INTRODUCTION

Growth needs are defined as strong needs for personal challenge and accomplishment, for learning and for professional development. It is predicated that the employees should have high growth needs in order to perform better and face challenge. These employees are said to have high internal work motivation when working on a complex challenging job. The concept of Growth Need strength (GNS) has come out after reviewing the studies which had been carried out to see the relationship between the job performance and job satisfaction by different researchers. (Herzberg, Mansner, Peterson and Capwell, 1957; Vroom, 1964). These investigations suggest that not much can be learned about the relationship between employee satisfaction and performance from simple two variable research designs. In this context Jacobs and Solomon, (1977) have emphasized the discovery of other personal and situational variables that would permit a better understanding of the intricate relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

Research works by Porter and Lawler (1968) Hackman and Lawler (1971) and Hackman and Oldham (1976) have pointed to employee’s higher order needs as an important factor that influences the relationship between work motivation and job satisfaction. Porter and Lawler have emphasized, for example, that an
individual's degree of higher order need satisfaction is more closely related to his or her job performance than satisfaction of lower order needs.

Jacobs and Solomon (1977) have also reported that self esteem significantly increases the relationship between both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction measures and performance rating by acting as a moderator variable. However, Inkson (1978) indicates that self esteem exercises a significant moderating effect on correlations between performance ratings and intrinsic but not extrinsic satisfaction measures.

The higher order needs strength concept includes such needs as the need for personal growth and the need for challenge and achievement (Maslow, 1954). Individuals with strong high order need strength are more likely to place higher valence on the attainment of their performance objectives than do those with weak higher order needs. Superior performance for the former often represents the form of intrinsic rewards and often leads to the receipt of positively valent extrinsic rewards from the organization such as pay, promotion and recognition. To the extent that such rewards are perceived as resulting from effective performance on the job and of sufficient magnitude vis-à-vis initial expectations, the individual tends to be satisfied (Porter and Lawler, 1968). Individuals with week high order need strength on the other hand, manifest needs such as security
and social needs. Job satisfaction for those individuals probably depends on the extent to which other needs are fulfilled on the job.

As such, the growth needs strength has been recognized as an important variable in different studies. Deviating from the importance of seeing GNS as a moderator between the job satisfaction and job performance, Hackman and Lawler (1971) used GNS as a moderator between the core job characteristics and high internal work motivation. Which ultimately led to a model called job characteristics model or theory. This idea of Hackman and Lawler job characteristic model has its roots in a major study by Turner and Lawrence (1965) that examined the relationship between certain objective attributes of tasks and employees reactions to their work. Among the task attributes studied were the amount of variety in the job, the level of employee autonomy in performing the job, the degree of interaction required in carrying out the task activities, the number of opportunities for optional interaction, the level of knowledge and skill required, and the degree of responsibility entrusted to the job holder.

Further research done by Hackman and Lawler (1971) showed that measurable job characteristics are directly associated with employee attitudes and behavior at work. Thus, the job characteristics model has been further extended and revised, with a view to have a theory aiming at work redesign activities.
Like motivation-hygiene theory, job characteristics theory deals only with aspects of the job that can be attended to create positive motivational incentives for job holders. The theory does not deal directly with the dysfunctional aspects of repetitive work.

The job characteristics theory focuses on jobs that are done independently by individuals working more or less alone. Existing versions of the theory offer little guidance about how work should be designed for interacting teams of employees, nor do they address social, technical, and situational factors. A core job characteristics theory like motivation hygiene theory, is a theory of individual motivation.

The job characteristics theory mainly concentrates on five “core” job characteristics namely (a) Skill variety (b) Task identity (c) Task significance (d) Autonomy and (e) Job feedback.

(a) **Skill variety**: the extent to which the job requires the worker to perform different activities calling for different skills and abilities.

(b) **Task identity**: The extent to which the job requires completion of a “whole” and identifiable peace of work-doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome.
(c) **Task significance**: The extent to which the job has a substantial and perceivable impact upon others in the immediate organization or external environment.

(d) **Autonomy**: The extent to which the job gives the worker freedom, independence, and discretion in scheduling work and determining procedures.

(e) **Feedback**: The extent to which the worker, in carrying out the activities required by the job, receives information about the effectiveness of his efforts.

The following formula would explain a measure of a job characteristics called Motivating potential score (MPS).

\[
MPS = \left( \frac{\text{Skill variety} + \text{Task identity} + \text{task significance}}{3} \right) \cdot \text{Autonomy} \cdot \text{feedback}
\]

A job high in motivating potential must be high on at least one (and hopefully more) of the three characteristics that prompt experienced meaningfulness and high on both autonomy and feedback as well, thereby creating conditions that foster the critical psychological states.

It should be emphasized that the objective “motivating potential” of a job does not cause employees who work on that job to be internally motivated, to
perform well, or experience job satisfaction. Instead a job that is high in a 
motivating potential merely creates a condition such that if the job holder 
performs well he/she is likely to experience a reinforcing state of affairs as a 
consequence. Job characteristics, then serve only to set the stage for internal 
motivation. The behavior of people who work on a job, determines the action 
that unfolds on the stage. Considering these aspects of the job, some people are 
much better positioned to take advantage of the opportunities offered by 
"enriched" job than are others.

Job high in motivating potential create opportunities for considerable self-
direction, learning and personal accomplishment. Not all individuals appreciate 
such opportunities. Neither one’s competence to do a complex, challenging job 
but one’s disposition towards such a job that matters much. Certain individuals 
value high MPS jobs positively, certain others do not. If not value them 
negatively. The former thus react positively to high MPS jobs and later do not, 
which is a bearing factor. The psychological needs of people are critical in 
determining how vigorously an individual will respond to a job high in 
motivating potential (Hackman and Lawler, 1971; and Hackman and Oldham, 
1976).

Some people have strong needs for personal accomplishment, for learning, 
and for developing themselves beyond what they are now. Theses people are said
to have strong "growth needs" and are predicted to develop high internal work motivation when working on a complex challenging job. Others lacking needs for growth will be less eager to exploit the opportunities for personal accomplishment provided by a job high in motivating potential.

The studies by Hackman and Lawler (1971) Hackman and Oldham (1976, 1980) have tested and found this hypothesis valid, that GNS moderates, the hitherto taken for granted relationship between motivating potential score and internal work motivation. The moderating effect of GNS is such that the high GNS people respond positively to high MPS jobs and develop high internal work motivation. And in the case of low GNS people, high MPS jobs do not result in internal work motivation.

The research on motivation over the years have thus moved from the job characteristic model to GNS model. The two models as given by Turner and Lawrence (1965) and Hackman and Lawler (1971) are given below:
MODEL - I

EARLIER MODEL AS IN TURNER AND LAWRENCE (1965)

Objective Attributes of tasks

* RTA Index → Employee Reactions

a) Variety
b) Autonomy
c) Required interaction
d) Optional Interaction
e) Knowledge and skill required
f) Responsibility

MPS (RTAI) → Employee Reactions

* Requisite Task Attribute Index

MODEL - II

THE DEVELOPED MODEL AS IN HACKMAN AND LAWLER (1971)
WITH GNS AS MODERATOR

*MPS → Critical Psychological States → Outcomes

Skill Variety → Experienced Meaningfulness of work
Task Identity
Task Significance

Autonomy → Experienced Responsibility for outcomes of the work

Feedback → Knowledge of the actual results of the work activities

GNS

High work effectiveness
High growth satisfaction
High general job satisfaction
High internal work motivation
However, the GNS model in itself is not a panacea to the problem involving motivation. The model rather raises certain questions. The issues lie in the corollaries of the model. What if the job has low MPS and the performer has high GNS? The corollary would be that the result is poor internal work motivation. What if the job has high MPS and the performer has low GNS? The result again is poor internal work motivation.

Under such conditions what would be the reaction of these poor performers, whether having high or low GNS? How do they adjust with the condition whether having high or low MPS to which they are not favorably disposed? Do these conditions necessarily lead to absenteeism and turnover? Do the organizations provide any other conditions to these workers to cope with or escape the present situation - for instance, promotion with new conditions of work? Or do these workers make use of some other work, mechanism, though informal, to cope with these situations?

The present study takes up these suggestions to find out the operating mechanisms in such situations, which are often informal and latent.
THE FOUR STAGES CAREER MODEL

Dalton and Thompson (1977) began a series of studies that looked at the performance factors that would distinguish the high achievers from their less productive colleagues. Their studies resulted in what now known as “the four-stage career model”. The four-stage career model presents the thesis that there are different stages in careers, and that different activities skills, and relationships are required to be successful in each stage. The four-stage career model was regarded as an innovative tool to help/solve the unique problems that technical knowledge workers in organizations faced. However, it has proven itself to be more useful tool that many organizations from the banking, energy, educational, and consumer goods industries have successfully employed the tool and their accompanying concepts to solve complex problems of career development and performance management that besets not only their technical knowledge workers but also their management staff.

Career stages: the four stages in a persons organizational career as defined by Dalton and Thompson (1976); stage I, stage II, stage III and stage IV. All the four stages are not discrete or nominal. There is a progression or novation across the stages; from stage I to stage II to stage III and finally to stage IV. Each of the different stages entails different central activities, primary relationship and major psychological issues.
As one moves or novats from stage I through stage IV one's responsibilities, power stages and influence increase.

Model - III explains the central activities, relationships and psychological issues in the four stages.

**MODEL - III: THE FOUR STAGE CAREER MODEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage I</th>
<th>Stage II</th>
<th>Stage III</th>
<th>Stage IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Activity</td>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Training, Interfacing,</td>
<td>Shaping the direction of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning and following</td>
<td>Independently</td>
<td>contributing through</td>
<td>the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directions</td>
<td></td>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Assuming responsibility</td>
<td>Exercising Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The central message of the four stages of career model is clear: People who remain highly valued throughout their careers (at least by those who do the rating) tend to expand their contributions by moving through the stages over time. This transition process is called Novation.

The word “novation” is adopted to describe the complete renegotiations of one's role. The word comes from legal terminology, where it means the renegotiation of obligations by all parties to a new contract. The word is used to characterize the informal adjustment and alternation that take place as an individual move into the next career stage.
We have to keep it in mind that this novation is controlled by the individual. The organizations may or may not promote but one has to novate himself as one starts doing the job in a new, more value added way (Dalton & Thompson, 1991).

It is hypothesized in the present study that the employees who have high Growth Need Strength (GNS) would renegotiate their roles or novate in the four stage career model. It is obvious from the four stage career model that it assumes a continuum of role relationships, personal leadership, local leadership, & organizational leadership, as stated in Figure-1. As seekers of high order needs gratification the high GNS employees readily take cognizance and use this self controlled mechanism, that is novation, to make room for meaningfulness in their jobs. Put in a more conspicuous manner, the hypothesis is that the GNS employees, despite their jobs having low or high MPS, will novate in order to enrich their jobs.

The implication of the four-stage career model where the process of novation occurs through the four stages over time is that an employee should have considerable extent of job tenure in the organization in order to novate through the four stages. It may be recalled at this juncture the finding of Kemp and Cook (1983). In their study, "Job Longevity and Growth Needs Strength as Joint Moderators in the Task Design-Job Satisfaction Relationship", they suggest that GNS moderates the job complexity-job satisfaction relationship only for employees with short job tenure.

When long job tenure does not facilitate for the moderating effect of GNS as found by Kemp and Cook (1983), the present study proposes that even with long job tenure, which allows for novation through the four career stages, GNS and novation together moderate the relationship between the motivating potential
of the job and internal work motivation of the employees. Thus the present study proposes novation as a joint moderator along with GNS. The proposed model, as given below, incorporates novation into the GNS model given by Hackman and Lawler (1971).

**MODEL - IV**

**THE PROPOSED MODEL AS IN THE PRESENT STUDY WITH NOVATION AS A JOINT MODERATOR**

- Skill Variety
- Task Identity
- Task Significance

\[ \text{Skilled Variety} \rightarrow \text{Task Identity} \rightarrow \text{Task Significance} \rightarrow \text{Experienced Meaningfulness of work} \]

- Autonomy

\[ \text{Autonomy} \rightarrow \text{Experienced Responsibility for outcomes of the work} \]

- Feedback

\[ \text{Feedback} \rightarrow \text{Knowledge of the actual results of the work activities} \]

**NOVATION**

- GNS = Growth Needs Strength
- Novations = Four-stages career model
- MPS = Motivating Potential Score
- IWM = Internal Work Motivation
In pursuing the evidence for the developed model, existing literature has been reviewed. The theoretical and empirical studies have been reviewed although some important references were already quoted in the Introduction Chapter. The review of literature in the next chapter reveals the growth of job characteristics model and career management model.