the question of what motivates people.

Carl Rogers (1902-1987) said that people are driven more or less by two desires, the desire to grow, called Self-Actualization, and the desire for Self Acceptance. According to this viewpoint, the key to happiness is to live our lives in accordance with our values. When people do things that are inconsistent with their values, they lose respect for themselves, stop growing, and become unhappy. Roger’s theory represented an original effort to reduce much of what is meaningful to us to a few overarching motives.

B.F. Skinner (1904 – 1990), another leading behaviourist, urged psychologists to pay little attention to finding the basic motives that guide our lives. Skinner believed that all motives, thoughts, and feelings (including pleasure and pain) are private. Only you know what your motives are, and if you do not tell us, we can only guess at them. Since a person’s motives cannot be known with scientific certainty, Skinner reasoned, psychologists should not pay attention to them.
The great American psychologist and philosopher William James said, “The deepest principle in human nature is the craving to be appreciated. William James (1842 – 1910), philosopher, and educator, and William McDougall (1871 – 1938), the brilliant Harvard social psychologist, believed that behaviour is guided by instinctual desires. In his epic work, “The Principles of Psychology”, James provided the following list of basic instinctual desires. Saving- the desire to hoard and collect, Construction- the desire to build and achieve, Curiosity – the desire to explore and learn, Exhibition- the desire for attention, Family- the desire to raise our children, Hunting- the desire to find food, Order - the desire for cleanliness and organization, Play - the desire for fun, Sex - the desire to reproduce, Shame- the desire to avoid being singled out, Pain - the desire to avoid aversive sensation, Herd - the desire for social contact, Vengeance - the desire for aggression. McDougall expanded and improved on this list. Together, James and McDougall realized that human desire is multifaceted. They resisted the temptation to reduce everything to one or two supermotives, such as Freud’s sex and aggression, or Adler’s drive for superiority. James and McDougall were the first influential psychologists to develop a comprehensive theory of basic human desires.

After James passed away in 1910, McDougall was opposed by both behaviourist and psychoanalysts. Behaviourist rejected McDougall’s idea that desires are inherited, arguing instead that they are learned. Viewing human behaviour in terms of mostly sexual motivation, psychoanalysts argued that James and McDougall recognized too many instinctual desires. The influence of James and McDougall might have been lost altogether except that Harvard psychologist Henry A. Murray (1893-1988) restated McDougall’s list of instincts as a list of psychological needs. Murray’s work was influential, partially because he developed a popular technique for assessing a person’s motives.
Another psychologist who made an important contribution to the study of human motivation was Abraham Maslow (1908-1970). Maslow was one of the few psychologists who looked at human nature primarily from a motivational perspective. He made the important point that we are creatures of desire who are always wanting something. In this regard, Maslow analyzed human behaviour very differently than most psychologists did.

Post the Maslow days, people started realizing the importance of influencing workers to accomplish tasks for an organization. The oldest technique used to motivate others is known today as the Carrot and Stick method. The name evolved from the stubbornness of donkeys that could only be moved by taunting them with a carrot. Early managers regularly offered economic ‘carrots’ to entice people to work harder. This technique was passed on from generation to generation and was a deeply rooted part of society for hundreds of years. This theory created a misconception that money always motivated a person to work harder. More often, managers were beginning to realize that the methods of the past were not effective. The awakening field of psychology was looking for newer ways to motivate people, and in a short time, managers would begin seeking help from psychologists to understand new methods of management (Mescon).

**The Scientific Approach**

The earliest attempts to study behaviour in organizations came out of a desire by industrial efficiency experts to improve worker productivity. Their central question was: What could be done to get people to do more work in less time? Attempts to answer this question were made at the turn of the century – a period of rapid industrialization and technological change in the US.
As engineers attempted to make machines more efficient, it was a natural extension of their efforts to work on the human side of the equation—making people more productive too.

Fredrick Taylor worked most of his life in steel mills, starting as a laborer and working his way up to the position of chief engineer. In the 1880s, while a foreman at Philadelphia’s Midvale Steel Company, Taylor became aware of some of the inefficient practices of the employees.

Noticing, for example, that laborers wasted movements when shifting pig iron, Taylor studied the individual components of this task, and established what he believed was the best way—motion by motion to perform it. A few years later, while a consulting engineer at Pittsburgh’s Bethlehem Steel, Taylor similarly redesigned the job of loading and unloading rail cars so they too could be done as efficiently as possible. On the heels of these experiences, Taylor published his groundbreaking book, “Scientific Management”. In this work, Taylor argued that the objective of management is to secure the maximum prosperity for the employer, coupled with the maximum prosperity of each employee.

Beyond identifying ways in which manual labor jobs can be performed more efficiently, Taylor’s Scientific Management Approach was unique in its focus on the role of employees as individuals. Taylor advocated two ideas that hardly seem special today, but were quite new eighty-five years ago.

First, he recommended that employees be carefully selected and trained to perform their jobs—helping them become, in his own words, “first class” at some task. Second, he believed that increasing worker’s wages would raise their motivation and make them more productive. Although this idea is unsophisticated by today’s standards—and not completely accurate, Taylor may be credited with recognizing the important role of motivation in job performance.

It was contributions like these that stimulated further study of behaviour in organizations and created an intellectual climate that eventually paved the way
for the development of the field of Organizational Behaviour. Acknowledging these contributions, management theorist Peter Drucker has described Taylor as “The first man in history who did not take work for granted, but who looked at it and studied it”.

Despite the important contributions of Scientific Management, this approach did not go far enough in directing our attention to the wide variety of factors that might influence behaviour in work settings. The efficient performance of jobs and monetary incentives are very important, to be sure, although emphasizing these factors makes people feel like cogs in a machine. In fact, many employees and theorists alike Taylorism, favouring instead an approach that focused on employees’ own views and emphasized respect for individuals.

At the forefront of this orientation was Elton W. Mayo, an organizational scientist and consultant widely regarded as the founder of what is called the Human Relations Movement.

**The Human Relations Era**

The Hawthorne studies were the turning point in the thinking of management theorists and scientists. Elton Mayo and his colleagues from the Harvard Business School who studied workers at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company in Chicago, found that worker’s attitudes, perceptions, feelings, and beliefs played a big part in their productivity.

They studied the effects of fatigue, layout, heating, and lighting on productivity. As might be expected when studying lighting, employee productivity levels increased as the illumination level was increased; however, the same effect was noted when the illumination level was decreased. The researchers concluded that the attention paid to the employees was more of a contributing factor to their productivity level than the environmental
conditions. Work satisfaction depended to a large extent on the informal social pattern of the workgroup. Physical conditions or financial incentives had little motivational value. People will form workgroups and this can be used by management to benefit the organization. He concluded that people’s work performance is dependent on both social issues and job content.

The fact that paying attention to workers could improve their behaviour was called the Hawthorne Effect. As a result of this research, it was evident that employees should be treated in a humane way.

The Human Resource Approach

As the Human Relations Theory gained momentum and training programmes in Human Relations were becoming popular, it began to be noticed that happy workers are not necessarily productive workers. Organization theorists then began to propose that managers are themselves often responsible for creating problems because they do not understand the complexity of human nature and often operate and manage under wrong assumptions. The management of human resources where the needs of both the individual and the organization can be jointly met then became an idea to be pursued. In contrast to the Human Relations Movement which took a relatively simplistic view of human nature, the organizational behaviour approach encompassed in the human resources and other models, recognizes the complexities of human behaviour in the organizational setting.

The Systems Approach

While the classical theorists paid too much attention to the structure of the organization (span of control, unitary command, etc), the Human Relations and Human Resources people paid attention solely to the feelings and attitudes of the workers.

What was missing in understanding management was the simultaneous examination of the structural as well as the human aspects of the organization.
The Systems Theory people argue that an organization is a purposeful system with several sub systems which are highly interconnected. Any action that is taken to solve the problems in one subsystem will have its repercussions on the other subsystems as well, since all parts of the organization are closely interconnected. The Systems Approach envisions the organization as a purposeful system with its subsystems which should operate in unison because of their interconnection in achieving the goals of the organization. The systems theorists, primary among them, Katz and Kahn (1966), describe the organization as “open to its external environment”, receiving certain “inputs” from the environment such as human resources, raw materials and other necessary ingredients to run the organization, engaging in operations that transform the inputs into the final product, the process known as “throughputs”, and finally turning out the “outputs” in its final form to be sent back to the environment. The organization, since it is open to the environment, also receives “feedback” from the environment and takes corrective action as necessary.

The Contingency Approach

While the other approaches to management discussed suggest that there is one best way to manage, the Contingency theorists suggest a situational approach to effective management. That is, they subscribe to the notion that different organizations facing different environments and operating in different situations need to be managed differently. Contingency theorists do not accept universalistic management principles which offer the one best way to manage effectively under all circumstances.

Effective management processes will vary in different situations depending on the individuals and groups in the organization, the nature of the jobs and the technology, the environment facing the organization, and its structure. When the environment, the structure, the employees, the jobs, and
the processes used to manage the organization all mesh well together, the organization will function effectively. Since no two organizations or situations are exactly alike, there is no one best way to manage. Hence, different managerial practices and styles are needed for effective management.

Thus, contingency theorists view effective behaviours as emerging when the management style fits the unique demands of each individual situation.

When management was first studied in a scientific way at the turn of the twentieth century, Frederick Winslow Taylor worked to improve productivity in labor situations which were important in those days of the developing Industrial Revolution. Taylor developed efficiency measures and incentive systems, where workers were paid more for meeting a standard higher than their normal production and thus productivity increased dramatically. Therefore, workers seemed to be economically motivated. At this time in history, social issues involved in human behavior were not yet considered. A more Humanistic Approach soon developed, that has been influencing management ever since.

Below are a few more perspectives on motivation in the form of theories.

**Theories of Motivation**

A number of theories of human motivation have been proposed over the years.

1) **Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory**

   Perhaps the most widely known theory of individual needs and motivation comes from Abraham Maslow who was a clinical psychologist in the U.S.A.

   He held the belief that human beings rarely reach a state of complete satisfaction except for a short time. As one need gets satisfied, another rises to take its place and this never ending process produces a hierarchy of needs.
According to him all human beings have same Need Hierarchy but the level at which they operate in hierarchy may differ from person to person.

The needs get linked to actual behaviour through the process of deprivation and gratification. He explained that ‘deprivation’ of a specific need leads to ‘dominance’ of that particular need. Relative gratification of that need submerges it and activates another need which will be the next higher need in the hierarchy. Then this new activated need becomes dominant and guides behaviour.

This process of deprivation-dominance-gratification-activation continues until the entire hierarchy of needs has been gratified and the last need of the hierarchy, i.e., self actualization gets activated.

**The Hierarchy of Need contains Five Needs**
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**Fig- 2.1**

**Maslow’s Need Hierarchy**

a) **Physiological Needs**

These needs are most powerful ones and when unmet, dominate the entire personality of the person. These needs include the basic needs for food, water, air etc. These needs, when activated cannot be ignored for very long time and after they are satisfied tend to reoccur again at regular intervals. To satisfy such needs, organizations must provide employees with a salary that allows them to afford adequate living conditions. Similarly, sufficient
opportunities to rest (e.g., coffee breaks) and to engage in physical activity (e.g., fitness and exercise facility) are also important for people to meet their physiological needs. The rationale is quite simple people who are too hungry or too ill to work will hardly be able to make much of a contribution to their companies.

b) Safety Needs

After the satisfaction of physiological needs another need that emerges is called safety need. This need refers to our concern for protection against physiological dangers, threats and deprivation. However, in modern times physiological dangers are not as important as we live in a civilized world. But people need protection against arbitrary action, favouritism, discrimination, unpredictable administrative policies etc. They need economic security like pension, various types of insurances, savings accounts, gratuity, provident fund, job security etc.

Organizations can provide employees with safety equipments (e.g., police, fire protection). Similarly jobs that provide tenure (such as teaching) and no – layoff agreements provide a psychological security blanket that helps satisfy safety needs. All these practices enable people to do their jobs without any fear of harm, and in safe and secure atmosphere.

c) Affiliation Needs

As human beings are social animals they have for companionship, seeking acceptance, giving and receiving love and affection, cooperating with others and need for belonging. In 19th and 20th century, employers saw no need for social satisfaction on the job. In fact, workers were prohibited from engaging in any informal talks with co-workers.

However, Taylor’s experiment in 1900 and Hawthorne studies in 1928 highlighted the importance of affiliation need.
Modern organizations are fully conscious of the importance of this need and realize that in fact informal group processes can help in achieving the organizational goals. So to satisfy this need, organizations encourage participation in social events like parties, picnics, sports with co-workers. Company bowling or football leagues, as well as country club memberships, also provide good opportunities for meeting social needs and also help promote physical fitness- helping satisfy physiological needs.

Taken together as a group, physiological needs, safety needs, and social needs are known as deficiency needs. Maslow’s idea was that if these needs are not met, an individual will fail to develop into a healthy person- both physically and psychologically. In contrast, the next two highest – order needs, the ones at the top of the hierarchy, are known as growth needs. Gratification of these needs is said to help a person grow and to develop to his or her fullest potential.

d) **Esteem Needs**

Esteem needs refer to a person’s need to develop self-respect and to gain the approval of others. The desire to achieve success, have prestige, and be recognized by others all fall into this category. Companies do many things to satisfy their employee’s esteem needs. They may have awards to recognize distinguished achievements. Giving monetary bonuses- even small ones- in recognition of employee’s suggestions for improvement helps promote their esteem. Non monetary awards, such as trophies and plaques, provide reminders of an employee’s important contributions.

e) **Self- Actualization Needs**

This is the need for realizing one’s own potentialities and for continued self development, self fulfillment, becoming all that one is capable of becoming. According to Maslow, self actualizing people are characterized by their efficient perception of reality, higher ability to judge people correctly and
efficiently, acceptance of themselves and others with all their shortcomings. They are spontaneous but not necessarily unconventional. Their behaviour is simple and natural. They have a genuine desire to help the human race although they tend to have deep ties with relatively few individuals.

**Maslow believed that the hierarchy was characterized by some supporting aspects such as:**

a) The higher the need and the less imperative it is for sheer survival the longer the satisfaction of that need can be postponed and it is easier for that need to disappear permanently.

b) Higher needs gratification produces more desirable subjective results like more happiness, serenity and richness of the inner life.

c) Satisfaction of higher needs is closer to self actualization than is the satisfaction of lower needs.

d) Living at the higher need level means greater biological efficiency and less disease.

e) Higher needs require better outside conditions to make them possible, e.g., better economic, educational conditions.

Maslow did not intend that his Needs Hierarchy be directly applied to work motivation. In fact, he did not delve into the motivating aspects of humans in organizations until about 20 years after he originally proposed his theory. Despite this lack of intent on Maslow’s part, others, such as Douglas McGregor in his widely read book “The Human Side of Enterprise”, popularized the Maslow theory in management literature. The needs hierarchy has had a tremendous impact on the modern management approach to motivation but also has shortcomings.
Criticism

After reviewing a number of studies W. Bridewell concluded “It is not possible to assess from the studies reviewed whether self actualization is in fact a need or simply a social desirability response resulting from certain cultural values”. There is some empirical evidence to support this conclusion.

a) Luthans noted that there are many situations where the order of dominance among needs is not in accordance with Maslow’s theory, e.g., fasting for religious and political causes.

b) There is no empirical evidence that gratification of one need automatically activates the next need in the hierarchy.

c) Hall and Naligaim (1968) found that need intensity correlated positively with need satisfaction. In other words, the more a need is satisfied, the more important it becomes. This finding is in direct opposition to the Need Hierarchy Theory.

d) Walba and Bridewell concluded that it is not clear what is meant by the concept of need. Does need have a psychological or physiological base? Does a need come into existence due to deficiency only or does need always exist even if it is satisfied?

e) Surveys in Japan and Continental European countries show that this model does not apply to the managers. Cultural, religious, environmental influences play a major role in determining the need priority in various countries.

f) Questions have been raised regarding what happens when an individual reaches the ultimate level of motivation. Is the self actualization achieved person no longer motivated? However, later on Maslow said that self actualization need feeds on itself.

g) Maslow’s assumption that needs are crucial determinants of behaviour are also often doubtful. There are simple evidences to show that people seek objects and engage in behaviour that are in no way connected to
the gratification of needs, e.g., kicking a stone or tin in the street or
bathroom singing.

b) Maslow’s contention that satisfaction of lower order needs leads to the
emergence of higher order needs may give an impression that a need
must be satisfied 100% before the next need emerges. But Maslow
himself said that an average individual cannot be fully (100%)
satisfied. As one goes up the need hierarchy the percentage of
satisfaction decreases.

c) Maslow’s theory does not handle the problem of linkage between need
satisfaction and the achievement of organizational objectives.

d) The Need Theory is almost a non-testable theory. It defies empirical
testing. It is difficult to interpret and operationalize its concepts, e.g.,
what is the time span for the unfolding of the hierarchy? What
behaviour should or should not be included in each category? How
does the shift from one need to another need take place?

e) Maslow’s theory is based on a relatively small sample of subjects.
Maslow recognized their limitation and presented the model with
apologies to those who insist in conventional reliability, validity,
sampling etc.

Yet it is unthinkable to negate the impact of this theory. His theory has
useful implications for managers. It offers a good conceptual scheme to
understand and deal with issues of employee motivation at the workplace.

**His three important contributions are:**

a) He identified important need categories, which can help managers
create effective positive reinforcers.

b) It is helpful to think of two general levels of needs, in which the lower
level needs must be satisfied before higher level needs become
important. This theory also highlighted the importance of higher order
needs. His work shifted the attention of organizational theorists from lower order motivators to higher order motivators. Maslow sensitized managers to the importance of personal growth and self actualization.

(c) Emphasis on individual differences is another important contribution of his theory. He emphasized that different people will be at different levels of the hierarchy at different times. Managers must be sensitive to different needs of the people if they want them to be highly motivated.

2) **Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory**

For several years managers had been wondering why their fancy personnel policies and fringe benefits were not increasing employee motivation on the job. To answer this, Herzberg extended the work of Maslow and developed a specific content theory of work motivation. It is also called the Dual Factor Theory and Motivation-Hygiene Theory of motivation. He concluded a widely reported motivational study on about 200 accountants and engineers employed by firms in and around Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He used the critical incident method of obtaining data for analysis. The professional subjects in the study were essentially asked two questions:

(a) When did you feel particularly good about your job – what turned you on; and

(b) When did you feel exceptionally bad about your job – what turned you off?

Responses obtained from the critical incident method were interesting and fairly consistent. The results indicated that when people talked about feeling good or satisfied they mentioned features intrinsic to the job and when people talked about feeling dissatisfied with the job they talked about factors extrinsic to the job. Herzberg called these Motivation and Maintenance Factors respectively.
Hygiene Factors- Hygiene factors represent the need to avoid pain in the environment. They are not an intrinsic part of a job, but they are related to the conditions under which a job is performed. They are associated with negative feelings. They are environment related factors, hygienes. They must be viewed as preventive measures that remove sources of dissatisfaction from the environment. Like physical hygiene, they do not lead to growth but only prevent deterioration. Hygiene factors produce no growth in worker output but they prevent loss in performance caused by work restriction. Herzberg believed that hygienes create a zero level of motivation and if maintained at proper level prevents negative type of motivation from occurring.

According to Scott Myers “Maintenance factors are characterised by the fact that they inspire little positive sentiment when added, but incite strong negative reactions when removed”. Examples of hygiene factors are company policy and administration, supervision, technical salary, interpersonal relations, supervisor and working conditions.

Motivators- Motivators are associated with positive feelings of employees about the job. They are related to the content of the job. They make people satisfied with their jobs. If managers wish to increase motivation and performance above the average level, they must enrich the work and increase a person’s freedom on the job. Motivators are necessary to keep job satisfaction and job performance high. On the other hand, if they are not present they do not prove highly satisfying. Examples of motivators are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement.
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Taken together, the Motivators and the Hygiene factors have become known as Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of motivation.

Herzberg’s theory is closely related to Maslow’s Need Hierarchy. The hygiene factors are preventive and environmental in nature and they are roughly equivalent to Maslow’s lower-level needs. Hygiene factors prevent dissatisfaction, but they do not lead to satisfaction. In effect, they bring motivation up to a theoretical zero level and are necessary “floor” to prevent dissatisfaction, and they serve as a takeoff point for motivation. By themselves, the Hygiene factors do not motivate. Only Motivators, Herzberg asserted, motivate employees on the job. They are roughly equivalent to Maslow’s higher – level needs. According to Herzberg’s theory an individual must have a job with a challenging content in order to be truly motivated. Although Herzberg’s two factor theory remains a very popular textbook explanation of work motivation and makes sense to practitioners, it also is true that from an academic perspective the theory oversimplifies the complexities of work motivation. When researchers deviate from the critical incident methodology used by Herzberg, they do not get the two factors. Further there is always a question regarding the samples used by Herzberg. Would he have obtained the results from low complexity jobs such as truck drivers and third shift factory workers or wait staff personnel? Presumably both the hygiene factors and satisfiers could be substantially different when comparing these groups. Other factors that affect research results include the age of the sample and other factors that are not held constant or under control.

In international settings, older workers in an Israeli kibbutz preferred jobs that had better physical; conditions and convenience also, Caribbean hotel workers reported being more interested in wages working conditions and appreciation for their work as key motivators. These findings suggest that sample and setting may affect preferences for motivators and hygiene factors. Finally there seem to be job factors such as pay that lead to growth, satisfaction and
dissatisfaction for example pay can be dissatisfying if not high enough but also satisfying as a form of achievement and recognition. These findings indicate that strict interpretation of the two factor theory is not warranted. In spite of the obvious limitations, few would question that Herzberg has contributed substantially to the study of work motivation.

He extended Maslow’s Need Hierarchy concept and made it more applicable to work motivation. Herzberg also drew attention to the importance of job content factors in work motivation, which previously had been badly neglected and often totally overlooked, however, even the context can be made to better fit the job holder. For example, many internet businesses never have employees directly interact with customers so their dress appearance and work space can be highly informal and designed according to personal choice. The job design technique of job enrichment is also one of Herzberg’s contributions. Overall, Herzberg added much to the better understanding of job content factors and satisfaction and also sensitizing the managers to the fact that merely treating the employees well through good company policies and the like is not sufficient to get them motivated. Managers should utilize the skills, abilities and talents of the people at work through effective job designing. In the other words the work given to employees should be challenging and exciting, and offer them a sense of achievement, recognition, and growth. Unless these characteristics are present in the job, employees will not be motivated. Herzberg can be said to be the father of the Job Design Theory which has been subsequently developed more completely by Hackman and his associates. Hackman and others argue that good job design will lead to internal motivation of the workers and result in good job performance and employee satisfaction.
3) **Alderfer’s ERG Theory**

An additive extension of the Herzberg and especially, the Maslow content theories of work motivation comes from the work of Clayton Alderfer. He formulated a needs category model that was more in line with the existing empirical evidence. Like Maslow and Herzberg, he does feel that there is value in categorizing needs and that there is a basic distinction between lower-order needs and higher-order needs.

Alderfer identified three groups of core needs: Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (hence ERG theory).

Existence Needs are needs which are concerned with the physical existence of the person. They include basic needs such as food, clothing and shelter. Organisations satisfy these needs by means of pay, fringe benefits, safe working conditions, job security, etc. So these needs are combination of what Maslow categorized as physiological needs and safety needs.

Relatedness Needs are needs which Maslow categorized as affiliation needs and esteem needs. These needs are satisfied through interaction with others both on and off the job. They stress the importance of interpersonal, social relationships. Growth Needs are needs which are concerned with the individual’s intrinsic desire for personal development and improvement. Maslow referred to this need as self actualization. Alderfer is suggesting more of a continuum of needs than hierarchical levels or two factors of prepotency needs. Unlike Maslow and Herzberg, he does not contend that a lower-level need must be fulfilled before a higher-level need becomes motivating or that deprivation is the only way to activate a need. For example, according to ERG theory the person’s background or cultural environment may dictate that the relatedness needs will take precedence over unfulfilled existence needs and that the more the growth needs are satisfied, the more they will increase in intensity.

Further, Maslow’s hierarchy suggested a process called satisfaction-progression, in which a person moves up the hierarchy after a lower-order
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need is being routinely met. Alderfer’s approach adds what may be termed frustration–regression. When higher-order growth needs are stifled or cannot be met due to personal circumstances, the lack of ability, or some other factor, the individual is inclined to regress back to lower-order needs and feel those needs more strongly. This would occur, for instance, when a person cannot move up the corporate ladder and is stuck in a mundane job. According to Alderfer’s ERG model, that individual would be expected to then emphasize social relationships both on and off the job and become more enamoured with pay and benefits.

There has not been a great deal of research on ERG theory. Although there is some evidence to counter the theory’s predictive value, most contemporary analyses of work motivation tend to support Alderfer’s theory over Maslow’s and Herzberg’s. The ERG theory seems to include some of the strong points of earlier content theories and represents no major conceptual breakthrough, making this theory merely an improvement over Maslow’s theory. At the same time, Alderfer’s theory is less restrictive and limiting and thus more flexible in describing human behaviour than Maslow’s theory. Alderfer has also tried to operationalize the three need levels of Existence, Relatedness, and Growth. Research in this area has, however not progressed to the point where we can be certain about the accuracy or usefulness of Alderfer’s theory. At least one study has refuted Alderfer’s theory thus far (Rauschenberger, Schmidt, and Hunter, 1980). Thus more work is needed to test the validity of the ERG theory.

4) **Achievement Motivation Model**

In addition to Maslow’s there is another theory of individual motivation that uses needs as the central focus. David McClelland and his associates (notably John Atkinson) proposed that the organization offers an opportunity to satisfy at least three needs— for Achievement, for Affiliation, and
for Power. According to this theory called Achievement Motivation theory, a major factor in willingness to perform is the intensity of the individual’s need for achievement.

a) Need for Power

This is the need to dominate, influence or control people. Power speaks about the ability to manipulate or control the activities of others to suit one’s own purposes. People with a high need for power look for positions of leadership. They like to set goals, make decisions and direct activities. In a way the N. Pow helps in understanding managers. There is a positive and negative side to power. Some seek power for personal aggrandizement and such personalized power is obtained at the expense of others. Others seek socialised power in order to survive the institution of which they are a part. Research findings indicate that effective managers are high in the need for socialised power as against the need for personalised power.

b) Need for Affiliation

The need for affiliation is a social need for companionship and support, for developing meaningful relationships with people. Persons who have a high need for affiliation view the organization as a chance to form new and satisfying relationships. They are motivated by jobs that demand frequent interaction with co workers. Such people are not likely to succeed well at the tasks that force them to work in isolation. Quite often people seek affiliation because of a desire to have their beliefs confirmed, to avoid boredom, to avoid the mutual feelings of being beaten by the system.

c) Need for Achievement

This is the need for challenge for personal accomplishment and success in competitive situations. The Achievement motive is aroused in response to incentives in the environment that a person perceives as enhancing feelings of achievement. McClelland has made an extensive study of the Achievement
motive and identified the following characteristics which describe high achievers.

i) They like to take personal responsibility for finding solutions to problems. To men, strong in achievement concern the idea of winning by chance simply does not produce the same achievement satisfaction as winning by their own personal efforts.

ii) They like to take calculated risks and set moderate goals. High achievers want to win; they will not set goals too difficult to reach. Too risky an approach would greatly reduce the chances of goal accomplishment and eventually may prove to be a source of frustration and anxiety. Goals that are too easy would provide inadequate satisfaction.

iii) They want concrete feedback on their performance. High achievers would like to know how well they are doing.

iv) High achievers are not motivated by money per se, but instead; employ money as a method of keeping score of their achievements.

v) High achievers find accomplishing a task intrinsically satisfying in and of itself; they do not expect or necessarily want the accompanying material rewards. Given the choice between simple task with a good payoff for accomplishment and a more difficult task with a lesser payoff, other things being equal, high achievers may choose the latter.

Studies show that people with a high need to achieve do perform better, especially on important entrepreneurial jobs like starting a new business. McClelland saw the need for achievement to be most critical to a nation’s economic success. Unfortunately, contrary to common belief, only about 10% of the population (in USA, according to McClelland) are actually high achievers. How do managers motivate the 90% of the people who are not high achievers? To answer this McClelland has given the achievement course to executives in large American firms and in several Mexican firms and to
businessmen in India (from Bombay and from small city Kakinada in the state of Andhra Pradesh).

The achievement development course contained four important points:

a) The individual should strive to attain concrete and frequent feedback.

b) The individual should seek models of achievement, i.e. watch those who have performed well and emulate.

c) The individual would imagine himself as one who needs success and challenge and set carefully planned and realistic work goals.

d) The individual must control day dreaming by thinking and talking to himself in positive talks.

After two years, those who had taken the achievement course, except for one Mexican case, performed better than comparable men who did not take the course (made more money, got promoted faster and expanded their business faster).

McClelland’s technique for assessing need for achievement is the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) which presents the subject with an ambiguous picture and asks for an interpretation of what he sees and what is happening in the picture. Achievement related themes are counted and the subject’s final score represents the individual’s desire for high achievement. Most of the research supports the hypothesis that need for achievement motivation contributes to economic and entrepreneurial success. Achievement motivated people can be the backbone of most organizations. Achievement motivation underlies success in entrepreneurial ability.

As such considerable time and attention must be devoted to constructing ways of developing the achievement motive at the managerial level. Organizational climate must be conducive to high achievement. Managers must try to raise the achievement need level of subordinates by creating the proper work environment- permitting their subordinates a measure of independence,
increasing responsibility and autonomy, gradually making tasks more challenging and praising and rewarding excellence in performance.

McClelland’s achievement motivation, however, is fraught with a number of limitations:

a) The use of projective technique is objectionable.

b) The evidence in support of this theory is fragmentary and doubtful.

c) Achievement Motivation cannot be taught. It is because acquisition of motives occurs in childhood and it is very difficult to change them once established.

d) Achievement Motivation is a slippery term. It’s only a temporarily induced feeling rather than a permanent change in behaviour.

e) The theory does not fully address the question of the process of motivation and how it really comes about.

f) Achievement training, though promising is time consuming and expensive.

Inspite of these limitations, McClelland’s theory holds promise for work motivation.

5) Murray’s Manifest Needs Theory

Henry Murray (1938) developed a list of 28 needs that human beings have. Among these, are the needs for achievement, affiliation, dominance, aggression, dependence, and nurturance. Murray argued that our needs are mostly acquired in life rather than inherited, and needs can be activated or made to manifest themselves by introducing appropriate cues in the environment. For example, an employee’s need for achievement will manifest itself when the individual is exposed to a challenging job. Since a challenging job requires the individual to muster all the creativity and abilities that are within, the person has an opportunity to tap into his or her need for achievement. If, however, the individual is continuously exposed to
monotonous jobs only, this need is never tapped and the individual becomes bored with the job. Thus, given a conducive work environment, our latent needs can manifest themselves.

6) White’s Need for Effectance

Robert White identified the Need for Effectance as a powerful motivator. N. Effectance is a concept which describes our inborn drive to explore and gain mastery over our own immediate environment. N. Effectance is manifest even in babies who constantly try to explore their small world. They reach out for things, crawl, and take their first steps, and feel happy with their explorations. Such explorations of our environment continue throughout our lives. In interacting with the environment constantly, human beings experience both successful and unsuccessful experiences, and gain varying degrees of mastery over the environment. The history of successful experience over one’s lifetime, offers one a sense of confidence in his or her own competence. White considered this confidence as a powerful motivator to interact more with the environment so as to accumulate more success experiences, and feel confident about our competence. White called this confidence in one’s own competence a “Sense of competence”.

Jay Lorsch and John Morse at the Harvard Business School used the concept of Sense of Competence to study the motivation and performance of organizational members (Lorsch and Morse, 1975). They found that Sense of Competence accounted for higher levels of managerial motivation and performance in several types of organizations. The concept of Sense of Competence is important because managers can easily make use of the N. Effectance that employees have, or arouse this need in the work setting so that employees’ energies can be advantageously tapped and their sense of competence enhanced. This, in turn will increase the level of motivation in employees. The concept of sense of competence has not been extensively
researched even in the United States, but Sekaran’s pioneering work in the Indian banking industry (Sekaran and Wagner, 1980) indicates that sense of competence is highly correlated to motivation, job involvement, and job satisfaction of employees at all levels. Sekaran’s (1986) research indicates that several job related and organizational climate factors in the work setting lead to motivation, job involvement and a sense of competence. It has been found that a sense of competence in particular leads to the job satisfaction of Indian bank employees (Sekaran, 1986).

The Need for Effectance in individual, a powerful motivator, can be creatively channeled by managers through proper job assignments, and allowing employees to gain mastery over their environment. Given adequate encouragement and support, employees will be motivated to engage in work behaviour. The more they interact with their work environment, the more they will feel a sense of competence, which in turn, will motivate them to even more actively engage in their work. Hence, motivation and a sense of competence will mutually influence each other and offer employees intrapsychic or intrinsic rewards.

7) Maturity – Infancy Theory

The needs and drives described by Maslow, Alderfer, McClelland, and McGregor may well be in all of us. How, though, do these become activated? Chris Argyris attempts to explain this in the context of our moving from a state of infancy to that of a mature adult. There is a continuum between these two states and people can be in varying stages of maturation. People in work organizations according to Chris Argyris, will have a tendency to grow from an infant to a matured state.

Argyris contends that the demands for conformance, adherence to rules, and so on made by modern organizations are in conflict with the profile of a mature person. When mature employees are faced with jobs over which they have little control, allow little use of abilities, are of short-time duration, and
so on they will be psychologically distressed. These employees will escape via quitting or absenteeism, fight via a union or informal group for changes in the job, or adapt by becoming apathetic or indifferent and accepting one’s fate.

**Below are the descriptions of the infancy-maturity states:**

**a) Infant:** Passive, depends on others, limited set of behaviours, casual, erratic, shallow, quickly dropped interests, short time perspective, desire to be subordinate, lacks self-awareness and control.

**b) Mature person:** Active, independent, capable of behaving in many ways, deeper, longer lasting interests, long-time perspective, desire to be equal or superordinate, very self-aware and in control.

**8) Equity Theory**

Unlike Need Theories, Equity Theory does not believe that deprivation leads to motivation of both. It adds a social component instead of looking at within individuals only. It can be categorized as one of the Balance Theories, which assumes that behaviour is initiated, directed and sustained by the attempts of the individual to maintain some internal balance or psychological harmony. Most of the industrial versions of Balance Theories are based on Festinger's Theory of Cognitive Dissonance.

**His theory proposed that:**

**a)** Discrepant cognitions produce psychological tension within the individuals.

**b)** Tension is unpleasant for the individual.

**c)** Individuals try to reduce the tension by taking some actions.

Adam’s Theory of Equity is one of the popular Social Exchange Theories and is perhaps the most rigorously developed statement of how individuals evaluate social exchange relationship. Basically the theory points
that the people are motivated to maintain fair relationships with others and will try to rectify unfair relationships by making them fair.

This theory is based on two assumptions about human behaviour:

a) Individuals make contributions (inputs) for which they expect certain outcomes (rewards).

Inputs include all the rich and diverse elements that employees believe they bring, or contribute, to the job- their education, knowledge, seniority, prior work experiences, loyalty and commitment, time and effort, creativity, and job performance.

Outcomes are the rewards they perceive they get from their jobs and employers, outcomes include direct pay and bonuses, fringe benefits, job security, social rewards, and psychological rewards.

b) Individuals decide whether or not a particular exchange is satisfactory, by comparing their inputs and outcomes to those of others in the form of a ratio.

Equity exists when an individual concludes that his/her own outcomes/input ratio is equal to that of other people. If there is a perceived equity or fairness, all is well. However, if inequity is perceived, then the person feels unhappy, distressed, and restless since what he/she thinks is equitable and what has actually happened are at variance. This cognitive dissonance or restlessness and agitation in the individual’s mind will propel the person to take some type of action. Since felt inequity motivates or moves people to take action it is a motivator. Hence, motivation or work behaviours could very well be a function of felt inequity.

Stacy Adams (1965) defined inequity as an injustice perceived by a person when he compares the ratio of his outcomes (rewards) to his inputs (efforts)
with the ratio of another comparable person’s outcomes to inputs, and finds that they are not equal.

**Inequity exists under two conditions:**

a) When the person feels that in comparison, he suffers a negative inequity. That is, he has been rewarded less for his efforts than the other.

b) When he experiences a positive inequity, in comparing he finds himself rewarded more than the other for a similar degree of effort.

Both kinds of inequities produce Cognitive Dissonance or internal tensions and propel people to action in order to reduce the dissonance. The positive and negative inequities can be denoted as follows.

**Overpayment inequity:** The person gets more out of the job relative to what he puts in compared to another.

\[
\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} > \frac{\text{Other's outcomes}}{\text{Other's inputs}}
\]

**Equity:** In this situation both person and other obtain the same relative gain for their investments.

\[
\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} > \frac{\text{Other's outcomes}}{\text{Other's inputs}}
\]

**Underpayment inequity:** In this situation the person and the other do the same job but other gets paid more and the person experiences dissonance.

\[
\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} > \frac{\text{Other's outcomes}}{\text{Other's inputs}}
\]

**Fig- 2.3**

**Types of Inequity**

**Consequences of Inequity**

At least six different consequences are possible as a result of felt inequity. Adams (1965) suggests that people tend to resolve inequity through the following ways:

a) The person can alter inputs (efforts). That is, people who feel they are underpaid for their efforts may tend to reduce their efforts, and people who feel they are overpaid might want to increase their effort.
b) The person can try to alter outcomes or rewards.
c) The person can cognitively distort inputs or outcomes.
d) The person might quit the job.
e) The person could try to influence the other individual to reduce inputs.
f) The person might change the level of comparison.

To elaborate, depending upon whether negative or positive inequity is felt, individuals can reduce or increase the quality or quantity of the effort they put in. Secondly when inequities are felt the person can try to alter the outcomes. This can be achieved by individuals by talking to the proper authorities and asking for a pay rise or other desired rewards. Third, in order to reduce the cognitive discomfort caused by the felt inequities, the person could begin to think and believe that either her inputs were not as great as should have been, or that the rewards received were after all not bad. Fourth reaction to felt inequity could be to alienate oneself from the job by remaining absent, coming late, or even quitting the job. Fifth, the person who feels negative inequity can influence the other person with whom comparisons are made to reduce his/her inputs. Finally, a person feeling inequity may change his/her comparison level by choosing another person as the reference for social comparison.

First of all an organization must make a conscious effort to ensure that underpayment situation is not caused as it leads to negative consequences like reduced productivity and even unethical behaviour like stealing.

Green Berg (1990) found that people may not only resort to stealing but the amount of stealing was also proportionate to the amount of justification given for underpayment. If a manager believes that creating overpayment for a particular employee or even for a group of employees will lead to higher productivity and thus will benefit the organization, he is sadly mistaken. The overpayment condition for some employees automatically gives the feeling of
underpayment to other employees. Even overpaid employees will improve their performance only for some time and then will go back to their previous performance as they would convince themselves that they deserve higher pay and need not do anything to justify it. The other employees will reduce their productivity as they will perceive the situation as unfair. So in the long run, the organization will be saddled with lowered productivity of all employees. Therefore it is advisable to avoid the situation of both underpayment and overpayment and treat all the employees equally.

One should keep in mind that it is not the ground realities which are important but the perception of employees. Distortion of perception or misperception can be avoided by adopting an openness policy. The management should not hide anything and should be open and honest about inputs and outcomes. Very often people have a misperception that their superiors are paid more than them and therefore feel that their own pay is not appropriate. This can be tackled by adopting a policy of openness.

Finally, the managers should present the information about inputs and outcomes in a detailed and socially sensitive manner. It was found that people were more accepting of underpayment when through sensitive explanation was given and less extreme reaction took place. On the other hand, if the explanation was superficial, people were highly dissatisfied and resorted to stealing more often.

This shows that people are influenced not only by input/output ratio but also by the way they were treated by others. Treating others in a kind sensitive manner has been shown to be an effective way of getting people to accept many of the different inequities they may expect to encounter on the job.

Limitations:

a) It is somewhat narrow in its emphasis on visible rewards and overemphasises conscious processes.
b) It is difficult to assess the perceptions (misperceptions) of employees. Hence, the difficulty in operationalizing the concepts of the theory.

c) How does person choose the comparison ‘Other’? The process by which individuals decide whom to compare themselves with is not clearly understood at present. According to Hamner and Organ, one of the weakest element of Equity theory is its analysis of the process by which individuals choose a comparison ‘Other’.

d) Equity theory is not precise enough to predict which actions are most probable.

Inspite of these limitations Equity Theory is a promising motivation theory and has direct relevance for compensation practice, which is why it is important for managers to manage equity dynamics intelligently and carefully, where felt inequities are common in all organizations.

9) **Motivational Constraints Theory**

March and Simon have elaborated a Theory of Motivational Constraints which operate upon (a) Intra-organizational decisions, and (b) The individual decision to participate in the organization. They feel that the success of the organization depends on the equilibrium between the payment made to induce the employee and the corresponding contribution made by him.

“This equilibrium according to them is a function of (a) The perceived desirability of leaving the organization and (b) The perceived ease of movement from the organization or the utility of alternatives a person foregoes in order to remain in the organization”.

The desirability of movement depends on the satisfaction the individual derives in his job and the perception of alternatives available within the organisation. However, the perceived ease of leaving an organisation is
related to a number of extra-organisational alternatives which the employee perceives.

The Motivational Constraint Theory has a number of limitations. The machinistic view of man has been over exaggerated. Human units are not easily changeable. Further the balance between inducements and contributions is sometimes not possible. At times the company pays more than what has been contributed by the individual and vice versa. “It is not simple to get a close fit between inducements and contributions”. In spite of this fact, the companies have the job evaluation and merit rating systems in operation so as to reduce the gap between inducements and contributions.

10) Porter- Lawler Model

Lyman Porter and Edward Lawler (1968) came out with a comprehensive theory of motivation, combining various aspects. The model indicates that people first try to figure out whether the rewards that are likely to be received from doing a job will be attractive or valent to them (box 1). For a person who is looking for more money for example, extra vacation time may not be an attractive reward. If the reward to be obtained is attractive or valent, then the individual will decide to put in the necessary effort to perform the job. If the expected reward is not valent, he will lower his effort. In addition, before people put forth any effort, they will also try to assess the probability of a certain level of effort leading to a desired level of performance, and the probability of that performance leading to certain kinds of rewards (box 2). Based on the valence of the reward, and the effort reward – probability, people then decide to put in a certain level of work effort (box 3). The effort put in will lead to the expected level of performance (box 4) only if the individual has the requisite abilities and traits to perform the job (box 5). Abilities include job knowledge, skills, and intellectual capacity to perform the job. Traits such as endurance, perseverance, and goal –
directedness are also important for many jobs. If these are absent, the effort put in will not lead to the desired level of performance. Thus abilities and traits will moderate the effort-performance relationship.

In other words, only those who have the requisite abilities and traits will perform the job well when they put forth the effort; the others will not. In addition, the individual performing the job should also have accurate role perceptions (box 6). Role perception refers to the way in which people define their jobs. We often hear managers say that the job is what the employee makes of it. Some people may take on additional responsibilities and expand the scope of their job. Others may avoid some aspects of their job and hence narrow its scope. Thus people may perceive their goals (job behaviours) differently. The accuracy of role perceptions is another variable that moderates the effort-performance relationship. That is, only those who perceive their role as it is defined by the organization will be able to perform, well when they put forth the requisite effort. For instance, a machinist who has recently been promoted as a supervisor will not be able to effectively get the job done through others, if he still clings on to his former role as a machinist working hard on the machines himself. His role after promotion is to supervise other machinists and get the job done through them so that the production level in his department goes up.

However, if he still expends all his effort in doing the job himself, he is going to be an ineffective supervisor and his performance (as a supervisor) will be poor despite all the efforts he puts in. Thus, both abilities and traits, and accurate role perceptions, moderate the relationship between effort and performance.

Performance leads to certain outcomes in the shape of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards (box 7) are those feelings of joy, self esteem, and sense of competence that individuals feel when they do a good job. Extrinsic rewards (box 8) are those external rewards that are given by others in the work
environment, either in the form of more money, recognition, or praise. Both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards provide satisfaction (box 9) to the individuals. However, the rewards – satisfaction relationship is moderated by the perceived equitability of rewards (box 10). That is, satisfaction will be experienced only when the person feels fairly and justly rewarded for his or her efforts, not otherwise.

Significance of the Porter and Lawler Model
Porter and Lawler’s Model is of great significance to managers since it sensitizes them to focus attention on the following to keep their employees motivated.

a) Put the right person on the right job (match abilities and threats of individuals to the requirements of the job).
b) Carefully explain to employees what their role is, and make sure they understand it.

c) Describe in concrete terms the actual performance levels expected of the individuals (output quantity, waste control percentages, number of customers to the serviced, that will be tolerated etc).

d) Make sure that the rewards dispensed are valued by the employee. That is, find out what rewards are attractive to the employee and see if such rewards can be given to them.

e) If high levels of motivation are to be induced, managers should ensure that employees perceive a direct link between performance and desired rewards. If significant changes in performance levels are desired, the rewards dispensed must also be significant and valued enough by the employees to change their effort levels.

The Porter and Lawler Model is useful in understanding the dynamics of motivation at the work place.

11) **Vroom’s Expectancy Theory**

Expectancy theory is also known as Instrumentality Theory or a Process Theory. The historical origin of Expectancy Theory goes back to Tolman (1932), Lewin (1938) and Peak (1955) but Vroom’s version of the theory introduced it to industrial psychology in 1964. Vroom’s theory (1964) and that of Porter and Lawler (1968) emphasized on ‘how’ of motivation instead of ‘what’ of motivation. While Need Theories look into which factors motivate people, Expectancy Theories show us the route from motivators to behaviours. The theory is based on rational economic view of people. In other words, it assumes that before exerting themselves people try to find out whether it will benefit them or not. Thus people are basically decision-makers who choose among various alternative actions those actions which appear to fetch maximum benefit at that time.
All expectancy theories assume that people have three different types of beliefs. They are (a) Valence (b) Instrumentality (c) Expectancy.

a) Valence

Valence can be referred as person’s desire or the psychological attracting or repelling capacity of an object. Outcomes like salary, security, recognition etc. have different valences (attractiveness) for different people. They do not have any generalized fixed value, e.g., valence of a Rs. 100 prize for a multimillionaire will be negative while for a very poor man the valence of the same Rs. 100 prize will be very high. The crucial aspect of valence in motivation is the anticipation. A person anticipates or expects certain satisfaction or pleasure by obtaining a particular object. The anticipation contributes to the attractiveness or valence of the object. After receiving the object, in reality a person may not find it as satisfying as anticipated, but that is not important. The important thing is the anticipation, e.g., person may have high valence or attraction of receiving the promotion because he believes the life will be much more comfortable or the workload will reduce. After getting promotion he may not find his expectations fulfilled. But before getting promotion the person’s behaviour was driven by anticipation and not by reality. So one has to take into account valence while trying to motivate a person.

b) Instrumentality

Instrumentality refers to the degree to which a first level outcome will lead to a desired second level outcome. For example, a person would be motivated toward superior performance because of the desire to be promoted. The superior performance (first level outcome) is seen as being instrumental in obtaining a promotion (second level outcome).

c) Expectancy

The first Expectation that effort will lead to effective performance will be known as expectancy. It is subjective probability or a personal belief that a
person has. This probability can range from 0.00 to 1.00. In other words a person may be absolutely sure that his actions will not lead to attainment of his goal while expectancy of 1.00 will mean that a person is absolutely sure that his actions will lead to achievement of his goals, e.g., a person working on a machine from morning to evening may be sure of achieving the targets set for him or he may be absolutely sure that working on that machine from morning to evening will not enable him to achieve the targets set for him.

Motivation according to this theory is product of Valence, Expectancy and Instrumentality, e.g., if an individual wants pay rise or more comforts (Valence) and realizes that promotion can bring in more comforts (Instrumentality) and understands that hard work can lead to promotion (Expectancy), in that case he will put in more efforts. But if his experience tells him that hard work will not lead to promotion or that promotion will not lead to more money, then he will not put in hard work.
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**Vroom's Expectancy Theory**

Greenberg and Baron pointed out that motivation should not be equated with job performance; instead motivation is just one of the factors that influences job performance. Apart from motivation, skills and abilities also
influence job performance. Even if a person in absolutely sure of hard work leading to promotion and promotion leading to more money but he does not have the required skills and abilities to put in the hard work he won’t be able to start in spite of the fact that he wants to. So skill and ability are important determinants of performance. Apart from that a person’s role perception also influences his job performance. Even if a person wants more money, is very clear about the link between money and promotion, has the abilities but does not know what exactly he is supposed to do, what are his job responsibilities or his beliefs about his job responsibilities are totally different from his superior’s idea of his job responsibilities, he may be rated as poor performer. In such a case the person is rated as poor performer not because he has poor motivation but because of misunderstanding between him and his superiors about what is appropriate for him?

According to Porter and Lawler Role Perception can be thought of as the agreement or lack of agreement between a superior and a subordinate about the nature of good performance. If they agree, then employee’s efforts can be transported into effective performance.

Another factor that may influence job performance is opportunities available to perform one’s job. In spite of high motivation, skills and abilities, being very clear about what he is supposed to do, a person may yet not perform because he has not got a chance to perform e.g., a cricketer may be very good player, knows what is expected of him if he gets a chance to play and is highly motivated to play, but does not get selected in the team or match gets over before he had the chance to go to the field.

The Theory has generated lot of interest among researchers and has got mixed support, yet is a very popular theory.
Implications of the Vroom Model for Organizational Behaviour

Vroom’s theory departs from the content theories in that it depicts a process of cognitive variables that reflects individual differences in work motivation. It does not attempt to describe what the content is or what the individual differences are. Everyone has a unique combination of valences, instrumentalities, and expectancies. Thus, the Vroom theory indicates only the conceptual determinants of motivation and how they are related. It does not provide specific suggestions on what motivates organizational members, as the Maslow, Herzberg, and Alderfer models do. Although the Vroom Model does not directly contribute much to the techniques of motivating personnel in an organization, it is of value in understanding organizational behaviour.

The theory strongly suggests that is essential to clarify people’s expectancies that their effort will lead to performance. Motivation can be enhanced by training employees to do their jobs more efficiently, thereby achieving higher levels of performance from their efforts. It also may be possible to enhance effort-performance expectancies by following employees’ suggestions about ways to change their jobs.

A second practical suggestion is to clearly link valued rewards and performance. In other words, managers should enhance their subordinates’ beliefs about instrumentality by specifying exactly what job behaviours will lead to what rewards.

Third suggestion is to administer rewards that are positively valent to employees. In other words, the carrot at the end of the stick must be tasty for it to have potential as a motivator. Some might recognise the incentive value of a pay rise, whereas others might prefer additional vacation days, improved insurance benefits, day care or elder care facilities. With this in mind, many companies have introduced cafeteria-style benefit plans- incentive systems allowing employees to select their fringe benefits. The theory is also of great value in understanding organizational behaviour. It can clarify the relationship
between individual and organizational goals. For example, suppose workers are given a certain standard for production. By measuring the workers output, management can determine how important their various personal goals (second-level outcomes such as money, security, and recognition) are; the Instrumentality of the organizational goal (the first-level outcomes, such as the production standard) for the attainment of the personal goals; and the workers’ expectancies that their effort and ability will accomplish the organizational goal. If output is below standard, it may be that the workers do not place a high value on the second-level outcomes; or they may not see that the first-level outcome is Instrumental in obtaining the second-level outcomes; or they may think that their efforts will not accomplish the first-level outcome. Vroom feels, that any one, or a combination, of these possibilities will result in a low level of motivation to perform.

The Model is designed to help management understand and analyze workers’ motivation and identify some of the relevant variables; it does not provide specific solutions to motivational problems. Besides having an application problem, the model also assumes, as earlier economic theory did, that people are rational and logically calculating such an assumption may be too idealistic. It has not been fully tested empirically. It is complex and thus its validity is difficult to test in its entirety. Most studies that have attempted to test its validity have been only marginally successful.

It is overly rational. Not everyone is willing or able to expend the energy to calculate probabilities. “People rarely sit down and list their expected outcomes for a contemplated behaviour, estimate expectancies and valences, multiply, and add up the total unless, of course, they are asked to do so by a researcher”. The predictive accuracy of the theory leaves much to be desired. The amount of effort individuals are willing to put on the job is influenced by many factors (besides those mentioned in the theory).

Research on the principles of Expectancy Theory has been plugged by a wide variety of technical, methodological problems. There is no way of measuring
valences on a ratio scale and each valence is explained in terms of all other valences.

**More precisely it is has ignored three things:**

a) The individual differences in ability to calculate expectancies and valences.

b) Individual differences in the number and the type of consequences people consider when making decisions.

c) Unconscious motivations of behaviour as well as impulsive and expressive behaviour.

Probably the major reason Vroom’s model has emerged as an important modern theory of work motivation and has generated so much research is that it does not take a simplistic approach. The content theories oversimplify human motivation. Yet the content theories remain extremely popular with the practicing managers because the concepts are easy to understand and to apply to their own situations. On the other hand, the VIE Theory recognizes the complexities of work motivation, but it is relatively difficult to understand and apply. Thus from a theoretical standpoint, the VIE Model seems to help managers appreciate the complexities of motivation, but it does not give them much practical help in solving their motivational problems except simple prescriptions such as making sure employees know exactly what is expected of them.

In some ways Vroom’s Expectancy Model is like marginal analysis in economics. Business people do not actually calculate the point where marginal costs equals marginal revenue, but it is still a useful concept for an economic theory of the firm. Likewise, the Expectancy Model attempts only to mirror the complex motivational process, it does not attempt to describe how motivational decisions are actually made or to solve actual motivational problems facing a manager. From a theoretical point of view, the model appears to be a “Step in the right direction”, for, it recognizes the complexities
of work motivation and does not take an oversimplified and simplistic approach like the content models.

12) **Behaviour Modification**

Organizational Behaviour Modification, or OB Model, is the application in organizations of the principles of Behaviour Modification, which evolved from the work of B.F. Skinner. OB Mod and Goal Setting are two Process Theories of Motivation, since they provide perspectives on the dynamics by which employees can be motivated.

OB Mod is based on the idea that behaviour depends on its consequences; therefore, it is possible for managers to control (or at least affect) a number of employee behaviours by manipulating their consequences. OB Mod relies heavily on the law of effect, which states that a person tends to repeat behaviour that is accompanied by favourable consequences (Reinforcement) and tends not to repeat behaviour that is accompanied by unfavourable consequences. Two conditions are required for successful application of OB Mod: the manager must be able to identify some powerful consequences (as perceived by the employee) and then must be able to administer them in such a way that the employee will see the connection between the behaviour to be affected and the consequences.

The Law of Effect comes from Learning Theory, which suggests that we learn best under pleasant surroundings. While Content Theories argue that internal needs lead to behaviour, OB Mod states that external consequences tend to determine behaviour. The advantage of OB Mod is that it places a greater degree of control (and responsibility) in the hands of the manager. Several firms, including Frito – Lay, Weyerhaeuser, and B.F. Goodrich, have used various forms of Behaviour Modification successfully.

OB Mod places great emphasis on the use of rewards and alternative consequences to sustain behaviour. Before using OB Mod, however, managers
must decide whether they wish to increase the probability of a person’s continued behaviour or to decrease it. Once they have decided on their objective, they have two further choices to make which determine the type of consequence to be applied. First, should they use a positive or a negative consequence? Second, should they apply it or withhold it? The answers to those two questions result in four unique alternative consequences, as shown in the fig.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Positive reinforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager's use</td>
<td>Negative reinforcement</td>
<td>Extinction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig- 2.6**

*Four Alternative Consequences in OB Mod*

Behaviour is encouraged primarily through Positive Reinforcement. Positive Reinforcement provides a favourable consequence that encourages repetition of behaviour. An employee may find that when high-quality work is done, the supervisor gives a reward of recognition. Since then employee likes recognition, behaviour is reinforced, and the employee tends to want to do high-quality work again. The reinforcement always should be contingent on
the employee’s correct behaviour. Shaping is a systematic and progressive application of Positive Reinforcement. It occurs when more frequent, or more powerful, reinforcements are successively given as the employee comes closer to the desired behaviour. Even though the completely correct behaviour does not yet occur, it is encouraged by giving reinforcement for behaviour in the desired direction. Shaping is especially useful for teaching complex tasks. Negative Reinforcement occurs when behaviour is accompanied by removal of an unfavourable consequence; therefore, it is not the same as punishment, which normally adds something unfavourable. Consistent with the law of effect, behaviour responsible for removal of something unfavourable is repeated when that unfavourable state is again encountered. An example of negative reinforcement is the experience of a jet aircraft mechanic who learned that if she wore noise suppressors over her ears, she could prevent discomfort from the jet engine noise— the unfavourable consequence; this reinforcement encouraged her to wear the proper noise equipment.

Punishment is the administration of an unfavourable consequence that discourages certain behaviour. Although punishment may be necessary occasionally to discourage an undesirable behaviour, it needs to be used with caution because it has certain limitations. A major one is that punishment primarily discourages an undesirable behaviour; it does not directly encourage any kind of desirable behaviour unless the person receiving it is clearly aware of the alternative path to follow. (Punishment may, however, serve as a social cue to inform others of the value of acceptable behaviours). Another problem is that managers acting as punishers may be disliked for their disciplinary actions. This result may place a strain on the work relationship and reduce the punisher’s effectiveness when offering future reinforcements. Also, people who are punished may be unclear about what specific part of their behaviour is being punished, and it is possible that some desirable behaviours may be accidentally discouraged.
Extinction is the withholding of significant positive consequences that were previously provided for a desirable behaviour. Such desirable learned behaviour needs to be reinforced to encourage the person to repeat the action in the future. If no reinforcement by the manager, the employee, or anyone else occurs, the behaviour tends to diminish (become extinguished) through lack of reinforcement. In one instance an employee who had been praised for her creativity made three suggestions to her supervisor over a period of several weeks. The supervisor did not reject the suggestions or accept them or do anything else. The suggestions just disappeared in the bureaucratic maze. Needless to say, the employee’s suggestion making behaviour was extinguished by the lack of consequences. In this case the supervisor probably did not intend to cause the Extinction, but in other cases extinction is used as a conscious strategy. Then alternative responses that are desired can be reinforced to change behaviour.

It would be naïve to conclude that supervisors can gain the benefits of extinction by simply ignoring undesirable employee behaviours, however. There are many other sources of need satisfaction inside and outside the workplace, and many of these are beyond the supervisor’s control. Managers can generally achieve more favourable results by actively manipulating the favourable or unfavourable consequences of behaviour and doing so on a predetermined schedule.

Before various types of consequences can be applied, managers should monitor employee behaviour to learn how often, or how well, employees are performing. The frequency of the behaviour creates a baseline, or standard, against which improvements can be compared. Then the manager can select a reinforcement schedule, which is the frequency with which the chosen consequence accompanies a desired behaviour.

Reinforcement may be either continuous or partial. Continuous reinforcement occurs when a reinforcer accompanies each correct behaviour by an employee. In some instances, this Level of Reinforcement may be desirable to encourage
quick learning, but in the typical work situation it usually is not possible to reward even one employee for every correct behaviour – much less several employees. An example of Continuous Reinforcement is payment of employees for each acceptable item that they produce.

Partial Reinforcement occurs when only some of the correct behaviours are reinforced. Learning is slower with Partial Reinforcement than with Continuous Reinforcement. However, a unique feature of Partial Reinforcement is that learning tends to be retained longer when it is secured under conditions of Partial Reinforcement.

There are four types of partial reinforcement schedules—Fixed Interval, Variable Interval, Fixed Ratio and Variable Ratio schedules—which offer a variety of reinforcement approaches.

a) Fixed Intervals

A Fixed Interval schedule provides reinforcement after a certain period of time. A typical example is a pay cheque that arises every two weeks. Except in very unusual circumstances, the employee can depend on the cheque’s arriving on a certain day every two weeks.

b) Variable Intervals

Variable Interval schedules give reinforcement after a variety of time periods. Usually the variations are grouped around some target, or average, period of reinforcement. An example is one company’s policy of making safety inspections of every department four times a year in order to encourage compliance with safety regulations. The inspections are made on a random basis, so the intervals between them vary.
c) **Fixed Ratio**

Fixed Ratio schedules occur when there is reinforcement after a certain number of correct responses. An example is payment of sales bonuses after a certain number of large items (such as automobiles) are sold. In one automobile agency, sales personnel are given a bonus after every fifth car sold. This bonus is an encouragement to sell more cars, especially when employees which appoint where they already have sold three of four and need only one or two more to earn the bonus.

d) **Variable Ratio**

Variable Ratio schedule is a reinforcement after a variable (but undisclosed) number of correct responses, such as reinforcement after 19, then 15, then 12, then 24, and then 17 responses. This type of reinforcement schedule provokes much interest and is preferred by employees for some tasks. It tends to be the most powerful of all the reinforcement schedules. An interesting fact is that slot machines and a number of other gambling devices operate on a variable ratio schedule so gamblers experienced the power of this reinforcement schedule before it was isolated and studied by behavioural scientists.

The major benefit of Behaviour Modification is that it makes managers become conscious motivators. It encourages managers to analyse employee behaviour, explore why it occurs and how often, and identify specific consequences that will help change it when those consequences are applied systematically. Application of this process often encourages effective supervisors to devote more time to monitoring employee behaviours. Performance Feedback and recognition are often parts of this strategy because they tend to be widely desired and therefore are strong reinforcements. When specific behaviours can be identified and desired reinforcements are properly applied Behaviour modification can lead to substantial improvements in specific areas, such as absences, tardiness, and error rates.
General guidelines for applying Behaviour Modification are:

a) Identify the exact behaviour to be modified.
b) Make sure the expected behaviour is within the employee’s capabilities.
c) Determine not only the rewards that employees value but also the magnitude that would affect their behaviour.
d) Clarify the connection between desired behaviour and rewards.
e) Use Positive Reinforcement whenever possible.
f) Use Punishment only in unusual circumstances and for specific behaviours.
g) Ignore minor undesirable behaviour to allow its extinction.
h) Use shaping procedures to develop correct complex behaviours.
i) Minimize the time between the correct response and the reinforcement.
j) Provide reinforcement frequently and on some chosen schedule.

Behaviour Modification has been criticized on several grounds including its philosophy, methods, and practicality. Because of the strong power of desired consequences, Behaviour Modification may effectively force people to change their behaviour. In this way it manipulates people and is inconsistent with humanistic assumptions that people want to be autonomous and self actualising. Some critics also fear that Behaviour Modification gives too much power to the managers, and they raise the question, “Who will control the controllers?”

Other critics say that Behaviour Modification insults people’s intelligence. At the extreme, people could be treated like rats in a training box when in fact they are intelligent, thinking, self controlled individuals who are capable of making their own choices are perhaps motivating themselves. Another problem is that Behaviour modification has limited applicability to complex jobs. For example it is difficult to identify specific behaviours in the jobs of corporate lawyers or chief executive officers and reinforce them.
Locke and Latham’s Goal Setting Theory

Ryan (1970) presented a very convincing argument for the role of intention in motivated behaviour. He notes that “One of commonly observed characteristics of intentional behaviour is that it tends to keep going until it reaches completion. When we are interrupted before reaching the natural conclusion of the activity, we often experience irritation and resist the interruption”.

It is a common experience that if we start doing something, we don’t feel happy until we achieve the objectives or goals we had set for ourselves. Baldamus called this procedure one of ‘traction’ as opposed to distraction and defined it as “The feeling of being pulled along by the inertia inherent in the particular activity”. Thus Goal-Setting is a motivational technique.

Goals can be defined as something that a person intends to do in near future.

Goal setting works as a motivational process because it creates a discrepancy between current and expected performance. This results in a feeling of tension, which the employee can diminish through future goal attainment. Meeting goals also helps satisfy a person’s achievement drive, contributes to feelings of competence and self-esteem, and further stimulates personal growth needs. Individuals who successfully achieve goals tend to set even higher goals in the future.

A major factor in the success of Goal Setting is self-efficacy. This is an internal belief regarding one’s job-related capabilities and competencies. Self-efficacy can be judged either on a specific task or across a variety of performance duties. If employees have high self-efficacies, they will tend to set higher personal goals under the belief that they are attainable. The first key to successful Goal Setting is to build and reinforce employee self-efficacy. Following this step, managers should try to incorporate the four essential elements of Goal Setting.

Research by Latham and Yulk (1975) have indicated that four important requirements should be met in the task goal setting process if employees are to
be motivated to perform well on their jobs. They are Goal Acceptance, Goal Specificity, Goal Challenge, and Monitoring & Feedback. Managers should try to incorporate the four essential elements of Goal Setting, which are discussed in the figure given.

Fig-2.7
Elements of Effective Goal Setting

Elements of Effective Goal Setting
a) Goal Acceptance

Effective goals need to be understood and accepted. Simply assigning goals to employees may not result in their commitment to those goals, especially if the goal will be difficult to accomplish. As a minimum, supervisors need to explain the purpose behind goals and the necessity for them. A more powerful method of obtaining acceptance is to allow the employees to participate in the goal-setting process. When goals are set jointly by the superior and the subordinate, the likelihood of the latter accepting the goal and becoming committed to it is greater. Goals are accepted by employees when they are in consonance with the employees’ own value
system. Once there is acceptance and commitment to the goals, the employees will be motivated to put forth greater effort and perform well.

b) Goal Specificity

Goals that are set should be clear, specific and measurable. In other words, the employees should know what exactly is expected of their performance both in terms of quantity and quality, such knowledge reduces ambiguity or confusion that may exist, and the individual can then expend effort and concentrate on the achievement of a well-defined final output. Results of research in this area also indicate that setting specific performance goals is a better motivator and achieves better results than asking employees to “do their best”. Specific goals let them know what to reach for and allow them to measure their own progress.

c) Goal Challenge

It is not sufficient just to have specific goals for performance to improve; one must consider the difficulty level also. The goals should be neither too easy nor too difficult for an individual. Moderately difficult goals pose a challenge to an individual and improve the commitment. If the goals are too easy or too difficult, the commitment will be low. If they are seen as too difficult, the person will not convert them into personal goals and will put up his hands even before trying on. The employee will out rightly reject the goals as unrealistic. Another way to get better acceptance of difficult goals is through supervisors support. If supervisors are not serious about certain goals the subordinates will be hardly bothered about them.

d) Monitoring and Feedback

Even after employees have participated in setting well-defined and challenging goals, two other closely related steps are important to complete the process. Performance monitoring-observing behaviour, inspecting output,
or studying documents of performance indicators—provides at least subtle cues to employees that their tasks are important, their effort is needed, and their contributions are valued. This monitoring heightens their awareness of the role they play in contributing to organizational effectiveness. Simply monitoring results, however, may not be enough. Many employees are hungry for information about how well they are performing. Without performance feedback—the timely provision of data or judgment regarding task-related results, employees will be “working in the dark” and have no true idea how successful they are. Performance Feedback tends to encourage better job performance, and self-generated feedback is an especially powerful motivational tool.

Northcraft, Lee and Lituchy (1990) pointed out that feedback can be of two types—Outcome Feedback and Process Feedback. Outcome Feedback provides information about the consequences of one’s actions and the Process Feedback provides information about the ways to improve task performance. Though both types of feedback can be effective in improving the performance, the process feedback is more effective, because it helps people to understand how to improve.

Researchers examined the financial performance of 437 companies to explore the effects of setting goals, giving feedback, reviewing results, and rewarding behaviour. They discovered that firms with these performance management programs had greater profits, better cash flow, and stronger stock market performance than those that did not have them. Further, in a comparison of the before and after performances of the firms with performance management, the average shareholder return increased by 25 percent and productivity gains averaged 94 percent.

14) **Social Learning Theory**

Organizational Behaviour Modification has basically overlooked people’s cognitive (judgment and choice) skills as active participants in the
performance process. It has also only minimally considered the influence of antecedents (cues) of behaviour. These limitations have led to the emergence of Social Learning Theory, which is a more recent adaptation of the OB Mod process.

Social Learning Theory, developed by Albert Bandura, suggests that employees gain substantial information about how to perform and act by observing and imitating role models around them. (This process is also called Vicarious Learning, or learning through the experiences of others). Similarly, employees influence others in their work environments who are watching them. In effect, there is a continuous formal or informal exchange of information passing back and forth between employees and their surroundings even as they are interpreting management’s attempts to modify their behaviour. As a result, employees focus more on what their managers do, rather than what they say. Managers need to serve as effective role models.

The importance of Social Learning Theory for Motivation is that it reminds managers that employees do not always react mechanically to their environment. Instead, workers carefully observe other people and continually interpret the symbols and cues around them. As a result, much of employee behaviour is consciously chosen. This widely used motivational approach provides important signals to employees about what is important to the organization and therefore cues their behavior in desired directions.

15) **Expectation Achievement Theory**

The Expectation and Achievement Theory places its main emphasis on individual and group behaviour. Ralph M. Stogdill in his book “Individual Behaviour and Group Achievement” relates his Achievement Theory in interaction patterns and group structure.
He asserts that the behaviour pattern of group members depends on three factors. They are (a) Interactions, (b) Performances, and (c) Expectations. Each of these postulates is interconnected in the following manner.

Expectation philosophy is reflected in the works of George Herbert Mead, Barnard, Elton Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickens McGregor and Peter Drucker. It is more formally embodied in the writings of Tolman, Hull, Skinner, Hilgard, McGeoch and other learned theorists. Expectation is defined as an element of readiness for Reinforcement and thus has the learning aspect. It is the function of (a) Drive, (b) The estimated probability of occurrence of an outcome and (c) The estimated desirability of an outcome.

“Motivation also is a function of drive and confirmed desirability estimates”. Hence “Expectation and Motivation are thus overlapping concepts since drive and desirability estimates contribute to both motivation and expectation”.

The Achievement Approach to motivation is related to human needs. Consequently H.A. Murray describes motivation in terms of needs. He opines that personality is greatly influenced by the needs of an individual. To measure these needs Murray has developed the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). The needs which could be categorised by him as the need to achieve success, recognition or security.
16) **Theory X and Y**

McGregor’s Theory is based on the assumptions of human behaviour. He proposes Theory X and Theory Y reflective of what he considered as two distinct perspectives of administrative action. Actually Theory X and Theory Y are attitudes or predispositions toward people. Theory X is negative traditional and autocratic style with the assumption that, “The average human being has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if he can”, this assumption led him to propound Theory X; the managers of such employees will think that “Most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organisational objectives”. After describing Theory X, McGregor questioned if this view of human nature is correct. On the contrary, “The average human being does not inherently dislike work” which led to the development of his Theory Y, which is positive, participatory and democratic. Thus, these labels described contrasting set of assumptions about human nature.

**Assumptions – Theory X are:**

a) The average human being has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if possible.

b) Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.

c) The average human prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, lacks integrity, lacks ambition and wants security above all.

d) These people are incapable of directing their own behaviour, dislike responsibility and prefer to be directed by others and are indifferent to organisational needs.
e) These people by nature are restricted to change.

**Assumptions – Theory Y are:**

**a)** The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

**b)** External control and the threat of punishment are not only means of bringing about effort toward organisational objectives. People will exercise self-direction and self control in the service of objectives to which they are committed.

**c)** Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.

**d)** The average human being learns under proper conditions not only to accept but also to seek responsibility.

**e)** The capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organisational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population. The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility is already present. Management does not put them there. It is the responsibility of the management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves.

McGregor has drawn a sharp line of demarcation, between the two distinct perspectives of administrative action. One is equated with tradition and the other is identified with change. One is labelled as autocratic, control centered and the other is glamourised as the epitome of democratic governance. The impression that one might get from the discussion is that managers who accept Theory X assumptions about human nature exhibit a built-in affinity for carrot and stick policies while Theory Y managers exhibit a built-in devotion in participative, behaviour centered policies.
Theory Y person, no doubt, will have a greater potential for being a good manager, especially, at higher managerial jobs but he must have the relevant training and experience for this potential to become real. Theory X person might be more suitable in some crisis, situations, and less appropriate in more routine and formalized situations. The essential point is that Theory Y may be a more desirable and productive path, reflecting ‘A more reality centered view of people’, to follow. It may not be the best approach for all situations. The best approach, obviously, is one that is appropriate to the nature of the work done. Recognizing this, Mc Gregor stated later that it was not his intention ‘to suggest more than that these (Theory X and theory Y) are examples of two among many managerial cosmologies. For the present, let us say that under some conditions Theory X works best and under other conditions, Theory Y works best. Perhaps, the optimum theory would be called theory Z and would take into consideration the manager’s need to press into service both approaches at one time or the other.

17) Job Characteristic Model

Earlier research was not very clear about what constitutes job enrichment. Most of the researchers used Herzberg’s Theory as the base for enrichment but by 1970s and 1980s the two factor theory itself was under lot of attacks. So psychologists wondered exactly what elements of job should be enriched to make job enrichment effective. To answer these questions job characteristic model was offered by Hackman in 1976 and followed by Hackman and Oldham in 1980.

According to this model the jobs should be designed in such ways that increase the feeling of improvement for the employee. No matter what job people are performing in the organization, they must get the feeling that they are making an important contribution to the organization. The elements of job
which can bring such change in psychological states of the employees should be targeted for enrichment programme.

The Model has identified five core job dimensions that can help create three psychological states that can result in many positive outcomes, for both individuals and for organization as a whole.

**The five core dimensions identified were as follows:**

a) **Skill Variety**
   
   This refers to the degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work which requires the use of different skills and talents of employees.

b) **Task Identity**
   
   This refers to the degree to which the job requires completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work, i.e., doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome.

c) **Task Significance**
   
   This refers to the degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other people whether in the immediate organization or in the extended environment.

d) **Autonomy**
   
   This refers to the degree to which job provides substantial freedom, independence and description to the employee in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out.

e) **Feedback**
   
   This refers to the degree to which the worker gets information about the effectiveness of his or her efforts, either directly from the work itself or
from others. This helps them to develop better understanding, of what should be done to give effective performance.

These core dimensions produce certain critical psychological states. These states differ from person to person and from situation to situation.

**These three Psychological States are:**

**a) Experienced Meaningfulness**

This refers to the psychological satisfaction experienced by the worker who knows that the work he is doing is important, valuable and worthwhile. That is, the individual feels he is engaged in doing something meaningful. This experienced meaningfulness results from using a number of different skills (Skill Variety in job), doing an identifiable piece of work (Task Identity) and engaging in work that has a significant impact on others (Task Significance).

**b) Experienced Responsibility**

This refers to the degree to which the individual feels he is personally responsible or accountable for the outcome of the work done, results from the extent of job autonomy that the individual has while working.

**c) Experienced Knowledge of Results**

This refers to the degree to which the individual realizes how well he is performing the job or the satisfaction of knowing how well one is performing on the job is derived from the fact that the job provides feedback even as the individual is working on it.

Hackman and Oldham however, qualify their statement that the core job dimensions will lead to experienced psychological states, which in turn, will eventually result in intrinsic motivation, performance, and involvement, by suggesting that these relationships will hold true only for such employees who have a high “Growth Need Strength”.
Growth Need Strength refers to the need people have to learn, develop, and grow on the job. Not everybody has a high Growth Need. Some people feel content to stay where they are and have no desire to develop and grow, or learn and advance in the organization.
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**Fig- 2.9**

**Job design model of Hackman & Oldham**

Hackman and Oldham (1975) also came up with a formula for determining the motivating potential score (MPS) in each job. That is, the propensity of each job to be motivating can be assessed by using the formula.

\[
MPS = \frac{(SV + TI + TS) \times A \times F}{3}
\]


To assess whether job motivation will increase in proportion to the level of job performed in various dimensions, ‘Job Diagnostic Survey’ was developed.
The scores of JDS indicate the degree to which job will motivate the job holders and this can be measured by MPS index as explained above. Loher et al. (1985) tested this model in an experiment in a group of South African clerical workers. The clerks were divided into two groups. They had identical nature of job to begin with. The jobs of clerks in one group were enriched by giving them the chance to choose the kind of task they would perform (high skill variety), chance to perform entire job (high task identity), the chance to receive information about how exactly their jobs fit in the organizational hierarchy (high feedback and a chance to keep records of their own productivity (high feedback). After six months both the groups were compared and results were supportive of job characteristic model. The workers in enriched group did report feeling more satisfied with their job and internally motivated. The rate of absenteeism and turnover also came down. However, the quality of their performance did not make much difference from the other group. This indicated that job enrichment influences job attitudes and beliefs more than actual performance. Yet the theory is widely used in practical life.

**Ropp K.C. (1987) has given various practical suggestions to increase the motivational potential by redesigning the jobs as follows:**

a) **Combine tasks and form natural work limits**

This refers to doing away with the concept of job implication. An employee should be allowed to perform a full natural unit of work rather than just a piece of it. This will help to provide a high task identity as well as high skill variety to the worker, e.g., Suppose tables are to be produced by three carpenters, then instead of assigning one job of cutting the wooden planks to one person, fixing the nails to another person and polishing to third person, it is better that all three are assigned the job of producing entire table right from cutting to polishing and they are told how many pieces each one is supposed to produce.
b) **Establish client relationships**

If a person is performing a service job rather than the manufacturing job let that person come into contact with actual consumer who will be enjoying his services. This will not only give feedback to the employee about his work but will also provide Skill Variety, as interacting with customer will give different experience than interacting with only co-workers. It will also increase their Autonomy as they can develop their own report with the customer, e.g., a chef in the restaurant.

c) **Load jobs vertically**

This refers to giving employees greater responsibility, greater problem solving tasks, more control over their own job and more freedom.

d) **Open feedback channels**

Feedback can be received from various sources apart from the traditional source of superiors. One may get feedback from co-workers, subordinates, customers and many other sources. This feedback can be either intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic feedback refers to feedback built in job itself. No one needs to tell the worker about the quality of the performance, while performing he will himself know of result. Extrinsic feedback refers to external feedback or the feedback which has to be given by agencies other than the job. As the number of sources of feedback increase, the accuracy of feedback and an employee’s motivation also improves.

**Why the theories of motivation failed?**

Over the past century, various theorists had proposed elaborate Theories of Motivation. As discussed earlier, these theories were categorized based on the approach taken, like Need Theories, Process Theories, Cognitive Theories and more. Every category placed significance on a particular aspect
of motivation. Later, proposed theories were more refined as compared to the earlier one’s incorporating ideas that were missing in the earlier theories. Every Theory of Motivation was a milestone in understanding the complex concept of Motivation. Every contribution helped organizations take necessary steps towards increasing motivation, but at the same time these theories also had various shortcomings. Every theory was a mix of strengths and weaknesses therefore not providing a complete solution to the motivation concern.

Motivation as a concept has failed to evolve. Management students are still been taught various motivation theories that were proposed in the 1940s to 1960s. Not to deny the fact that these theories were ideations and research of great pioneers who surely made a significant contribution to the world of management. These theories also provide us with a plethora of knowledge, on which we can build on. Considering the present era, one should acknowledge the drastic change, right from the systems, to procedures, to workforce attitudes, nature of jobs, work culture etc which we need to internalize in various aspects of work life.

Earlier theories were often criticized because they failed to take into account Individual differences, which is the core essence of human behaviour. The approach of “One size fits all” was a complete failure, as every individual has unique set of expectations, needs, aspirations and motivations at every career stage. So while one theory might do wonders motivating an individual, it might not have the same effect on the other individual. When it comes to human behaviour one should avoid generalizations, as behaviour is a product of multiple aspects.

Therefore, the need of hour is to identify new methods of motivation, taking into account subjective aspects of human behaviour and avoiding oversimplification or overgeneralization by redesigning and nurturing the role of Human Resource.