CHAPTER-IV

Leadership and motivation: New paradigms

It is an era of globalisation and transnational companies having multiple bases of production across the world. The world of business is now in dire need of new age leaders, who can change their work style according to the needs and demands of a specific culture or economy. Now a day, it is common to have expats as CEOs of business organisations world over. But there are doubts about their success rates. Now a day’s business doesn’t need charismatic personalities to charm their employees, they rather need performers. Deepak Chopra, a US based business guru says that now we need servant leaders, who can successfully manage the ego of their employees rather than expecting others to manage their ego.

Great leaders are most times great only because they have great people to lead. The success of a business organisation equally depends on the ability of team members. There are innumerable examples of that, the current world cup football champions do not have stars their captain is a defender in his mid thirties, but they definitely are a bunch of most motivated and determined individuals in the game. So at all times the team is equally or even more important than the leaders.

A company which is very successful invariably has management and staff who truly believe in teamwork. The company has what the French call ‘esprit de corps’, a sense of unity and common purpose among the members of a group. Now the question is that, what separates a great team from a bunch of people who can’t work together? A great team of course needs a great leader. He relies the team together, gives them the big picture, and gets them focused towards the goal. He is the cheerleader who motivates the
group to work towards success. Ray Kroc, founder of McDonald's said: "No one of us is more important than rest of us."

Teams must share information unselfishly. The same information may be put to good use by another team member who is good at seeing relationships. We can't achieve much by venturing alone. We get better perspectives of the problem when sharing it with others who have experience and insights.

Teams provide opportunities for interaction. Although each department in a company is a team, it must also cooperate with other departments. Some departments guard their interest so jealously that they are autonomous regions within a big nation. This works to the detriment of the company. One way to get around this is to form committees with members from different departments. Such committees will provide opportunities for staff from different parts of the company to get to know each other better, not only at meetings but also socially.

Teams also share moments of glory and blames of failures. Such a situation creates a sense of belongingness in the mind of team members and they work as a happy family. Great teams are always a coherent unit.

Forming a team:

An organisation must get good people to form a great team. So at prima facie the prerequisite for a great team is great team members. As the principle of magnetism suggest – opposite poles attract – an organisation should try to have variety of people in the team, only then they will form a cohesive unit, because their interests will not clash. On the other hand they will have their own utility in their respective areas, which is again significant in the overall operations of the organisation. People, who are creative, contribute immensely for the success of a team.
An organisation needs a catalyst for every team. In chemistry, a catalyst is a substance that causes or speeds a reaction with itself being affected. In teamwork, a catalyst is a person who precipitates an event or a change. Such people contribute ideas to keep

**Leadership**

**Defining Leadership:**

There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept. We define managerial leadership as the process of directing and influencing the task related activities of group members. There are four important implications of this definition.

First, leadership involves other people – employees or followers. By their willingness to accept direction from the leader, group members help define the leader’s status and make the leadership process possible. Without people to lead, all the leadership qualities would be irrelevant.

Second, leadership involves an unequal distribution of power between leaders and group members. Group members are not powerless; they can and do shape group activities in a number of ways. Still the leader will usually have more power.

A third aspect of leadership is the ability to use the different forms of power to influence follower’s behavior in a number of ways. Indeed leaders have influenced soldiers to kill and leaders have influenced employees to make personal sacrifices for the good of the company.
The fourth aspect combines the first three and acknowledges that leadership is about values. James Mc Gregor Burns argues that the leader who ignores the moral components of leadership may well go down in history as a scoundrel or worse. Moral leadership concerns values and requires that followers be given enough time to respond to a leader’s proposal to lead.

Leadership has different meanings to various people leadership is defined as influence, that is, the art or process of influencing people so that will strive willingly and enthusiastically toward the achievement of group goals. Ideally people should be encouraged to develop not only willingness to work but also willingness to work with zeal and confidence. Zeal is ardor, earnestness and intensity in the execution of work; confidence reflects experience and technical ability. Leaders act to help a group attain objectives through the maximum application of its capabilities. They don’t stand behind a group as they facilitate progress and inspire the group to accomplish organizational goals. A good example is an orchestra leader, whose function is to produce coordinate sound and correct tempo through the integrated effort of the musicians. Depending on the quality of the director’s leadership, the orchestra will respond.

Leadership of Southwest Airlines

Let us consider the leadership style of Herbert Kelleher, the chairman of southwest Airlines. He attempts to create a family feeling among his employees by remembering their names and personally sending out birthday cards. In an attempt to stay competitive in the deregulated airline industry, he asked for, and received considerable concessions from employees and their union. His hands on leadership style won him the respect and follower
ship of his employees. The austerity measures apply equally to management and employees. His office for example, is in a barracks-style building. Leading in example those who follow him, he seems concerned about both the tasks to done and the people are who work for him. His leadership style is also congruent with the airline policy of providing friendly service and keeping costs low.

According to George R.Terry," Leadership is the activity of influencing people to strive willingly for group objectives. Robert Tannenboum Irving R. Weshler and Fred Massorik define leadership as “Interpersonal influence exercised in a situation and directed, through the communication process. Toward the attainment of a specialized goal or goals.”

A review of other writers reveals that most management writers agree that leadership is the power of influencing the activities in a given situation. From this definition of leadership, it follows that the leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower and other situational variables:

\[ L = f(e, f, s) \]

It is important to note that this definition makes no mention of any particular type of any particular type of organization. In any situation is which someone is trying to influence the behavior of another individual or group, leadership is occurring.

It should also be remembered that when this definition mention leader and followers, one should not assume that we are talking only about a hierarchical relationship such as suggested by superior (boss)/subordinate. Any time an individuals attempting of influence the behavior of someone
else, that individual is the potential leader and the person subject to the influence attempt is the potential follower, no matter whether that person is the boss, a colleague (associate), a subordinate, a friend, a relative or group.

Ingredients of Leadership

Leader envision the future, they inspire the organization members and chary the course of the organization. Leaders must instill values whether they be concern for quality, honesty and calculated risk taking or concern for employees and customers.

Every group of people that performs near its total capacity has some person as its head who is skilled in the art of leadership. This skill seems to be a compound of at least four major ingredients:

1. The ability to use power effectively and in a responsible manner.
2. The ability to comprehend those human beings has different motivation forces at different times and in different situations.
3. The ability to inspire and
4. The ability to act in a manner that will develop a climate conductive to responding to and arousing motivation.

The first ingredient of leadership is power. The second ingredient of leadership is a fundamental understanding of people. As in all other practices, it is one thing to know motivation thing; kinds of motivating forces and the nature of a system of motivation but another thing to be able to apply this knowledge to people and situation. A manager of any other leader who at least knows the present state of motivation thing and who understands the elements of motivation is more aware of the nature and
strength of human needs and is better able to define and design ways of satisfying them and to administer so as to get the desired response.

The third ingredient of leadership is the rare ability to inspire followers to apply their full capabilities to a project. While the use of motivators seems to center in subordinate and their needs, inspiration also comes from group heads. They may have qualities of charm and appeal that give rise to loyalty, devotion and strong desire on the part of followers to promote what leaders want. This is not a matter of need satisfaction; it is rather a matter of people giving unselfish support to a chosen champion.

The fourth ingredient of leadership has to do with the style of the leader and the climate he/she develops. The strength of motivation greatly depends on expectancies, perceived rewards, the amount of effort believed to be required, the task to be done, and other factors that are part of an environment, as well as an organizational climate.

Almost every role in an organized enterprise is made more satisfying for participants and more productive for the enterprise for those who can help others fulfill their desire for such things as money, status, power and pride of accomplishment. The fundamental Principle of Leadership is this: since people tend to follow those who in their view offer them a means of satisfying their own personal goals, the more managers understand who motivates their subordinates and how these motivations operate, and the more they reflect their understanding in carrying out their managerial actions, the more effective they are likely to be as leader.

Because of importance of leadership in all kinds of group action, there is a considerable volume of theory and research concerning it. It is difficult to
summarize such a large body of research in a form relevant to day-to-day management. However, examined below and several measure types of leadership theory and research, together with outlines of some basic kinds of leadership style.

**Importance & Approaches to Leadership**

**Trait approaches to Leadership**

Prior to 1949, studies of leadership were based largely on an attempt to identify the traits that leaders possess. Starting with the "great man" theory that leaders are born and not made, a belief dating back to the ancient Greeks and Romans, researchers have tried to identify the physical, mental and personality traits of various leaders. The "great man" theory lost much of its acceptability with the rise of the behaviorist school of psychology.

Many studies of traits have been made. Ralph M. Stogdill found that various researchers have identified specific traits related to leadership ability: five physical traits (such as energy, appearance and height), four intelligence and ability traits, sixteen personality traits (such as adaptability, aggressiveness, enthusiasm, and self-confidence), and six task-related characteristics (such as cooperativeness, interpersonal skills and administrative ability).

The discussion of the importance of traits to leadership goes on; more recently, the following key leadership traits were identified: drive (including achievement, motivation, energy, ambition, initiative and tenacity), leadership motivation (the aspiration to lead but not to seek power as such), honesty and integrity, self-confidence (including emotional stability),
cognitive ability and an understanding of the business. Less clear is the impact of creativity, flexibility and charisma on leadership effectiveness.

In general, the study of leader’s traits has not been a very fruitful approach to explaining leadership. Not all leaders possess all the traits and many non-leaders may possess most or all of them. Also, the trait approach gives no guidance as to how much of any trait a person should have. Furthermore, the dozens of studies that have been made do not agree as to which traits are leadership traits or what their relationships are to actual instances of leadership. Most of these so-called traits are really patterns of behavior.

Leadership Behavior and Styles

There are several theories on leadership behavior and styles. This section focuses on (1) leadership based on the use of authority, (2) Likert’s four systems of management, (3) the managerial grid, and (4) Leadership involving a variety of styles, ranging from a maximum to minimum use of power and influence.

Style Based on Use of Authority

Some earlier explanations of leadership styles classified them on the basis of how leaders use their authority. Leaders were seen as applying three basic styles. The autocratic leader commands and expects compliance, is dogmatic and positive, and leads by the ability to commands and expects compliance, is dogmatic and positive, and leads by the ability to withhold or give rewards and punishment. The democratic or participative leader consults with subordinates on proposed actions and decisions and encourages participation from them. This type of leader ranges from the
person who does not take action without subordinate’s concurrence to the one who makes decisions but consults with subordinates before doing so.

The **free-rein** leader uses his or her power very little, if at all, giving subordinates a high degree of independence in their operations. Such leaders depend largely on subordinates to set their role as one of aiding the operations of followers by furnishing them with information and action primarily as a contact with the group’s external environment. **Figure** -A-1 illustrates the flow of influence in the three leadership situations.

There are variations within this simple classification of leadership styles. Some autocratic leaders are seen as “benevolent autocrats”. Although they listen considerately to their follower’s opinions before making a decision, the decision is their own. They may be willing to hear and consider subordinate’s ideas and concerns, but when a decision is to be made, they may be more autocratic than benevolent.

A variation of the participative leader is the person who is supportive. Leaders in this category may look upon their task as not only consulting with followers and carefully considering their opinions but also doing all they can to support subordinates in accomplishing their duties.

The use of any style will depend on the situation. A manager may be highly autocratic in an emergency; one can hardly imagine a fire chief holding a meeting with the crew to consider the best way of fighting a fire. Managers may also be autocratic when they alone have the answers to certain questions.
A leader may gain considerable knowledge and a better commitment on the part of persons involved by consulting with subordinates. As already noted, this is true in developing verifiable objectives under systems of managing by objectives. Furthermore, a manager dealing with a group of research scientists may give them free rein in developing their inquiries and experiments. But the same manager might be quite autocratic in enforcing a rule stipulating that employees wear a protective covering when handling certain potentially dangerous chemicals.
THE FLOW ON INFLUENCE WITH THREE LEADERSHIP STYLE
Likert’s Four Systems of Management

Professor Rensis Likert and his associates at the University of Michigan have studied the patterns and styles of leaders and managers for three decades. In the course of this research, Likert has developed certain ideas and approaches important to understanding leadership behavior. He sees an effective manager as strongly oriented to subordinates, relying on communication to keep all parties working as a unit. All members of the group, including the manager of leaders, adopt a supportive attitude in which they share in one another’s common needs, values, aspirations, goals and expectations. Since it appeals to human motivations, Likert views this approach as the most effective way to lead a group.

As guidelines for research and for the clarification of his concepts, Likert has suggested four systems of management. **System 1** management is described as “exploitative-authoritative”; its managers are highly autocratic, have little trust in subordinates, motivate people through fear and punishment and only occasional rewards, engage in downward communication, and limit decision making to the top. **System 2** management is called “benevolent-authoritative”; its managers have a patronizing confidence and trust in subordinates, motivate with rewards and some fear and punishment, permit some upward communication, solicit some ideas and opinions from subordinates and allow some delegation of decision making but with close policy control.

**System 3** management is referred to as “consultative”; Managers in this system have substantial but not complete confidence and trust in subordinates, usually try to make use of subordinate’s ideas and opinions,
use rewards for motivation with occasional punishment and some participation, engage in communication flow both down and up, make broad policy and general decisions at the top while allowing specific decisions to be made to lower levels, and act consultatively in other ways.

Likert say **System 4** management as the most participative of all and referred to is as "participative-group"; System 4 managers have complete trust and confidence in subordinates in all matters; they always get ideas and opinions from subordinates and constructively use them. They also give economic rewards on the basis of group participation and involvement in such areas as setting goals and appraising progress toward goals. They engage in much communication down and up and with peers, encourage decision-making throughout the organization and operate among themselves and with their subordinates as a group.

In general, Likert found that those managers who applied the System 4 approach to their operations had the greatest success as leaders. Moreover, he noted that departments and companies managed by the System 4 approach were most effective in setting goals and achieving them and were generally more productive. He ascribed this success mainly to the degree of participation and the extent to which the practice of supporting subordinates was maintained.

Although there is considerable support for System 4 theory, the approach is not without its critics. The research focus of this theory is on small groups, yet the discussion is frequently extrapolated and applied to the total organization. Furthermore, the research has primarily been conducted at lower organizational levels and may not be supported when data from
top-level managers are separated. Likert and his associates realize the need for clarity in role definitions, but at the same time they suggest, for example, matrix departmentation, which usually increases role conflict and uncertainty. Since System 4 is often introduced when companies are profitable, the results attributed to the survey feedback method may actually be due to the general prosperity of the firm. It appears, then, that those evaluating System 4 theory should take careful account of the surrounding circumstances. For the practicing manager this means that the benefits attributed to System 4 must be viewed with some caution.

The Managerial Grid

A well-known approach to defining leadership styles in the managerial grid, developed some years ago by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton. Building on previous research that showed the importance of a manager’s having concern both for production and for people, Blake and Mouton devised a clever device to dramatize this concern. This grid, shown in figure, has been used throughout the world as a means of training managers and of identifying various combinations of leadership styles.

The grid dimensions. The grid has two dimensions: concern for people and concern for production. As Blake and Mouton have emphasized, their use of the phrase “concern for” is meant to convey “how” managers are concerned about production or “how” they are concerned about people, and not such things as “how much” production they are concerned about getting out of a group.

“Concern for production” includes the attitudes of superiors toward a wide variety of things, such as the quality of policy decisions, procedures and
processes, creativeness of research, quality of staff services, work efficiency and volume of output. "Concern for people" is likewise interpreted in a broad way. It includes such elements as degree of personal commitment toward goal achievement, maintenance of the self-esteem of workers, placement of responsibility on the basis of trust rather than obedience, provision of good working condition and maintenance of satisfying interpersonal relations.

The four extreme styles. Blake and Mouton recognize four extremes of style. Under the 1.1 style (referred to as "impoverished management"), managers concern themselves very little with either people or production and have minimum involvement in their jobs; to all intents and purposes, they have abandoned their jobs and only mark time or act as messengers communicating information from superiors to subordinates. At the other extreme are the 9.9 managers, who display in their actions the highest possible dedication both to people and to production. They are the real "team managers" who are able to mesh the production needs of the enterprise with the needs of individuals.

Another style is 19 management (called "country club management" by some), in which managers have little or no concern for production but are concerned only for people. They promote an environment in which everyone is relaxed, to accomplish enterprise goals. At another extreme are the 9.1 managers (sometimes referred to as "autocratic task managers"), who are concerned only with developing an efficient operation, who have little or no concern for people, and who are quite autocratic in their style of leadership.
By using these four extremes as points of reference, every managerial technique, approach, or style can be placed somewhere on the grid. Clearly, 5.5 managers have medium concern for production and for people. They obtain adequate, but not outstanding, morale and production. They do not set goals too high and they are likely to have a rather benevolently autocratic attitude toward people.

The managerial grid is a useful device for identifying and classifying managerial styles, but does not tell us why a manager falls into one part or another of the grid. To determine the reason, one has to look at underlying causes, such as the personality characteristics of the leader or the followers,
the ability and training of managers, the enterprise environment and other situational factors that influence how leaders and followers act.
Leadership as a Continuum

Manager able to make decision which non-managers accept.

Manager must "sell" decision before gaining acceptance.

Manager presents tentative decision subject to change after non-manager inputs.

Manager presents decision but must respond to questions from non-managers.

Manager presents problem, gets inputs from non-managers, then decides.

Manager defines limits within which non-managers make decision.

Manager and non-managers jointly make decision within limits defined by organizational constraints.

For non-managers

Area of freedom

For manager

Area of freedom

Constraints:
Organizational limits defined by organizational limits within which decisions are made.

Non-managers join in making decisions.
The adaptation of leadership styles to different contingencies has been well characterized by Robert Tannenbaum and Warren H. Schmidt, developers of the leadership continuum concept. They see leadership as involving a variety of styles, ranging from one that is highly boss-centered to one that is highly subordinate-centered. The styles vary with the degree of freedom a leader or manager grants to subordinates. Thus, instead of suggesting a choice between the two styles of leadership - authoritarian or democratic - this approach offers a range of styles, with no suggestion that one is always right and another is always wrong.

The continuum theory recognizes that which style of leadership is an appropriate depends on the leader, the followers and the situation. To Tannenbaum and Schmidt, the most important elements that may influence a manager's style can be seen along a continuum as (1) the forces operating in the manager's personality, including his or her value system, confidence in subordinates, inclination toward leadership styles and feelings of security in uncertain situations; (2) the forces in subordinates (such as their willingness to assume responsibility, their knowledge and experience and their tolerance for ambiguity) that will affect the manager's behavior; and (3) the forces in the situation, such as organization values and traditions, the effectiveness of subordinates working as a unit, the nature of a problem and the feasibility of safely delegating the authority to handle it and the pressure of time.

SITUATIONAL OR CONTINGENCY, APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP

As disillusionment with the "great man" and trait approaches to understanding leadership increased, attention turned to the study of
situations and the belief that leaders are the product of given situations. A large number of studies have been made on the premise that leadership is strongly affected by the situation from which the leader emerges and in which he or she operates. That this is a persuasive approach is indicated by the rise of Hitler in Germany in the 1930s, the earlier rise of Mussolini in Italy, the emergence of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the Great Depression of the 1930s in the United States and the rise of Mao Tse-tung in China in the period after World War II. This approach to leadership recognizes that there exists an interaction between the group and leader. It supports the follower theory that people tend to follow those whom they perceive (accurately or inaccurately) as offering them a means of accomplishing their own personal desires. The leader, then, is the person who recognizes these desires and does those things or undertakes those programs, designed to meet them.

Situational, or contingency, approaches obviously have much meaning for managerial theory and practices. They also tie into the system of motivation and they are important for practicing managers, who must consider the situation when they design an environment for performance.

**Fiedler's Contingency Approach to Leadership**

Although their approach to leadership theory is primarily one of analyzing leadership style, Fred E. Fiedler and his associates at the University of Illinois have suggested a contingency theory of leadership. The theory holds that people become leaders not only because of the attributes of. Their
personalities but also because of various situational factors and the interactions between leaders and group members.

**Critical dimensions of the leadership situation.** On the basis of his studies, Fiedler described three critical dimensions of the leadership situation that help determine what style of leadership will be most effective:

1. **Position power.** This is the degree to which the power of a position, as distinguished from other sources of power, such as personality or expertise, enables a leader to get group members to comply with directions; in the case of managers, this is the power arising from organizational position power can obtain good followership more easily than one without such power.

2. **Task structure.** With this dimension, Fiedler had in mind the extent to which tasks can be clearly spelled out and people held responsible for them. If tasks are clear (rather than vague and unstructured), the quality of performance can be more easily controlled and group members can be held more definitely responsible for performance.

3. **Leader-member relations.** Fiedler regarded this dimension as the most important from a leader's point of view, since position power and task structure may be largely under the control of an enterprise. It has to do with the extent to which group members like trust and are willing to follow a leader.

**Leadership styles.** To approach his study, Fiedler set forth two major styles of leadership. One of these is primarily task-oriented; that is, the leader gains satisfaction from seeing tasks performed. The other is oriented primarily...
toward achieving good interpersonal relations and attaining a position of personal prominence.

The Path-Goal Approach to Leadership Effectiveness

The path-goal theory suggests that the main function of the leader is to clarify and set goals with subordinates, help them find the best path for achieving the goals and remove obstacles. Proponents of this approach have studied leadership in a variety of situations. As stated by Robert House, the theory builds on various motivational and leadership theories of others. In addition to the expectancy theory variables, other factors contributing to effective leadership should be considered. These situational factors include (1) characteristics of subordinates, such as their needs, self-confidence and abilities; and (2) the work environment, including such components as the task, the reward system and the relationship with coworkers

(See FIGURE—A-4)
PATH – GOAL APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Leader behavior is categorized into four groups:

1. Supportive leadership behavior gives consideration to the needs of subordinates, shows a concern for their well-being and creates a pleasant organizational climate. It has the greatest impact on subordinate’s performance when they are frustrated and dissatisfied.

2. Participative leadership allows subordinates to influence the decisions of their superiors and can result in increased motivation.

3. Instrumental leadership gives subordinates rather specific guidance and clarifies what is expected of them; this includes aspects of planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling by the leader.
4. Achievement-oriented leadership involves setting challenging goals, seeking improvement of performance and having confidence that subordinates will achieve high goals.

Rather than suggesting that there is one best way to lead, this theory suggests that the appropriate style depends on the situation. Ambiguous and uncertain situations can be frustrating for subordinates and a more-oriented style may be called for. In other words, when subordinates are confused, then the leader may tell them what to do and show them a clear path to goals. On the other hand, for routine tasks, such as those found on the assembly line, additional structure (usually provided by a task-oriented leader) may be considered redundant; subordinates may see such efforts as over controlling, which, in turn, may be dissatisfying. To put it differently, employees want the leader to stay out of their way because the path is already clear enough.

The theory proposes that the behavior of the leader is, acceptable and satisfies subordinates to the extent that they see it as a source for their satisfaction. Another proposition of the theory is that the behavior of the leader increases the effort of subordinates, that is, it is motivating, insofar as (1) this behavior makes satisfaction of the needs of subordinate's environment through coaching, directing, supporting and rewarding.

The key to the theory is that the leader influences the paths between behavior and goals. The leader can do this by defining positions and task roles by removing obstacles to performance, by enlisting the assistance of group members in setting goals, by promoting group cohesiveness and team effort, by increasing opportunities for personal satisfaction in work.
performance, by reducing stresses and external controls, by making expectations clear and by doing other things that meet people's expectations.

The path-goal theory makes a great deal of sense to the practicing manager. At the same time, one must realize that the model needs further testing before the approach can be sued as a definite guide for managerial action.

MOTIVATION (A BACKGROUND)

Management and leadership are often thought of as the same thing. Although it is true that the most effective manager will almost certainly be an effective leader and that leading is an essential function of managers, there is more to managing than just leading. Managing requires the creation and maintenance of an environment in which individuals work together in groups towards the accomplishment of common objectives. The manager's job is not to manipulate people but; rather to recognize what motivates people.

It is obvious that while enterprise objectives may differ somewhat in various organizations, the individuals involved also have needs and objectives that are especially important to them. Through the function of leading, managers help people see that they can satisfy their own needs and utilize their potential and at the same time contribute to the aims of an enterprise. Managers should thus have an understanding of the roles of assumed. By people, the individuality people and the personalities of people. Unless, managers understand the complexity and individuality of people, they may misapply the generalizations about motivation, leadership and communication. In an organization, not all the needs of individuals can be
completely satisfied, but managers do have considerable latitude in making individual arrangements.

Managing involves achieving enterprise objective. Achieving results is important, but the means must never violate the dignity of people. The concept of individual dignity means that people must be treated with respect, no matter what their position in the organization. We cannot talk about the nature of people unless we consider the whole person, not just separate and distinct characteristics, such as knowledge, attitudes, skills or personality traits. A person has --- all too different degrees. Moreover, these characteristics interact with one another and their predominance in specific situation changes quickly and unpredictably. The human is a total person influenced by external factors.

**MOTIVATION AND MOTIVATORS**

Human motives are based on needs, whether consciously or subconsciously felt. Same are primary needs, such as the physiological requirements for water, air, food; sleep and shelter. Other needs may be regarded as secondary, such as self-esteem, status, with others, affection, giving, accomplishment and self-assessment. Naturally, these needs vary in intensity and --- time among different individuals.

**MOTIVATION:** Motivation is a general terms applying to the entire class of drives, desires, needs, wishes and similar forces. To say that managers motivate their subordinates is to say that they do those things which they hope will satisfy these drives and desires and induce the subordinates to act in a desired manner. Motivation is a human psychological characteristic that contribute to a person's degree of commitment. It includes the factors that
causes channel and sustain human behavior in a particular committed direction. Motivating is the management process of influencing people's behavior based on this knowledge of "What makes people tick".

PERSPECTIVE SELF-MOTIVATION

Managers are responsible for providing an environment conducive to performance. But individuals themselves are responsible for self-motivation. George Odiorne, a management professor, scholar and experienced consultant, made specific recommendations. Here are some:

1. Set a goal for yourself and do not lose sight of it. Lee Iacocca (the president of Chrysler) set the goal of becoming vice president at Ford Motor Company by age 35 and for 15 years this aim motivated him and guided his behavior.

2. Supplement your long-term objectives with short-term goals and specific actions. It has been said that to get something done is to begin.

3. Learn a challenging new task each year. Learning to become a manager does not stop with a bachelor's or master's degree in business. A degree is the real beginning, not the end, of learning. Learning and applying the new microcomputer technology might be such a challenging task.

4. Make your job a different one. Set improvement objectives for your position. With some imagination, you probably can considerably increase your productivity.
5. Develop an area of expertise. Build on your strengths, or develop one of your weaknesses into strength. You might want to be known as the best accountant or the best engineer in your specific area of competence.

6. Give yourself feedback and reward yourself. Setting verifiable goals provides you with a standard against which you can measure your performance. Why not have a special dinner to celebrate your accomplishments?

The Need-Want-Satisfaction Chain

It is possible, then, to look at motivation as involving a chain reaction: Felt needs give rise to wants or goals sought, which cause tensions (that is, unfulfilled desires), which give rise to actions toward achieving goals, which finally result in satisfaction. This chain is shown in FIGURE - A-5.

The chain explanation is complex. In the first place, except for physiological needs, such as food, needs are not independent of a person's environment: Many physiological needs, however, are stimulated by environmental factors: The smell of food may cause hunger, a lower thermometer reading may cause chills or the sight of a cold drink may cause an overwhelming thirst.

Environment has a major influence on our perception of secondary needs. The promotion of a colleague may kindle one's desire for a higher position. A challenging problem may whet one's desire to accomplish something by solving it. A congenial social group may increase one's need for affiliation;
and of course, being alone more than one wants to be can give a strong motivation for wanting to be with people.

In the second place, the need-want-satisfaction chain does not always operate as simply as portrayed. Needs do cause behavior, but needs also may result from behavior. Satisfying one need may lead to a desire to satisfy more needs. For example, a person's need for accomplishment may be made keener by the satisfaction gained from achieving a desired goal or it may be dulled by failure. The one-way nature of the chain has also been challenged by the work of some biological scientists who have found that needs are not always the cause of human behavior but may be a result of it. In other words, behavior is often what people do and not why they do it.

**Complexity of Motivation**

It takes only a moment's thought to realize that at any given time, an individual's motives may be quite complex and often conflicting. A person may be motivated by a desire for economic goods and services (groceries, a better house, a new car, or a trip), and even these desires may be complex and conflicting (should one buy a new house or a new car?). At the same time, an individual may want self-esteem, status, a feeling of accomplishment or relaxation (who has not felt a conflict between the time demands of a job and the desire to play golf or go to a movie?).

**Motivators.** Motivators are things that induce an individual to perform. While motivations reflect wants, motivators are the identified rewards, or incentives, that sharpen the drive to satisfy these wants. They are also the means by which conflicting needs may be reconciled or one need heightened so that it will be given priority over another.
A manager can do much to sharpen motives by establishing an environment favorable to certain drives. For example, people in a business that has developed a reputation for excellence and high quality tend to be motivated to contribute to this reputation. Similarly, the environment of a business in which managerial performance is effective and efficient tends to breed a desire for high-quality management among most, or all managers and personnel.

A motivator, then, is something that influences and individual's behavior. It makes a difference in what a person will do. Obviously, in any organized enterprise, managers must be concerned about motivators and also inventive in their use. People can often satisfy their wants in a variety of ways. A person can, for example, satisfy a desire for affiliation by being active in a social club rather than in a business, meet economic needs by performing a job just will enough to get by, or satisfy status needs by spending time working for political party. What a manager must do, of course, is use those motivators which will lead people to perform effectively for the enterprise that employs them.

**Difference between motivation and satisfaction.** Motivation refers to the drive and effort to satisfy a want or goal. Satisfaction refers to the contentment experienced when a want is satisfied. In other words, motivation implies a drive toward an outcome, and satisfaction is the outcome already experienced, as shown in FIGURE.

From a management point of view, then, a person might have high job satisfaction but a low level of motivation for the job, or the reverse might be true. Understandably, the probability exists that highly motivated persons
with low job satisfaction will look for other positions. Likewise, people who find their positions rewarding but are being paid considerable less than they desire or think they deserve will probably search for other jobs.

MOTIVATION: THE CARROT AND THE STICK

The various leading theories of motivation and motivators seldom make reference to the carrot and the stick. This metaphor relates, of course, to the use of rewards and penalties in order to induce desired behavior. It comes from the old story that to make a donkey move, one must put a carrot in front of him or jab him with a stick from behind.

Despite all the research on and theories of motivation that have come to the fore in recent years, reward and punishment are still considered strong motivators. For centuries, however, they were too often thought of as the only forces that could motivate people. As the succeeding sections will explain, there are many other motivators.

At the same time, in all theories of motivation, the inducements of some kinds of "carrots" are recognized. Often the "carrot" is money in the form of pay or bonuses. Even though money is not the only motivating force, it has been and will continue to be an important one. The trouble with the money "carrot" approach is that too often everyone gets a carrot, regardless of performance, through such practices as salary increases and promotion by seniority, automatic "merit" increases and executive bonuses not based on individual manager performance.

The "stick" in the form of fear - fear of loss job, loss of income, reduction of bonus, demotion or some other penalty - has been and continues to be a
strong motivator. Yet it is admittedly not the best kind. It often gives rise to
defensive or retaliatory behavior, such as union organization, poor-quality
work, executive indifference, failure of a manager to take any risks in
decision making, or even dishonesty. But fear of penalty cannot be
overlooked. Whether managers are first-level supervisors or chief
executives, the power of their position to give or withhold rewards or impose
penalties of various kinks gives them an ability to control, to a very great
extent, the economic and social well-being of their subordinates. It is hardly
a wonder that many subordinates are "yes Sayers" simply agreeing with their
superiors rather than using their considered judgment.

AN EARLY BEHAVIORAL MODEL:

McGregor's THEORY X AND THEORY Y

One view about the nature of people has been expressed in two sets of
assumptions developed by Douglas McGregor and commonly known as
"Theory X" and "Theory Y". Managing, McGregor suggested, must start
with the basic question of how managers see themselves in relation to others.
This viewpoint requires some thought on the perception of human nature.
Theory X and Theory Y are two sets of assumptions about the nature of
people. McGregor chose these terms because he wanted neutral terminology
without any, connotation of being "good" or "bad".

Theory X Assumptions

The "traditional" assumptions about the nature of people, according to
McGregor, are included in Theory X as follows:

1. Average human beings have an inherent dislike of work and will
2. Because of this human characteristic of disliking 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.

3. Average human beings prefer to be directed, wish to avoid responsibility, have relatively little ambition and want security above all.

Theory Y Assumptions

The assumptions under Theory Y are seen by McGregor as follows:

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

2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for producing effort toward organizational objectives. People will exercise self direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which they are committed.

3. The degree of commitment to objectives is in proportion to the size of the rewards associated with their achievement.

4. Average human beings learn, under proper condition, not only to accept responsibility but also to seek it.

5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems...
is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.

6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized.

These two sets of assumptions obviously are fundamentally different. Theory X is pessimistic, static and rigid. Control is primarily external, that is imposed on the subordinate by the superior. In contrast, Theory Y is optimistic, dynamic and flexible with an emphasis on self-direction and the integration of individual needs with organizational demands. There is little doubt that each set of assumptions will affect the way managers carry out their managerial functions and activities.

Classifications of the Theories

McGregor was apparently concerned that Theory X and Theory Y might be misinterpreted. The following points will clarify some of the areas of misunderstanding and keep the assumptions in proper perspective. First, Theory X and Theory Y assumptions are just that: They are assumptions only. They are not prescriptions or suggestions for managerial strategies. Rather, these assumptions must be tested against reality. Furthermore, these assumptions are intuitive deductions and are not based on research. Second, Theories X and Y do not imply "hard" or "soft" management. The "hard" approach may produce resistance and antagonism. The "soft" approach may result in laissez-faire management and is not congruent with Theory Y. the effective manager recognizes the dignity and capabilities, as well as the limitations, of people and adjusts behavior as demanded by the situation. Third, Theories X and Y are not to be viewed as being on a continuous scale,
with X and Y on opposite extremes. They are not a matter of degree; rather, they are completely different views of people.

Fourth, the discussion of Theory Y is not a case for consensus management, nor is it an argument against the use of authority. Under theory Y, authority is seen as only one of the many ways a manager exerts leadership. Fifth different tasks and situations require a variety of approaches to management. At times, authority and structure may be effective for certain tasks, as found in the research by John J. Morse and Jay W. Lorsch. They suggest that different approaches are effective in different situation. Thus, the productive enterprise is one that fits the task requirements to the people and particular situation.
## Early views of Motivation

### Traditional Model

1. **Assumptions**
   - Work is inherently distasteful to most people.

2. **Assumptions**
   - What they do is less important than what they earn for doing it.

3. **Assumptions**
   - Few want or can handle work that requires creativity, self-direction, or self-control.

1. **Expectations**
   - The manager should closely supervise and control subordinates.

2. **Expectations**
   - He or she must break down tasks into simple, respective, easily learned operation.

3. **Expectations**
   - He or she must establish detailed work routines and procedures, and enforce these fairly but firmly.

### Human Relations Model

1. **Assumptions**
   - People want to feel useful and important.

2. **Assumptions**
   - People want to belong and to be recognized as individuals.

3. **Assumptions**
   - These needs are more important than money in motivating people to work.

1. **Expectations**
   - Sharing information with subordinates and involving them in routine decisions will satisfy their basic needs to belong and to feel important.

2. **Expectations**
   - Satisfying these needs will improve morale and reduce resistance to formal authority - subordinate will "willingly cooperate".

### Human Resources Model

1. **Assumptions**
   - Work is not inherently distasteful. People want to contribute to meaningful goals that they have helped establish.

2. **Assumptions**
   - Most people can exercise far more creativity, self-direction and self-control than their present jobs demand.

3. **Assumptions**
   - These needs are more important than money in motivating people to work.

1. **Expectations**
   - Expanding subordinate influence, self-direction, and self-control will lead to direct improvements in operating efficiency.

2. **Expectations**
   - Work satisfaction may improve as a "by-product' of subordinate's making full use of their resources.
THE HIERARCHY OF NEEDS THEORY

One of the most widely mentioned theories of motivation is the Hierarchy of needs theory put forth by psychologist Abraham Maslow. Maslow saw human needs in the form of a hierarchy, ascending from the lowest to the highest and he concluded that when one sets of needs is satisfied, this kind of need ceases to be a motivator.

The Needs Hierarchy

The basic human needs placed by Maslow in an ascending order of importance and shown in FIGURE are these:

1. **Physiological needs.** These are the basic needs for sustaining human life itself, such as food, water, warmth, shelter and sleep. Maslow took the position that until these needs are satisfied to the degree necessary to maintain life, other needs will not motivate people.

2. **Security or safety needs.** These are the needs to be free of physical danger and of the fear of losing a job, property, food or shelter.

3. **Affiliation or acceptance needs.** Since people are social beings, they need to belong, to be accepted by others.

4. **Esteem needs.** According to Maslow, once people begin to satisfy their need to belong, they tend to want to be held in esteem both by themselves and by others. This kind of need produces such satisfactions as power, prestige, status and self-confidence.
5. **Need for self-actualization.** Maslow regards this as the highest in his hierarchy. It is the desire to become what one is capable of becoming - to maximize one's potential and to accomplish something.

**Questioning the Needs Hierarchy**

Maslow's concept of a hierarchy of needs has been subjected to considerable research. Edward Lawler and J.Lloyd Suttle collected data on 187 managers in two different organizations over a period of 6 to 12 months. They found little evidence to support Maslow's theory that human needs form a hierarchy. They did note, however, that there were two levels of needs - biological and other needs - and that the other needs would emerge only when biological needs were reasonably satisfied. They found, further, that at the higher level, the strength of needs varied with the individual; in some individuals social needs predominated, while in others self-actualization needs were strongest.

In another study of Maslow's needs hierarchy involving a group of managers over a period of 5 years, Douglas T.Rall and Khalil Nougaim did not find strong evidence of a hierarchy. They found that as managers advance in an organization, their physiological and safety needs tend to decrease in importance and their needs for affiliation, esteem and self-actualization tend to increase. They insisted, however, that the upward movement of need prominence resulted from upward career changes and not from the satisfaction of lower-order needs.
THE MOTIVATION-HYGIENE APPROACH TO MOTIVATION

Maslow's needs approach has been considerably modified by Frederick Herzberg and his associates. Their research purports to find a two-factor theory of motivation. In one group of needs are such things as company policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, join security and personal" life.

These were found by Herzberg and his associates to be only dissatisfiers and not motivators. In other words, if they exist in a work environment in high quantity and quality, they yield no dissatisfaction. Their existence does not motivate in the sense of yielding satisfaction; their lack of existence would, however, result in dissatisfaction. Herzberg called them maintenance, hygiene or job context factor.

In the second group, Herzberg listed certain satisfiers - and therefore motivator-all related to job content. They include achievement, recognition, challenging work, advancement and growth in the job. Their existence will yield feelings of satisfaction or -: no satisfaction (not dissatisfaction). As FIGURE indicates, the satisfiers and dissatisfiers identified by Herzberg are similar to the factors suggested by Maslow.

The first group of factors (the dissatisfiers) will not motivate people in an organization; yet they must be present, or dissatisfaction will arise. The second group or the job content factors, Herzberg found to be the real motivators because they have the potential of yielding a sense of satisfaction. Clearly, if this theory of motivation is sound, managers must give considerable attention to upgrading job content.
The Herzberg research has not gone unchallenged. Some researchers question Herzberg's methods, saying that his investigation methods tended to prejudice his results. For example, the well-known tendency of people to attribute good results to their own efforts and to blame others for poor results is thought to have prejudiced Herzberg's findings. Other researchers, not following his methods, have arrived at conclusions that do not support Herzberg's theory.

THE EXPECTANCY THEORY OF MOTIVATION

Another approach, one that many believe goes far in explaining how people are motivated, is the expectancy theory. One of the leaders in advancing and explaining this theory is the psychologist Victor H. Vroom. He holds that people will be motivated to do things to reach a goal if they believe in the worth of that goal and if they can see that what they do will help them in achieving it. In a sense, this is a modern expression of what Martin Luther observed centuries ago when he said, "Everything that is done in the world is done in hope".

In great detail, Vroom's theory is that people's motivation toward doing anything will be determined by the value they place on the outcome of their effort (whether positive or negative), multiplied by the confidence they have that their efforts will materially aid in achieving a goal. In other words, Vroom makes the point that motivation is product of the anticipated worth that an individual places on a goal and the chances he or she sees of achieving that goal. In his own terms, Vroom's theory may be stated as

\[
\text{Force} = \text{Valence} \times \text{Expectancy}
\]
Where force is the strength of a person's motivation, valence is the strength of an individual's preference for an outcome, and expectancy is the probability that a particular action will lead to a desired outcome. When a person is indifferent about achieving a certain goal, a valence of zero occurs; there is a negative valence when the person would rather not achieve the goal. The result of either would be, of course, no motivation. Likewise, a person would have no motivation to achieve a goal if the expectancy were zero or negative. The force exerted to do something will depend on both valence and expectancy. Moreover, a motive to accomplish some action might be determined by a desire to accomplish something else. For example, a person might be willing to work hard to get out a product for a valence in the form of pay. Or a manager might be willing to work hard to achieve company goals in marketing or production for a promotion or pay valence.

The Vroom Theory and Practice

One of the great attractions of the Vroom theory is that it recognizes the importance of various individual needs and motivation. It thus avoids some of the simplistic features of the Maslow and Herzberg approaches. It does seem more realistic. It fits the concept of harmony of objectives: Individual has personal goals different from organization goals, but these can be harmonized. Furthermore, Vroom's theory is completely consistent with the system of managing by objectives.

The strength of Vroom's theory is also its weakness. His assumption that perceptions of value vary among individuals at different times and in various places appears to fit real life more accurately. It is consistent also with the idea that a manager's job is to design an environment for performance,
necessarily taking into account the differences in various situations. On the other hand, Vroom's theory is difficult to apply in practice. Despite its difficulty in application, the logical accuracy of Vroom's theory indicates that motivation is much complex than the approaches of Maslow and Herzberg seem to imply.

**EQUITY THEORY**

An important factor in motivation is whether individuals perceive the reward structure as being fair. One way of addressing this issue is through equity theory, which refers to an individual's subjective judgments about the fairness of the reward she or he got, relative to the inputs (which include many factors, such as effort, experience and education), in comparison with the rewards of others. J. Stacy Adams has received a great deal of credit for the formulation of the equity (or inequity) theory. The essential aspects of the equity theory may be shown as follows: for the formulation of the equity (or inequity) theory. The essential aspects of the equity theory may be shown as follows:

\[
\text{Outcomes by a person} = \text{Outcomes by another person} \\
\text{Inputs by a person} \quad \text{Inputs by another person}
\]

There should be a balance of the outcomes/inputs relationship for one person in comparison with that for another person.

If people feel that they are inequitably rewarded, they may be dissatisfied, reduce the quantity or quality of output, or leave the organization. If people perceive the rewards as equitable, they probably will continue at the same level of output. If people think the
rewards are greater than what is considered equitable, they may work harder. It is also possible that some may discount the rewards. These three situations are illustrated in FIGURE.

One of the problems is that people may overestimate their own contributions and the rewards others receive. Certain inequalities may be tolerated for some time by employees. But prolonged feelings of inequity may result in strong reactions to an apparently minor occurrence. For example, an employee being reprimanded for being a few minutes late may get angry and decide to quit the job, not so much because of the "reprimand" but because of long-standing feelings that the rewards for his or her contributions are inequitable in comparison with other’s rewards. Likewise, a person may be very satisfied with a weekly salary of $500 until he or she finds out that another person doing similar work gets $10 more.

REINFORCEMENT THEORY.

The psychologist B. F. Skinner of Harvard developed an interesting - but controversial technique for motivation. This approach, called positive reinforcement or behavior modification, holds that individuals can be motivated by proper design of their work environment and praise for their performance and that punishment for poor performance produces negative results.

Skinner and his followers do far more than praise good performance. They analyze the work situation to determine what causes workers to act the way they do and then they initiate changes to eliminate troublesome areas and obstructions to performance. Specific goals are then set with worker’s participation and assistance, prompt and regular feedback of results is made
available and performance does not equal goals, ways are found to help
people and praise them for the good things they do. It has also been found
highly useful and motivating to give people full information on a company's
problems, especially those in which they are involved.

This technique sounds almost too simple to work and many behavioral
scientists and managers are skeptical about its effectiveness. However, a
number of prominent companies have found the approach beneficial. Emery
Air Freight Corporation, for example, observed that this approach saved the
company a substantial amount of money by merely inducing employees to
take great pains to ensure that containers were properly filled with small
packages before shipment.

Perhaps the strength of the Skinner approach is that it is so closely akin to
the requirements of good managing. It emphasizes removal of obstructions
to performance, careful planning and organizing, control through feedback
and the expansion of communication.

McCLELLEN D'S NEEDS THEORY OF MOTIVATION

David C. McClelland has contributed to the understanding of motivation by
identified defying three types of basic motivating needs. He classified them
as the need for power (n/PWR), needs for affiliation (n/AFF), and need for
achievement (n/ACH). Considerable research has been done on methods of
testing people with respect to these three types of needs, and McClelland and
his associates have done substantial research, especially on the need for
achievement.
All three drives - power, affiliation and achievement - are of particular relevance to management since all must be recognized to make an organized enterprise work well.

Need for Power

McClelland and other researchers have found that people with a high need for power have a great concern for exercising influence and control. Such individuals generally are seeking positions of leadership; they are frequently good conversationalists, though often argumentative; they are forceful, outspoken, hardheaded and demanding and they enjoy teaching and public speaking.

Need for Affiliation

People with a high need for affiliation usually derive pleasure from being loved and tend to avoid the pain of being rejected by a social group. As individuals, they are likely to be concerned with maintaining pleasant social relationships, to enjoy a sense of intimacy and understanding, to be ready to console and help others in trouble and to enjoy friendly interaction with others.

Need for Achievement

People with a high need for achievement have an intense desire for success and an equally intense fear of failure. They want to be challenged, and they set moderately difficult (but not impossible) goals for themselves. They take a realistic approach to risk; they are not likely to be gamblers but, rather, prefer to analyze and assess problems, assume personal responsibility for getting a job done and like specific and prompt feedback on how they are
doing. They tend to be restless, like to work long hours, do not worry unduly about failure if it does occur and tend to like to run their own shows.

SPECIAL MOTIVATIONAL TECHNIQUES

After looking at the theories of motivation, one may well ask what they mean to managers. What motivational techniques can managers use? While motivation is so complex and individualized that there can be no single best answer, some of the major motivational techniques can be identified.

Money

As mentioned earlier, in the discussion of the carrot and the stick, money can never be overlooked as a motivator. Whether in the form of wager, piecework (getting paid for units produced at a certain quality level) or any other incentive pay, bonuses, tack options, company-paid insurance or any of the other things that may be given to people for performance, money is important. And, as some writers have pointed out, money is often more than monetary value. It can also mean status or power.

Economists and most managers have tended to place money high on the sale of motivators, while behavioral scientists tend to place it low. Probably neither view is right. But if money is to be the kind of motivator that it can and should be, managers must remember several things.

First, money, as money, is likely to be more important to people who are raising a family, for example, than to people who have "arrived" in the sense that their money needs are not so urgent. Money is an urgent means of achieving a minimum standard of living, although this minimum has a way of getting higher as people become more affluent. For example, an
individual who was once satisfied with a small house and a low-priced car may now be able to derive the same satisfaction only from a large and comfortable house and a fairly luxurious automobile. And yet it is impossible to generalize in even these terms. For some people money will always be of the utmost importance, while for others it may never be.

Second, it is probably quite true that in most kinds of business and other enterprises, money is used as a means of keeping an organization adequately staffed and not primarily as a motivator. Various enterprises make wages and salaries competitive within their industry and their geographic area to attract and hold people.

Third, money as a motivator tends to be dulled somewhat by the practice of making sure that salaries of various managers in a company are reasonably similar. In other words, organizations often take great care to ensure that people on comparable levels are given the same, or nearly the same, compensation. This is understandable, since people usually evaluate their compensation in light of what their equals are receiving.

Fourth, if money is to be an effective motivator, people in various positions, even though at a similar level, must be given salaries and bonuses that reflect their individual performance. Even if a company is committed to the practice of comparable wages and salaries, a well-managed firm need never be bound to the same practice with respect to bonuses. In fact, it appears that unless bonuses for managers are based on individual performance, an enterprise is not buying much motivation with them. The way to ensure that money has meaning, as a reward for accomplishment and
as a means of giving people pleasure from accomplishment, is to base compensation as much as possible on performance.

It is almost certainly true that money can motivate only when the prospective payment is large relative to a person's income. The trouble with many wage and salary increases, and even bonus payments, is that they are not large enough to motivate the receiver. They may keep the individual from being dissatisfied and from looking for another job, but unless they are large enough to be felt, they are not likely to be a strong motivator.

**Participation**

One technique that has been given strong support as a result of motivation theory and research is the increased awareness and use of participation. Only rarely are people not motivated by being consulted on action affecting them - by being "in on the act". In addition, most people in the centre of an operation have knowledge both of problems and of solutions to them. As a consequence, the right kind of participation yields both motivation and knowledge valuable for enterprise success.

Participation is also a means of recognition. It appeals to the need for affiliation and acceptance. Above all, it gives people a sense of accomplishment. But encouraging participation should not mean that managers weaken their positions. Although they encourage participation of subordinates on matters with which the latter can help, and although they listen carefully, on matters requiring their decision they must decide themselves.
JOB ENRICHMENT

Research on and analysis of motivation point to the importance of making jobs challenging and meaningful. This applies to the jobs of managers as well as to those of non-managers. Job enrichment is related to Herzberg's theory of motivation, in which factors such as challenge, achievement recognition and responsibility are seen as the real motivators. Even though his theory has not gone unchallenged, it has led to a widespread interest, both in the United States and overseas, in developing ways to enrich job content, particularly for non-managerial employees.

Job enrichment should be distinguished from job enlargement (but some authors do not make this distinction). Job enlargement attempts to make a job more varied by removing the dullness associated with performing repetitive operations. It means enlarging the scope of the job by adding similar tasks without enhancing responsibility. For example, a production line worker may install not only the bumper on a car but also the front hood. Critics would say that this is simply adding one dull job to another, since it does not increase the worker's responsibility. In job enrichment, the attempt is to build into jobs a higher sense of challenge and achievement. Jobs may be enriched by variety.

But they also may be enriched by (1) giving workers more freedom in deciding about such things as work methods, sequence and pace or the acceptance or rejection of materials; (2) encouraging participation of subordinates and interaction between workers; (3) giving workers a feeling of personal responsibility for their tasks; (4) taking steps to make sure that workers can see how their tasks contribute to a finished product and the
welfare of the enterprise; (5) giving people feedback on their job performance, preferably before their supervisors get it; (6) involving workers in the analysis and change of physical aspects of the work environment, such as the layout of the office or plant, temperature, lighting and cleanliness.

Limitations of Job Enrichment

Even the strongest supports of job enrichment readily admit that there are limitations in its application. One of these is technology. With specialized machinery and assembly line techniques, it may not be possible to make all jobs very meaningful. Another limitation is cost. General Motors tried six-person and three-person teams in the assembly of motor homes but found that this approach was too difficult, slow and costly. On the other hand, two Swedish auto manufactures, Saab and Volvo, have used the team approach and have gotten more status symbols in the form of titles and office facilities and tying bonuses and other reward found costs to be only slightly higher and they believe that this increase was more than offset by reductions in absenteeism and turnover.

There is also some question as to whether workers really want job enrichment, especially of the kind that changes the basic content of their jobs. Various surveys of workers attitudes, even the attitudes of assembly line workers, have shown that a high percentage of workers are not dissatisfied with their jobs and that few want "more interesting" jobs. What these workers seem to want above all is job security and pay. Moreover, workers are concerned that changing the nature of tasks to increase productivity may mean a loss of jobs.
The limitations of job enrichment apply mainly to jobs requiring low skill levels. The jobs of highly skilled workers, professionals and managers already contain varying degrees of challenge and accomplishment. Perhaps these could be enriched considerably more than they are. But this can probably be done best by modem management techniques such as managing by objectives, utilizing more policy guidance with delegation of authority, introducing more closely to performance.

**Making Job Enrichment Effective**

Several approaches can be used to make job enrichment appeal to higher-level motivations. First, organizations need a better understanding of what people want. As a number of motivation researchers have pointed out, wants vary with people and situation. Research has shown that workers with few skills want such factors as job security, pay, benefits, less restrictive plant rules and more sympathetic and understanding supervisors. As people move up the ladder in an enterprise, they find that other factors become increasingly important. But little job enrichment research has been done on high on high level professionals and managers.

Second, if productivity increases are the main goal of enrichment, the program must show how workers will benefit. For example, in one company with fleets of unsupervised two-person service trucks, a program of giving these employees 25 percent of the cost savings from increased productivity, while still making it clear that the company would profit from their efforts, resulted in a startling rise in output and a much greater interest in these jobs.

Third, people like to be involved, to be consulted and to be given an opportunity to offer suggestions. They like to be considered as people. In
one aerospace missile plant, increased morale and productivity, as well as greatly reduced turnover and absenteeism, resulted from the simple technique of having all employee's names on placards at their workstations and of having each program group - from parts production and assembly to inspection - work in an area in which machines and equipment were painted a different color.

Fourth, people like to feel that their managers are truly concerned with their welfare. Workers like to know what they are doing and why. They like feedback on their performance. They like to be appreciated and recognized for their work.

A SYSTEMS AND CONTINGENCY APPROACH TO MOTIVATION

The foregoing analysis of theory, research and application demonstrates that motivation must be considered from a systems and contingency point of view. Given the complexity of motivating people with individual personalities and in different situations, risks of failure exist when any single motivator or group of motivators, is applied without taking into account these variables. Human behavior is not a simple matter but must be looked upon as a system of variables and interactions of which certain motivating factors are an important element.

Dependence of Motivation on Organizational Climate

Motivating factors definitely do not exit in a vacuum. Even individual desires and drives are conditioned by physiological needs or by needs arising from a person's background. But what people are willing to strive for is also
affected by the organizational climate in which they operate. At times a climate may curve motivations; at other times it may arouse them.

Motivation, Leadership and Management

The interaction of motivation and organizational climate not only underscores the systems aspects of motivation but also emphasizes how motivation both depends on and influences leadership styles and management practice. Leaders and managers (who, if effective, will almost certainly be leaders) must respond to the motivations of individuals if they are to design an environment in which people will perform willingly. Likewise, they can design a climate that will arouse or reduce motivation.

As for the ways and means by which managers design an environment for performance. Managers do this they see that verifiable goals are set, strategies are developed and communicated and plans to achieve objectives are made. They do it also in designing a system of organizational roles in which people can be effective. Managers do it also when they make sure that the structure is well staffed. Their styles of leadership and their ability to solve communication problems are also central to managing. And managers do much to create an effective environment when they make sure that control tools, information and approaches furnish people with the feedback knowledge they must have for effective motivation.

At this point of time we can safely say that leadership and motivation are among the most dynamic disciplines in the organization behaviour research. The research in this particular area is continuously enlightening the academic discipline of organization behaviour. At one point of time we used to talk about autocratic leadership style being the best, but now we are
talking about servant leadership. Earlier motivation used to the working conditions only, which gradually turned into monetary and now it is a combination of a host of variables. So when we talk about leadership and motivation we talk about a discipline which is dynamic in nature and always evolving.