CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW
3.1 ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

3.1.1 Introduction

Since the dawn of human social systems, culture has existed to help people deal with the uncertainty and ambiguity of their existence. Members of formal organizations face uncertainties and ambiguities much like those that exist in the larger social system, hence, organizations develop distinctive cultures as part of the mechanism for managing the environment (B.J.Hodge, William P. Anthony, Lawency M. Gales, 1993).

In the words of Edgar H. Schein (1985), organizational culture is: "The pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems".

According to Hofstede (1995), Professor Elliot Jaques (1951) was the first one to use the word culture in management literature in his book "The changing Culture of a Factory". Hofstede cites the context in which the word culture was used by Jaques, which is almost same as it is interpreted today.

"The culture of the factory is its customary and traditional way of thinking and of doing things, which is shared to a greater or lesser degree by all its members, and which new members must learn and at least partially accept...Culture is part of a second nature to those who have been with the firm for some time.”

Organizational culture as a concept, as it is understood today, has greatly evolved in last two decades. Its popularity as a management concept has increased and decreased since the late 1970s and early 1980s when it was first introduced. Beginning in the late 1970s organizational scholars realized that culture plays a vital part in influencing many other organizational variables and outcomes. Three scholarly but popular books, Theory Z by William Ouchi, In Search of Excellence by Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, Jr., and Corporate Cultures by Deal and Kennedy marked a heightened awareness of the potential importance of culture among managers, academic researchers and general public. Peters and Waterman stresses that excellent companies have strong organizational culture. “Without exception, the dominance and coherence of culture proved to be an essential quality of the excellent companies. Moreover, the stronger the culture and the more it was directed toward the marketplace, the less need was there for policy manuals, organization charts, or detailed procedures and rules.”(Peters and Waterman, 1982)

3.1.2 Definitions and Theories of Organizational Culture

The term “culture”, as applied to human societies or groups, has its origins in the discipline of anthropology (Smircich, 1983; Sackman, 1991; Hofstede, 1991), and “the notion of an organizational culture appeared with force in the management literature some two decades ago, the beneficiary of this anthropological endowment” (Depres, 1995). Hofstede (1991) uses the synonym corporate culture which, he says, “gained popularity after a book carrying
this title, by Terrence Deal and Allan Kennedy, appeared in the USA in 1982". What exactly is meant by these terms is subject to some uncertainty. Smircich (1983) claims that “the culture concept has been borrowed from anthropology, where there is no consensus on its meaning”, which makes it unsurprising that, as Schein, and Baron and Walters, complain: "Unfortunately, most of the writers on organizational culture use different definitions, different methods of determining what they mean by culture, and different standards for evaluating how culture affects organizations" (Schein, 1985). "Even the culture theorists cannot agree on the nature of corporate culture and a brief glance at the literature reveals that there appear to be as many definitions of culture as there are writers on the subject" (Baron and Walters, 1994).

Sackman (1991) suggests that the subjectivity of various writers may be the deciding factor on this lack of consensus: "Conceptions of culture in the organizational and management literature draw quite selectively from various anthropological and sociological sources. This selection tends to be based on the author's particular interest and approach." (Sackman, 1991)

Meek (1988) agrees that culture studies derive their framework of reference mainly from anthropology, and suggests that there is a danger in borrowing concepts from one discipline to apply to another; incomplete understanding or inappropriate application can lead to misleading conclusions. All of which suggests that the subject of organisational/corporate culture should be approached with some caution. A selection of definitions reveals some underlying commonality, whilst tending to reinforce Sackman's view that different writers tend to emphasise different aspects of the wider concept. A recurring phrase is “the way we do things around here” (Kilman et al, 1985; Sackman, 1991; Schneider, 1994; Baron and Walters, 1994; Guest et al, 1996), with the implication that “the way we do things” is somehow different to the way someone else might do them. This notion of distinctiveness is fundamental to most concepts of culture. Thus Harrison (1972) describes culture as: "that distinctive constellation of beliefs, values, work styles and relationships that distinguishes one organisation from another - in other words, the sum of those aspects of an organisation which give it a particular climate or feel."

Cleland (1994) takes up this theme of distinctiveness: "An organizational culture is the environment of beliefs, customs, knowledge, practices, and conventionalized behavior of a particular social group. Every organization, every corporation has its distinct character. People make organizations work, and the culture of the corporation ties the people together, giving them meaning and a set of principles and standards to live and work by".

Baron and Walters (1994) arrived at a “working definition of culture ... commonly held and relatively stable beliefs, attitudes and values that exist within an organization. The advantage they see in this definition is that it “describes culture as something which can be subjected to empirical investigation, with the emphasis very much on think rather than do."

Morgan (1986), however, is uncomfortable with this approach: "Culture is often viewed as a set of distinct variables, such as beliefs, stories, norms, and rituals, which somehow form a cultural whole. Such a view is unduly mechanistic, giving rise to the idea that culture can be manipulated in an instrumental way. ... from the inside, culture seems more holographic than mechanistic."

Schein, too, advises caution in the interpretation of “behavioural regularities” as indicators of underlying culture: ".... overt behavior is always determined both by the cultural
predisposition (the assumptions, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings that are patterned) and by the situational contingencies that arise from the external environment. Behavioral regularities could thus be as much a reflection of the environment as of the culture and should, therefore, not be a prime basis for defining the culture. Or, to put it another way, when we observe behavior regularities, we do not know whether we are dealing with a cultural artifact or not" (Schein, 1985).

The contemporary definition of organizational culture (OC) includes what is valued, the dominant leadership style, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the definitions of success that characterizes an organization. OC represents the values, underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions present in an organization (Schein, 1992; Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

Culture, on its own, can be used as a generalisation to describe a set of concepts including "symbol, language, ideology, ritual and myth" (Knights and Willmott, 1987). Organization is defined as a group of individuals who, through experience, have developed a set of standard ways of dealing with the problems it faces (Robbins, 2000). And when the generalised term culture applies to an organization it embodies certain characteristics of its own, and becomes Organizational Culture.

As we can see from the above discussion, a single definition of organizational culture has proven to be very elusive. No one definition of organizational culture has emerged in the literature without any criticism for either being too narrow, or too broad or for its approach or for some other pretext. One of the issues involving culture is whether to define with reference to its cause or effect. For example, there are the two ways in which cultures are defined. (W. Scholl, 2003)

1. **Outcomes** - Defining culture as a manifest pattern of behavior- Many people use the term culture to describe patterns of cross individual behavioral consistency. For example, when people say that culture is "The way we do things around here," they are defining consistent ways in which people perform tasks, solve problems, resolve conflicts, treat customers, and treat employees.

2. **Process** - Defining culture as a set of mechanisms creating cross individual behavioral consistency- In this case culture is defined as the informal values, norms, and beliefs that control how individuals and groups in an organization interact with each other and with people outside the organization.

Both of these approaches are relevant to understanding culture. It is important to know on what types of behavior culture has greatest impact (outcomes) and how culture works to control the behavior of organizational members (process).

Other theories have demonstrated an appreciation for the function of culture as social glue. According to Smircich (1983), culture conveys to employees a sense of identity, facilitates the generation of commitment to something larger than the self, and enhances social system stability, as well as guiding and shaping behavior. Culture emerges at many levels to solve problems posed by life situations and generates learned ways of coping with experiences (Gregory, 1983; Krefting & Frost, 1985). By providing frameworks for solving problems and interpreting events in everyday life, culture reduces the number of variables with which
individuals must deal to levels more consistent with human information-processing capabilities (Krefting & Frost, 1985). Thus, culture often serves as a mechanism to reduce employee behavior variability in organizations. Schein's (1985) definition of organizational culture includes a description of culture as a coping mechanism for employees. Schein's definition of organizational culture mentioned in the beginning bears this.

It can be seen, therefore, that although there are widely-differing definitions of the term, culture is commonly seen to have some essential characteristics. These include shared values, attitudes and beliefs within the group, distinctive customs and practices; shared assumptions; mutually understood and accepted norms; and certain mutual expectations. These may be implicit rather than explicit, and may operate below the level of conscious awareness of the members of the group.

In view of the "enormous implications for how we understand organizations as cultural phenomena" (Morgan, 1986) of this perspective, it is surprising that, as Sackman (1991) maintains, "a critical review of the literature reveals ... that empirically based knowledge about culture in organizational settings is rather scarce and spotty." Willmott (1993), too, complains that "considering the volume and influence of books and articles that celebrate corporate culturism in its various guises, there is a remarkable dearth of serious, critical analysis of this phenomenon." Hollway (1991) suggests that a one-sided view of the issues may be responsible for this rather unsatisfactory situation: "One of the defining features of organizational culture seems to be the lack of theory informing its approaches".

Thompson and McHugh (1990) also point to the lack of evidence in organisational culture research and "the lack of rigor in research methodology (which) has been a persistent theme of critics". They claim that this research relies heavily on anecdotal accounts from "leaders". Denison (1990) detects a further source of distortion, in that "only 'exemplary' organizations were included in most of the studies. ... None of these authors studied firms that failed or did poorly, and none used a framework that contrasted failures and successes. Presumably, if a 'theory' is correct, the factors that contribute to success should also serve to separate successful and unsuccessful firms."

"Studies of organizational cultures can be divided into those based on soft, qualitative information versus those seeking hard, quantitative data. ... Qualitative data usually means case studies: many organizational culture studies are about one single case. With all their appeal such studies inevitably raise questions as to reliability ... and generalization ... Hard, quantitative studies of organizational cultures are few and far between and not necessarily very convincing." (Hofstede, 1991).

Hofstede warns, however, that "hard data risks losing the essence of culture and becoming mechanistic".

Meyerson and Martin (1987) describe three paradigms which emphasise different aspects of the subject.

1. "Culture is often defined as that which is shared by and/or unique to a given organization or group ... Culture, according to this definition, is an integrating mechanism ..., the social or normative glue that holds together a potentially diverse group of organization members. Given this definition of culture, paradigm 1 researchers use 'shared' as a code breaker for identifying relevant
manifestations of culture, seeking, for example, a common language, shared values, or an agreed-upon set of appropriate behaviours.

2. "According to paradigm 2, organizations are not simply a single, monolithic, dominant culture. Instead, a culture is composed of a collection of values and manifestations, some of which may be contradictory. For example, espoused values may be inconsistent with actual practices. ... In part because of this stress on inconsistency, paradigm 2 portrayals of culture often emphasize disagreement rather than consensus. Complex organizations reflect broader societal cultures and contain elements of occupational, class, racial, ethnic, and gender-based identifications ... These sources of diversity often create overlapping, nested subcultures. ... Paradigm 2 emphasizes multiple, rather than leader-generated, sources of cultural content."

3. Meyerson and Martin's Paradigm 3 accepts ambiguity: "complexity and lack of clarity could be legitimated and even made the focus of attention ... irreconcilable interpretations are simultaneously entertained; paradoxes are embraced. A culture viewed from a paradigm 3 vantage point would have no shared, integrated set of values, save one; an awareness of ambiguity itself. ... In paradigm 3, cultural manifestations are not clearly consistent or inconsistent with each other. Instead, the relationships among manifestations are characterized by a lack of clarity from ignorance or complexity. ... A paradigm 3 portrayal of culture cannot be characterized as generally harmonious or full of conflict. Instead, individuals share some viewpoints, disagree about some, and are ignorant of or indifferent to others."

Sackman (1991) discerns "three broad perspectives of culture ... in the managerial literature". The first is "a holistic perspective" within which "culture is defined as patterned ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting that are acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols. They constitute the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiment in artifacts. Culture has a core that consists of traditional - that is, historically derived - and selected ideas and their attached values. The resulting cultural system is, on the one hand, to be considered a product of action and, on the other, conditioning elements of further action." Sackman points out that it is difficult to research from this perspective - it requires long-term study with multiple data sources.

The second perspective is "a variable perspective" which "focuses on expressions of culture. These expressions may take the form of verbal and physical behaviors or practices, of artifacts, and of their underlying meanings. ... Culture is defined as 'the way we do things here'. ... Of major interest are collective activities such as rites, rituals, and ceremonies as well as collective verbal behaviors such as language in general and, more specifically, speeches, jargon, stories, legends, myths, or humor." From this perspective "the process of 'deciphering' cultural manifestations is ... difficult and involves some guesswork." Researchers' own cultural biases affect judgment.

The third perspective is a cognitive one which "focuses on ideas, concepts, blueprints, beliefs, values, or norms that are seen as the core of the complex and multifaceted phenomenon called 'culture'. ... Some authors refer to a set of shared understandings or meanings, to a system of publicly and collectively accepted meanings of a group, or a set of
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important understandings shared by a community. Others define *culture* as a set of shared values, as shared norms and expectations, as beliefs and expectations shared by most of the members of an organization's culture, or as assumptions commonly held by a group."

Baron and Walters (1994) have produced a model of four underlying components of culture, and the interactions between them, based on fifteen case studies. Within an environment which includes markets and customers, culture influences and is influenced by the four components, which in turn interact with each other.

"The relationship between all the variables within the model is a two-way process. Culture is a dynamic force and will inevitably influence many of the processes apparent in organisations. However, culture can also be driven by processes ... including human resource mechanisms" (Baron and Walters, 1994).

Further information is given about the components:

"(Values) may be expressed in the form of written 'value statements' or they may simply be the result of the shared beliefs of those with power in the organisation and hence not appear in any formal way. ... "The dominant values will inevitably shape the business plan and determine the objectives of organisations and vice versa, creating a mutually reinforcing cycle."

"The kind of systems and policies which the organisation chooses to develop and use may be influenced by the culture, or, rather, by the shared beliefs about how an
organisation should be managed. The systems and policies may, therefore, form part of a cycle of reinforcement, a product of the culture that they seek to perpetuate. Alternatively, the culture may inhibit the success of systems and policies designed to deliver the strategy if the organisation is unaware of the nature of the culture."

"Structure and technology are essentially the enablers that facilitate the development of a particular culture, perpetuate and reinforce a culture or, indeed, inhibit culture change. In themselves they do not drive culture change". (Baron and Walters, 1994).

Strategy is "an important aspect of corporate culture." The case studies show that "business objectives are main drivers of culture change" but values shape organisations' strategy and reinforce the value sets or challenge them if problems arise. There is a danger of a credibility gap and/or confusion if said and done policies are different, or if conflicts arise, for example between ethics and profit" (Baron and Walters, 1994).

The methodological categorisations described above lead almost seamlessly into descriptions of culture types and characteristics. Other writers concentrate on descriptive models on the premise that recognition of a "pure" (or "ideal" in the Platonic sense) form of a culture type will aid understanding of real-world cases, whilst accepting that "this division of the world of business into ... categories is, of course, simplistic. No company we know today precisely fits into any of these categories" (Deal and Kennedy, 1982).

Deal and Kennedy's early (1982) and succinct summary of the practical function of culture: "A strong culture is a system of informal rules that spells out how people are to behave most of the time" is not disputed in the later literature. Burnes (1992) argues that culture "legitimises certain forms of action and proscribes other forms" and impacts on everyone in an organisation: "from the most senior manager to the humblest clerk. Their actions are judged by themselves and others in relation to expected modes of behaviour".

Kilman et al (1985) describe culture as "a social energy that moves people to act" whilst Hampden-Turner (1990) maintains that "The culture of an organisation defines professional behaviour, motivates individuals and asserts solutions where there is ambiguity. It governs the way a company processes information, its internal relations and its values. It functions at all levels from subconscious to visible."

Culture also has an important effect on how an organisation forms judgements and makes decisions. "Like a human organism, an organization attends to certain matters and not to others; ... it has a unique style; it resists or embraces change; and it strives to succeed" (Schneider, 1994).

Perhaps Denison's (1990) perspective conveys a sense of the richness and complexity of the culture concept, and of its importance to an understanding of organisational life.

"An organization's culture may be seen as a code, a logic, and a system of structured behaviors and meaning that have stood the test of time and serve as a collective guide to future adaptation and survival. This definition helps to explain why cultures can be abstract and mystical, yet concrete and immediate; impossible to change, yet rapidly changing; complex and intricate, yet grounded in very basic values; and occasionally irrelevant to business issues, yet always central to an organization's strategy and
Sinha (1990) identifies the following components of organizational culture (Fig. 3.2):

1. Organizational mission, goals, objectives and underlying philosophy of management.
2. Organizational structure, systems, work forms, technology, financial resources and other physical artifacts.
3. Role relations, power and authority structures, leadership and other aspects of work and social relationships.
4. Employees' work and non-work behaviour inside the organization.
5. Employees' beliefs and values regarding work compared with life roles (such as beliefs and values regarding family, society, leisure, community and religion).

Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, and Sanders (1990) alternatively defined culture as manifestations from shallow to deep concentric circles. The outermost (most shallow) circle consists of symbols. Inside symbols are heroes, and inside heroes are rituals. Symbols, heroes, and rituals can be subsumed under the term practices, or "what is," because they are visible to an observer. The innermost circle consists of values, or "what should be."

Hofstede et al (1990) found in their empirical study that observed practices substantially influenced the behavior of new employees; however, observed organizational values had limited impact on the belief systems of new employees.

As a result of reviewing more than 100 studies in organizational behavior, sociology, and anthropology, Deshpandé and Webster (1989) defined organizational culture as a "pattern of effectiveness. This definition also explains why culture must be studied as both a cause and an effect."
shared values and beliefs that help individuals understand organizational functioning and thus provide them with the norms for behavior in the organization". The elements of organizational culture range from fundamental assumptions through values and behavioral norms to actual patterns of behavior (Rousseau, 1990). Values typically act as the defining elements of a culture, and norms, symbols, rituals, and other cultural activities revolve around them (Enz 1988). When the members of a social unit share values, an organizational culture or value system can be said to exist (Weiner 1988).

Recently, organizational culture has been defined as a type of consensual schema (Sims & Lorenzi, 1992). Consensual schema implies that individuals have achieved a certain similarity in the way they cognitively process and evaluate information. Therefore, even if employees are widely dispersed among multiple locations, these consensual schema provide organizational members with a common set of heuristics that guides decision making and performance of tasks. Thus, behavior variability among such employees may be effectively reduced.

Similar to the consensual schema approach, Hořstede (2001), taking analogy of computers, asserts that organizational cultures are the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organization from another.

Hofstede defines organizational culture as a construct, and are

- holistic
- historically influenced
- related to anthropological concepts
- socially constructed
- soft, and
- relatively stable — that is, difficult to change.

Some treat organizational culture as something the organization has, others treat it as something the organization is (Smircich, 1983). The former leads to an analytical approach and a concern with change. It predominates among management teachers and consultants. The latter supports a synthetic approach and a concern with understanding and is found exclusively among pure academicians. (Hofstede, 2001)

### 3.1.3 Organizational Culture Vs Organizational Climate:

Studies of organizational culture are varied, multilevel (department, division, company, country), and ubiquitous. The constructs of culture and climate are often interchanged, confused, and misconstrued without adequate explanation or justification (e.g., Alvesson, 1993; Chatman, 1991; Frost, 1991; Hatch, 1993; Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Pettigrew, 1990; Reichers and Schneider, 1990; Schultz and Hatch, 1996; Trice and Beyer, 1990). Denison (1996) asserts that culture is “the deep structure of organizations, which is rooted in the values, beliefs and assumptions held by organizational members.” In comparison, “climate is often considered as relatively temporary, subject to direct control, and largely limited to those aspects of the social environment that are consciously perceived by organizational
members” (Denison, 1996). Culture evolves and is sufficiently complex to not be manipulated easily, while climate is temporal and often subject to manipulation by people with power and influence (Denison, 1996). The term “climate” has been used (for example, by Harrison, 1972; Schein, 1985; Manning, 1990 and Hofstede, 1991) almost interchangeably with culture, but with connotations of “feel”. Schneider, Gunnarson and Niles-Jolly (1994) make a clearer distinction between the two terms:

“Employees observe what happens to them (and around them) and then draw conclusions about their organization’s priorities. They then set their own priorities accordingly. Thus, these perceptions provide employees with direction and orientation about where they should focus their energies and competencies. This, in turn, becomes a major factor in creating a climate. ... Culture, on the other hand, refers to the broader pattern of an organization’s mores, values, and beliefs. Again, the actions of senior managers strongly influence culture. By observing and interpreting these actions, employees are able to explain why things are the way they are, and why the organization focuses on certain priorities. Culture, then, stems from employees' interpretations of the assumptions, values, and philosophies that produce the climates they experience. ... Employees automatically make these attributions about what management values. The challenge for management is to act in ways that will lead employees to the kinds of attributions that result in commitment to management's most important values.”

3.1.4 Organizational Culture and Values:

The frequent appearance of the term values in the culture literature necessitates some exploration of the meaning of this concept in its application to culture. Rokeach (1973) defines a value as “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence”. Schwartz and Sagiv’s (1995) definition of values is “trans situational goals (terminal or instrumental) that express interests (individual, collective, or both) concerned with a motivational type and that are evaluated according to their importance as guiding principles in a person's life.”

In both these definitions the essence of a value as an “enduring”, “trans situational” “guiding principle” is clear. Values in this sense are pre-existing reference-points which influence choices between alternative possible behaviours. They are likely to be difficult to change (Hayes, 1994). In the corporate or organisational context, "Values ... are the basic concepts and beliefs of an organization; as such they form the heart of the corporate culture. Values define 'success' in concrete terms for employees - 'if you do this, you too will be a success' - and establish standards of achievement within the organization" (Deal and Kennedy, 1982).

According to Baron (1994) “Value-driven organisations manage by developing a set of values which they expect everyone involved with the organisation to subscribe to”

Deal and Kennedy (1982) regard such a value set as "the bedrock of any corporate culture. As the essence of a company's philosophy for achieving success, values provide a sense of common direction for all employees and guidelines for their day-to-day behavior. ... we think that often companies succeed because their employees can identify, embrace, and act on the values of the organization."
Defining and establishing such a value set is an imprecise activity. "Values are not 'hard', like organizational structures, policies and procedures, strategies, or budgets. Often they are not even written down. And when someone does try to set them down in a formal statement of corporate philosophy, the product often bears an uncomfortable resemblance to the Biblical beatitudes - good and true and broadly constructive, but not all that relevant to Monday morning" (Deal and Kennedy, 1982).

Nevertheless, in a survey involving “429 managers drawn from a wide range of manufacturing and service businesses”, Humble, Jackson and Thomson (1994) found that 80% of organisations had written value statements and 89% expected values to become more important for success in the next three years. Most firms (70%-73%) said that corporate values influenced decisions, but 53% also said that corporate values were "sometimes/partly...

Hofstede (1991) seems to be rather conspicuous in not regarding values as an especially significant factor in culture. Acknowledging that "although organizational cultures are mainly composed of practices, they do have a modest values component”, he found that “From the six organizational culture dimensions the numbers 1, 3, and 4 were ... to some extent associated with values. For the other three dimensions; 3, 5, and 6, no link to values was found at all. These dimensions just describe practices to which people have been socialized without their basic values being involved."

Hampden-Turner (1990) argues that “the values within a culture are more or less harmonious”, a view which is supported by Kotter and Heskett (1992): "When people talk of 'the corporate culture', they usually mean values and practices that are shared across all groups in a firm, at least within senior management."

This may be an optimistic view by senior managers: "there is an important difference between the guiding beliefs or vision held by top management and the daily beliefs or norms held by those at lower levels in the unit or organization. The former reflect top managements' beliefs about how things ought to be. The latter define how things actually are” (O'Reilly, 1989).

Pay (1994) maintains that "There are six principal ways in which functional values may differ:

1. Hierarchical or Informal (The degree to which position and hierarchy are accepted and considered important);
2. Risk Tolerance or Aversion (The degree of willingness to accept imprecision or to take risks);
3. Macho or Caring (The value placed on 'Macho' or Nurturing/Caring behaviour);
4. Team or Individual Focus (The preference for working in and being judged as groups or as an individual);
5. Theoretical or Practical (The degree of interest in and comfort with concepts and theories);
6. Short term or Long term (The extent to which thinking is focused on long or short term time scales and issues)".
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To some extent, according to Pay, values are associated with the function that is being performed:

"Most people would for example feel uneasy about an accountant who was flamboyant in style, who ignored rules and who wanted to take large risks. They would feel equally uncomfortable about a marketer who was introverted, highly conformist and risk averse. This is because all of these values are essentially derived from the nature of the work and the processes involved" (Pay, 1994).

Pay has provided a table (Table 3.1) of differentials in this respect between various organisational functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Manufact.</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Macho</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Functions and values (Pay, 1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.5 Formation/Evolution of Organizational Culture

The process of creating a new organizational culture is not simple. Generally, organizational heroes, rites and rituals, social norms and values, assumptions, and communication networks play key roles in creating organizational cultures (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). Once an organizational culture is created, a number of mechanisms help solidify the acceptance of the values and ensure that the culture is maintained or reinforced (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 1991). Organizational cultures sometimes need to be changed because they are different according to each organization, institute, society, and country.

The formation and acquisition of culture

According to Schein (1985), culture is "a learned product of group experience and is, therefore, to be found only where there is a definable group with a significant history". For Schein, the group is the key to understanding the development of culture in organisations of any size:

"Organizations evolve from small groups. But organizations develop dynamics that go beyond those of the small group. In order to understand organizational cultures, therefore, we
have to extrapolate from what one can observe in small groups to the situation of organizational growth and development."

Hollway (1991) is critical of Schein's readiness to generalise observations of small group behaviour to much larger organisations: "According to Schein, it is at the group level that culture forms .... Schein's definition falls into different traps. First, he relies almost entirely on the group level of analysis and, because of the traditions of American social psychology, that means assumptions about small groups. Given that the word 'organization' features in his book's title, the omission of analysis at the organizational level is very striking. ... in practice there is a constant slippage from group to organizational level, so that he ends up referring to organizational culture in the singular."

However, other writers have accepted Schein's direct linkage between the small group and the larger organisation, for example, Kilman et al (1985) make a similar assertion: "Culture is not a property of individuals (as, for example, personality is); it develops, however, when even a few people come together in a small group setting. The group is where culture first forms and then evolves, and it is also a key leverage point for changing and organization's cultures".

Kotter and Heskett (1992) also feel that the extrapolation is justified: "As MIT's Edgar Schein and others have well demonstrated, all that seems to be required is that a group of employees interact over a significant period of time and be relatively successful at what ever they undertake."

Schein (1985) has drawn up some basic prerequisites for the formation and persistence of groups:

"In order to function at all ... the group must have (1) a common language and shared conceptual categories; (2) some way of defining its boundaries and selecting its members, a process typically embodied in the recruitment, selection, socialization, training, and development systems of the organization; (3) some way of allocating authority, power, status, property, and other resources; (4) some norms for handling interpersonal relationships and intimacy, creating what is often called the style or climate of the organization; (5) criteria for dispensing rewards and punishments; and (6) some way of coping with unmanageable, unpredictable, and stressful events, a problem usually resolved by the development of ideologies, religions, superstitions, magical thinking, and the like."

It is mainly the fourth, fifth and sixth of Schein's criteria which are commonly interpreted as culture. These constitute the "rules we learn ... for how to relate to each other" and serve to "avoid the crippling anxiety of uncertainty and unpredictability" (Schein, 1985).

Because “cultures embody the needs and aspirations of their members” the process of culture formation is “inherently satisfying and a strong source of motivation” (Hampden-Turner, 1990), provided that the individual feels part of the group: "climate is moulded not only by relationships and work arrangements, but also by employees' feelings of inclusion or exclusion" (Manning, 1990). For those who feel excluded there can be a "devastating impact on the feelings, attitudes, and behavior of out-group members" (Northouse, 1997). Schein emphasizes this impulsion to be included in the group as “The clearest test of culture formation, ... comes when a (newcomer) ... has to be incorporated into the group. It suddenly
becomes very clear to everyone, including the new member, that missing even a few meetings is very critical because so much has already come to be taken for granted. The new member must learn a great deal to feel comfortable in the new group, and many of the norms may be articulated explicitly in order to speed up the process. " (Schein, 1985).

If the birthplace of culture is, as Schein and others contend, the small group, then the process of sharing, implicit in group formation, is the process by which specific cultural manifestations are acquired: "Culture is the solution to external and internal problems that has worked consistently for a group and that is therefore taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think about, and feel in relation to those problems. Such solutions eventually come to be assumptions about the nature of reality, truth, time, space, human nature, human activity, and human relationships - then they come to be taken for granted and, finally, drop out of awareness." (Schein, 1985).

Hampden-Tumer (1990) comments “all cultures are in fact responses to dilemmas”, in the sense that culture arise as the product of successful past choices, which supports Schein’s argument that “solutions that repeatedly appear to solve the problems they encounter tend to become a part of their culture” (Schein, 1985). Hampden-Tumer goes on: “If the culture cannot successfully mediate dilemmas, the organisation collapses”. Denison (1990) also refers to “principles and practices (which) endure because they have meaning for the members of an organization” and which “represent strategies for survival that have worked well in the past and that the members believe will work again in the future”. This view of culture as the product of a collective conditioning or social learning process continues the already established analogy of culture as a form of “group personality”. Whilst initially these processes operate at the individual level, they quickly become “aligned” (Schein, 1985) and shared by group members: “Psychologically we experience ... artifactual phenomena as something more than the effect of individual personalities because (1) we observe that a number of people in the organization seem to behave in the same way, (2) we observe that others in the setting treat the behavior as normal, and (3) we experience the behavior not as random or unmotivated but as purposive and patterned. We sense that there is some meaning in what people are doing, that there is a purpose to it that others in the situation seem to understand, even if we ourselves cannot decipher that purpose."

Checkland and Scholes (1990) and Schneider, Gunnarson and Niles-Jolly (1994) give support for this argument:

"One of the most obvious characteristics of human beings is their readiness to attribute meaning to what they observe and experience. Indeed, human beings are not simply ready to attribute meanings, they cannot abide meaninglessness. ... Mankind finds an absence of meaning unendurable. We are a meaning-endowed animal, on both the global long-term and the local short-term level. Members of organizations, for example, tend to see the world in a particular way, to attribute at least partially shared meanings to their world. And that is equally true of corporate members of the Warsaw Pact and individual members of the Batley Ladies Sewing Circle" (Checkland and Scholes, 1990).
"Culture is created and transmitted mainly through employees sharing their interpretations of events, ... or through storytelling. ... Cultural characteristics attributed to the organization actually become the organization's characteristics when employees share their beliefs about management. The more employees talk about management's qualities, the more the qualities become organization characteristics" (Schneider, Gunnarson and Niles-Jolly, 1994).

Schein (1985) suggests that there is an element of individual as well as group response involved in building cultural behaviour patterns because they foster a comforting sense of belonging: "values about how people should relate to each other, exercise power, define what is beautiful, and so on, can be validated by the experience that they reduce uncertainty and anxiety". This level of comfort and safety afforded to individual members in turn acts to ensure the group’s survival: "a group can learn that the holding of certain beliefs and assumptions is necessary as a basis for maintaining the group."

Kilman et al (1985) similarly contend that "It seems that human fear, insecurity, oversensitivity, dependency, and paranoia eventually motivate members to protect themselves by being cautious, by minimizing their risks, and by going along with cultures that build protective barriers around work units and around entire organizations."

Sometimes, according to Schein (1985) the process of socialisation of individuals into the group will not be successful:

"If the external task demands working together, the group members gradually learn through interaction what each other's biases are and how to accommodate to them. Some members may find that they cannot get their own needs met and may leave the group. Those who remain will gradually develop common conceptual categories and a language geared to mutual understanding and acceptance. However, if a group is trying to function on a common task while members still have difficulty understanding and accepting each other's different emotional styles, it will be difficult to accomplish anything. Too much emotional energy will go into coping with interpersonal anxiety reduction."

Sackman (1991) points to the importance of the contributions of individuals in building culture:

"Cognitions become commonly held in processes of social interaction. They can be introduced into the organization based on outside experiences, they can emerge from growing experiences, they can be invented and/or negotiated. In repeated applications they become attached with emotions and assigned with degrees of importance - also commonly held. They are relatively stable over time and accumulated in the form of different kinds of cultural knowledge ... (which) is passed on to new members."

Sackman defines four kinds of “cultural knowledge”:

1. Dictionary knowledge: commonly-held knowledge about definitions and descriptions. It refers to the 'what is' in a given cultural setting
2. Directory knowledge: commonly-held knowledge about cause-and-effect relationships. This knowledge refers to processes and delineates the 'how to' of things and events.

3. Recipe knowledge: cultural knowledge about recommendations, improvements, and repair strategies. It is composed of cognitions about what should be done to improve things or what should be done in case something goes awry.

4. Axiomatic knowledge: basic assumptions that have influenced an organisation's existence.

There is a consensus that the formation and acquisition of culture is a process of learning, on the part of groups and individuals (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1985; Kilman et al, 1985; Hofstede, 1991) and that this learning is vital for the well-being of both the individual and the group: "The cultural network is informal, yet its rules are nonetheless rigid - they're just not written down. You've got to learn them all or you can't survive in a culture. If you forget even one, you stand out as someone who doesn't know his or her way around the company. A new employee isn't handed a booklet called 'The 50,000 Informal Rules You Need To Survive Here. Nor do managers explicitly try to manage by these rules; yet they dictate the bulk of the activity that goes on in an organization" (Deal and Kennedy, 1982).

Schein (1985) argues that "if one is concerned about managing or changing culture, one must look to what we know about the learning and unlearning of complex beliefs and assumptions that underlie social behavior" and maintains that "two interactive mechanisms" are involved which have "different consequences for the stability of what is learned". First is "positive reward and reinforcement - the success model "which arises from "positive problem-solving situations" in which "people repeat what works and give up what does not". This leads to "positive reinforcement if the attempted solution works" This model represents Schein's basic premise for the formation of culture.

Schein's second model is "anxiety and pain reduction - the social trauma model" which arises from "anxiety-avoidance situations" which produce positive reinforcement if the anxiety is successfully reduced and if the painful consequences that produced the anxiety are prevented".

Schein maintains that "in practice these two types of situations are intertwined, but they have different motivational bases, different underlying learning mechanisms, and different consequences." In respect of the "social trauma model" He warns that "The problem with this learning mechanism is that once people learn how to avoid a painful situation, they continue to pursue this course without testing to see whether the danger still exists ... Learning theorists also note that trauma-based learning is so stable because not only does the ritualized response avoid the pain, but the actual reduction of the anxiety itself is very rewarding".

Positive reinforcement is a functionally "better" model for reasons which Schein explains: "This learning mechanism is different from trauma-based learning in that it produces responses that continually test the environment. If the environment changes so that strategies that previously were consistently successful no longer work, the group will quickly discover this, and their strategies will be re-examined and changed. This learning mechanism can, however, produce behavior that is very resistant to change if the environment is inconsistent,
producing success at one time and failure at another time. Unpredictable, intermittent reinforcement leads to very stable learning just as trauma does."

Stacey (1992) also has a perspective on the dangers of firmly-established behaviour patterns in suppressing flexibility:

"No group can operate effectively in the complete absence of some cultural sharing. In defining what may be appropriate sharing in a business it is helpful to distinguish between what may be called performing and learning cultural norms. Performing norms relate to what a group is doing together in carrying out its day-to-day activities and how they behave towards each other as they do this. Learning norms relate to how they interpret what is going on around them, what it is permissible to question, and what answers it is acceptable to give and generally how they think about things. ... Strong sharing of learning norms will always be harmful and even strong sharing of a few performing norms runs risks. Such strong sharing blocks complex learning".

Schein (1985) cautions that “the learning process is complex because it is groups rather than individuals that are doing the learning, and it is cognitions and emotions, not only overt behavior patterns, that are learned. Since group members are capable of experiencing many different forms of anxiety, learning and defensive behavior occur at many levels. And ... the paradox of cultural learning is that, while culture reduces one type of anxiety, it often increases other types."

Schein's model of positive reinforcement relies, like other forms of conditioning, upon successful outcomes ensuing from certain actions or strategies. However, “only those solutions which are proposed or invented can become candidates for cultural elements". To become a “candidate” in this sense a particular solution must first be perceived and then seem to be an attractive option. This will be heavily influenced by past experience and present culture. Managers and others bring with them into their organisational cultures the prior experiences and reinforcements which have occurred and still occur in their lives outside the organisation. As Baron and Walters (1994) put it, “individuals do not enter work organisations untrammelled by the values and attitudes of their past experience”. This view is strongly supported by a variety of writers over many years:

"Personality is not formed in a vacuum. A man's language is not independent of the language of his fathers, nor are his attitudes divorced from those of his associates and his teachers. A man does not live for months or years in a particular position in an organization, exposed to some streams of communication, shielded from others, without the most profound effects upon what he knows, believes, attends to, hopes, wishes, emphasizes, fears, and proposes" (Simon, 1976).

"Organizational culture as shared beliefs can determine in large measure what managers see and thus how they respond to their world. ... The language that managers use, especially their metaphorical language, arises out of their shared beliefs and can be a powerful shaper of organizational strategy" (Sapienza, 1985).
"Organizations choose and structure their environment through a host of interpretive decisions. One's knowledge of and relations with the environment are extensions of one's culture, since we come to know and understand our environment through the belief systems that guide our interpretations and actions" (Morgan, 1986).

"If we ask where a culture comes from initially, the answer is that it lies within the potentials of its individual members. They use the culture to reinforce ideas, beliefs, feelings and information which are consistent with their beliefs. The culture discourages, even represses, sentiments and information that are inconsistent" (Hampden-Turner, 1990).

"Every person carries within him or herself patterns of thinking, feeling, and potential acting which were learned throughout their lifetime. Much of it has been acquired in early childhood, because at that time a person is most susceptible to learning and assimilating. As soon as certain patterns of thinking, feeling and acting have established themselves within a person's mind, he must unlearn these before being able to learn something different, and unlearning is more difficult than learning for the first time. ... Workers' behavior is an extension of behavior acquired at school and in the family. Managers' behavior is an extension of the managers' school and family experiences, as well as a mirror image of the behavior of the managed." (Hofstede, 1991).

Deal and Kennedy (1982), however take a rather different view, arguing that culture is much more a response to environmental imperatives:

"Each company faces a different reality in the marketplace depending on its products, competitors, customers, technologies, government influences, and so on. To succeed in its marketplace, each company must carry out certain activities very well. In some markets that means selling; in others, invention; in still others, management of costs. In short, the environment in which a company operates determines what it must do to be a success. This business environment is the single greatest influence in shaping a corporate culture."

Baron and Walters (1994) report on "15 case studies carried out in a variety of organisations... all with an international perspective." They conclude that "corporate culture is determined by a two-way relationship between a number of factors including business strategy, history and environment, and the values and attitudes held by individuals." National culture also has an influence.

Sethia and Glinow (1985) examined the reward systems in place in several large companies. They argue that "the cultures and reward systems of organizations are strongly interdependent and will have a tendency to alter each other until they reach a state of mutual balance." Reward systems influence culture directly "by selectively reinforcing certain beliefs and values" and indirectly by "affecting the quality of human resources in organizations", because pay and conditions above the market norm attract the best people, who influence others to improve performance, whilst poor rewards lead to low commitment. Baron and Walters (1994) found that "a number of the case study organisations reported problems in creating a team culture in an environment which stressed only individual
contribution and reward. ... In all the case study organisations this problem had already been identified.

Several writers have examined the role of leaders in shaping culture. Morgan (1986) believes that "a focus on the links between leadership style and corporate culture often provides key insights on why organizations work in the way they do", although "formal leaders do not have a monopoly on the creation of organizational culture", those with formal power have "a special advantage in developing value systems and codes of behavior, since they often have the power to reward or punish those who follow or ignore their lead".

Coopey (1994) defines three ways in which leaders can "set the pattern of relationships": "hierarchical control of decision making regulates the power of principals over agents; mentoring relationships within that hierarchy secure narrowly conceived emotional bonding; and modes of selection, training and development bring about normative conformity of ambitious managers."

Morgan, however, emphasises the opportunities others have to influence this process by "acting as informal opinion leaders, or simply by acting as the people they are". Morgan is sure that "culture is not something that is imposed on a social setting. Rather, it develops during the course of social interaction." Schein (1985) suggests that leaders control the "primary mechanisms for culture embedding and reinforcement", which are: "(1) what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control; (2) leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises; (3) deliberate role modelling, teaching, and coaching by leaders; (4) criteria for allocation of rewards and status; (5) criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and excommunication."

Although less explicitly associated by Schein with leader practice, most of the "secondary articulation and reinforcement mechanisms" he defines are also subject at least to influence if not outright control by leaders: "(1) the organization's design and structure; (2) organizational systems and procedures; (3) design of physical space, facades, and buildings; (4) stories, legends, myths, and parables about important events and people; (5) formal statements of organizational philosophy, creeds, and charters."

Schneider (1994) is concerned with the appropriateness of leadership style, relating different approaches to his four core culture types:

"The leader as director is naturally congruent with the control culture. The participative leader fits hand-in-glove with the collaboration culture. The leader as standard setter operates naturally within the competence culture. The charismatic leader aligns naturally with the cultivation culture. ... To an important extent, leadership effectiveness is a question of degree of fit. A leader's effectiveness can be measured by the degree the leader's approach is integrated with the organization's core culture."

Coopey (1994), however, reviews a variety of aspects of leaders as exemplars, and concludes that most workers do not identify with senior managers and are therefore unlikely to be much influenced by their behaviour: "Non-directorial employees - especially non-managerial - might well have acquired a poor opinion of their leaders both as stewards of shared interests and as inspirational exemplars of commitment to organisational values. Poor stewardship is reflected in the effects of short-termism, in standards of trusteeship over pension funds, in a
willingness to engage in mergers and takeovers of dubious value, and in the treatment of women and ethnic minorities". Coopey points out that managers change jobs frequently, including sideways moves and promotions within organisations. This is unusual for ordinary workers, who are "probably stuck in their jobs until fired, retired or made redundant" and presents a barrier to mutual understanding and trust.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) discuss "heroes", as distinct from leaders. These are "symbolic figures whose deeds are out of the ordinary, but not too far out. They show - often dramatically - that the ideal of success lies within human capacity". Heroes "personify the culture's values and as such provide tangible role models for employees to follow" and "reinforce the basic values of the culture by: Making success attainable and human ... Providing role models ... Symbolizing the company to the outside world ... Preserving what makes the company special ... Setting a standard of performance ... Motivating employees ... Perhaps most importantly, heroes provide a lasting influence within the organization".

Schein's Stages of Culture Formation

People while forming groups to satisfy their needs, bring along with goals, values and even hopes to the group processes and endeavor. Schein suggests that groups progress through a series of stages that affect culture. Throughout the stages of group development, maintenance and continuation of the group depend on its finding ways to preserve the shared values and norms that hold it together. (Schein, 1983)

According to Schein, the first stage of cultural development revolves around issues of dependency and authority. The question of who will lead the group is the dominating theme. The group looks for someone to give it direction. The type of person who is selected to lead is indicative of many values and norms of the group and thus the future of the yet to blossom culture. More importantly, leader characteristics such as, age, training, background, experience, personality etc. may all be important in the formation of the culture.

Schein's second stage of cultural development involves the "confrontation of intimacy, role differentiation, and peer relationship issues" (Schein, 1983). Successful first efforts to deal with the authority issue at the first stage are likely to produce a sense of success and good feelings about the membership that are likely to carry over for an extended period of time. Early success can often motivate employees to give greater commitment and effort to the organization.

During the third stage of cultural development, creativity and stability issues must be confronted. The group begins to cope with the innovative approaches that brought its initial success as that innovation and creativity come into conflict with the needs for order and stability. Although creative and innovative forces may be critical factors in the formation of an organization, those same forces can disrupt the order of the organization.

Finally, the organization or group matures only to encounter a confrontation of survival and growth issues. The organization or group learns whether it is flexible and adaptable to changing conditions in the surrounding environment or whether its very survival will be questioned.
The stages of cultural development represent changed goals, values and focus of the organization. The underlying question throughout these stages of development is whether the organization can forge the kind of culture that is needed to survive. This is true even when members are not necessarily aware of attempts to form and change the culture. (B.J. Hodge, William P. Anthony, Lawency M. Gales, 1993).

Table 3.2 summarizes Schein’s four stages of cultural development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Dominant Assumption</th>
<th>Group Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dependency/authority confrontation</td>
<td>A leader will guide the group to its maximum benefit</td>
<td>Leadership selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confrontation of intimacy, role differentiation, peer relationship issues</td>
<td>The group is successful and the members like each other.</td>
<td>Normative consensus; harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Creativity/stability issue</td>
<td>The group can be innovative and stable at once</td>
<td>Team continuity and accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Survival/growth issues</td>
<td>The group has endured and so must be “right”.</td>
<td>Group’s attention: status quo/resistance to change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Scholtz’s Typology of Culture Formation

Christian Scholz views organizational culture as a complex phenomenon (Scholz, 1987). According to Scholtz, cultural typology is made up of three dimensions along which culture develops. The dimensions are:

1. Evolutionary Dimension
2. Internal Dimension
3. External Dimension

Evolutionary Dimension:

The evolutionary dimension of cultural formation, somewhat similar to Schein’s view, predicts that culture develops over time in a series of stages. Scholtz proposes that a nascent culture is already in place and the subsequent stages are the consequences of how the organization responds to challenges to the culture. Scholtz outlines five evolutionary stages:

I. the stable stage during which no change is contemplated
II. the reactive stage during which minimal change is accepted
III. the anticipating stage when incremental changes are accepted
IV. the exploring stage during which large amount of change are possible
V. the creative stage when continuous change is possible
According to Scholtz, not all organizations follow this sequence and, nor is any stage can be regarded as better than another.

**Internal Dimension:**

The focus of the internal dimension of culture is on particular internal conditions operating within the organization that affect the culture. For example, an organization that uses standardized production processes would create conditions for a culture that is constant and process oriented. The result is a consistency culture that places high value on standard procedures and consistent outputs (Dennison, 1995). On the other hand, a professional organization with employees possessing varied skills and high levels of professional expertise is likely to foster development of a culture that emphasizes individualism and professionalism. This type of culture is referred to as clan or involvement culture where employees' values and commitment to the organization are central.

**External Dimension:**

External environmental conditions are the forces that constitute the external dimension of culture. External conditions and how organizational members perceive and respond to those conditions play a critical role in the development of the culture. A company facing a complex and dynamic environment is likely to develop a culture that values flexibility, innovativeness and risk taking. The external focus can be manifested in two different ways: 1. as an "adaptability culture" directed at innovations or other attempts to change in response to the environment, or 2. as a "mission culture" with a focus on meeting customer needs.

Scholtz's model, a more comprehensive and complex depiction of evolution of culture than Schein's, basically concerns itself with three diverse sets of pressures – time, internal characteristics of the organization and external conditions in the environment. The Scholtz model can be depicted as shown in Fig.3.2.1:
Charles Fombrum (1983) describes the development of culture through interaction of forces emanating at three levels:

1. Societal Level
2. Industrial Level
3. Organizational Level
According to Fombrun, organizational culture is a product of the broader culture in which organizations are embedded. Understanding the interplay between societal and industry levels of culture with characteristics of the organization is vital for an accurate analysis of culture. (Fombrun, 1983)

At the "societal level", culture represents the values, attitudes, and meanings that members bring to the organization. This may be influenced by such social forces as the educational system, political system, economic conditions, and the social structure of the larger society as the organization operates within this general cultural atmosphere. These conditions influence the strategies, mission, objectives, norms and practices in the organization in subtle but real ways. In other way, a company's strategy, products and advertisements must be consistent with the community culture if the organization wishes to maintain legitimacy and approval.

The essence of the "industrial level" of culture is best realized by considering the similarities of cultures within and differences in cultures between industries. Often there are dominant values or beliefs of an organization that are espoused by a majority of organizations within an industry. Over time industries develop styles that have a remarkable influence on such things as decision making, political stances, member lifestyle, dress codes etc.

**Louis's Multiple Culture**

Unlike above models which treat organizational culture as monolithic, Louis's Multiple Culture approach treat organizational culture as divergent and multiple. Meryl Louis suggests that organizations, especially large, complex ones, often develop different cultures at different sites or "loci" within the organization. Thus unique cultures may develop around different levels in the organization or within different divisions or departments. Conditions, problems, or personnel at different loci can produce pressures for different cultures within the organization. Moreover, loci outside the organization may also produce conditions for different cultures. (B.J.Hodge, William P. Anthony, Lawency M. Gales, 1993).

**3.1.6 Levels of Organizational Culture**

As well as distinct types of culture, several writers have described varying levels of culture, or of the observable manifestations of culture. Denison (1990) defines four levels: Artifacts - "tangible aspects of culture shared by members of an organization" including verbal, behavioral, and physical artefacts. For example language, stories and myths, rituals and ceremonies, technology and art. Perspectives - "socially shared rules and norms". Values - "the evaluational base that organizational members use for judging situations, acts, objects, and people". And Assumptions - "the tacit beliefs that members hold about themselves and others ... Assumptions are the unconscious underpinnings of the first three levels."

Hofstede (1991) also describes four "levels of cultural manifestations". These are: Symbols - "words, gestures, pictures or objects that carry a particular meaning which is only recognized by those who share the culture"; Heroes - "persons, alive or dead, real or imaginary, who possess characteristics which are highly prized in a culture, and who thus serve as models for"
behavior"; Rituals - "collective activities, technically superfluous in reaching desired ends, but which, within a culture, are considered socially essential: they are therefore carried out for their own sake"; and Values - "broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others" acquired very early in life, possibly by age ten, and therefore hard to change. These values may be unconscious; not discussed and not directly observable, they may have to be inferred.

Kotter and Heskett (1992) consider only two levels:

"We have found it helpful to think of organizational culture as having two levels, which differ in terms of their visibility and their resistance to change. At the deeper and less visible level, culture refers to values that are shared by the people in the group and that tend to persist over time even when group membership changes. ... At the more visible level, culture represents the behavior patterns or style of an organization that new employees are automatically encouraged to follow by their fellow employees. ... Each level of culture has a natural tendency to influence the other".

Schein (1980, 1985, 1990) uses three levels. The deepest is the set of "basic assumptions" about the nature of being, reality and the environment. Above this lie the values; "the sense of what 'ought' to be, as distinct from what is", and on the surface, visible to the observer, are the "artefacts and creations - (the culture's) constructed physical environment. Schein (1985) suggests that "since the insiders of the culture are not necessarily aware of their own artefacts, one cannot always ask about them, but one can always observe them for oneself".

Schein provides some expansion of the "basic assumptions" which form the deepest layer of his model.

"1. Humanity's Relationship to Nature. At the organizational level, do the key members view the relationship of the organization to its environment as one of dominance, submission, harmonizing, finding an appropriate niche, or what?

1. The Nature of Reality and Truth. The linguistic and behavioral rules that define what is real and what is not, what is a 'fact', how truth is ultimately to be determined, and whether truth is 'revealed' or 'discovered'; basic concepts of time and space.

2. The Nature of Human Nature. What does it mean to be 'human' and what attributes are considered intrinsic or ultimate? Is human nature good, evil, or neutral? Are human beings perfectible or not?

3. The Nature of Human Activity. What is the 'right' thing for human beings to do, on the basis of the above assumptions about reality, the environment, and human nature: to be active, passive, self-developmental, fatalistic, or what? What is work and what is play?

4. The Nature of Human Relationships. What is considered to be the 'right' way for people to relate to each other, to distribute power and love? Is life cooperative or competitive; individualistic, group collaborative, or communal; based on traditional lineal authority, law, charisma, or what?" (Schein, 1985).
Most definitions of Organizational Culture note that it exists at two levels in an organization: the observable traces or indicators of the culture (also referred to as symbols), and the unobservable forces present in the organization (J. Steven Ott, 1989). The observable traces like artifacts, dress, language etc are nothing but the observable manifestation of the unobservable traces – norms, beliefs, assumptions, ideology, values and shared perceptions held by the members (B.J. Hodge, William P. Anthony, Lawency M. Gales, 1993).

Schein (1980) compares organizational culture to an onion having several layers/level. The layers are so classified that they proceed from overt to subconscious. The following figure describes the Schein’s levels of Organizational Culture and their Interaction.

Fig. 3.4
Schein’s Levels of Organizational Culture, Adapted from Sinha (1990)
Let us explain the levels of organizational culture as propounded by Schein in little more detail.

**Level 1 Artifacts**

The most visible level of the culture is its artifacts and creations. These are its constructed physical and social environment. At this level one can look at physical space, the technological output of the group, its written and spoken language, artistic productions, and the overt behaviour of its members. Since the insiders of the culture are not necessarily aware of their own artifacts, one can not always ask about them, but one can always observe them for oneself.

**Level 2: Values**

Values are the sense of what “ought to be”, as distinct from “what is”. A value, when widely shared, gradually starts a process of cognitive transformation into a belief, and ultimately an assumption, and drop out of consciousness. Not all values undergo such transformation. Only those values that are susceptible of physical or social validation, and that continue to work reliably in solving group’s problems, will become transformed into assumptions. Secondly, certain value domains, those dealing with the less controllable elements of the environment or with aesthetic matters, may not be testable at all. In such cases consensus through social validation is still possible, but it is not automatic. When values are explicit and predict well enough what people will say in a variety of situations, but which may be out of line with what they will actually do in situations where those values should be operating, are called espoused values (Argyris and Schon, 1974).

**Level 3: Basic Underlying Assumptions**

When a solution to a problem works repeatedly, it comes to be taken for granted. What was once a hypothesis, supported by only a hunch or a value, comes gradually to be treated as a reality. We come to believe that nature really works this way. Basic assumptions are different from what some anthropologists call “dominant value orientation” (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1981) in that such dominant orientations reflect the preferred solution among several basic alternatives, but all the alternatives are still visible in the culture, and any given member of the culture could, from time to time, behave according to variant as well as dominant orientations. Basic assumptions are comparable to what Argyris has identified as “theories in use”, the implicit assumptions that actually guide behavior, that tell group members how to perceive, think about, and feel about things. (Argyris, 1976). Basic assumptions are non-confrontable and non-debatable.

**3.1.7 Classification of Organization Cultures:**

Harrison (1972), Deal and Kennedy (1982), Handy (1985), Trompenaars (1993) and Schneider (1994) all identify four basic culture types. Harrison’s are described in terms of “orientations”:

1. Power orientation - typical of small entrepreneurial enterprises.
2. Role orientation - typical of bureaucracies and characterised by strong procedures, valuing order, consistency and predictability

3. Task orientation - this type values teams, achievement and intrinsic motivation

4. Support orientation - valuing relationships and bonding, characterised by “a ‘family’ feel.”

Deal and Kennedy’s (1982) types are:

- The process culture: A world of little or no feedback where employees find it hard to measure what they do; instead they concentrate on how it’s done. We have another name for this culture when the processes get out of control - bureaucracy

- The tough-guy, macho culture: A world of individualists who regularly take high risks and get quick feedback on whether their actions were right or wrong.

- The bet-your-company culture: Cultures with big-stakes decisions, where years pass before employees know whether decisions have paid off, a high-risk, slow-feedback environment.

- The work hard/play hard culture: Fun and action are the rule here, and employees take few risks, all with quick feedback; to succeed, the culture encourages them to maintain a high level of relatively low-risk activity.

Handy (1985) relates his four models to the classical world:

1. A power culture is frequently found in small entrepreneurial organizations. ... Its structure is best pictured as a web ... If this culture had a patron god it would be Zeus, the all-powerful head of the Gods of ancient Greece who ruled by whim and impulse, by thunderbolt and shower of gold from Mount Olympus

2. A role culture is often stereotyped as bureaucracy. But bureaucracy has come to acquire a pejorative note in common parlance, so ‘role’ will be used here. ... a role culture can be pictured as a Greek Temple. Its patron god is Apollo, the god of reason; for this culture works by logic and by rationality. The role organization rests its strength in its pillars, its functions or specialities (departments). ... They are coordinated at the top by a narrow band of senior management”.

3. The task culture is job or project oriented. ... (It) can best be represented as a net, with some of the strands of the net thicker and stronger than the others. Much of the power and influence lies at the interstices of the net. The so-called ‘matrix organization’ is one structural form of the task culture. ... The task culture has no totally appropriate presiding deity, perhaps because the Ancients were more interested in style and principle and power than in performance, for the whole emphasis of the task culture is on getting the job done.

4. The fourth culture is an unusual one. It will not be found pervading many organizations, yet many individuals will cling to some of its values. In this culture the individual is the central point. If there is a structure or an
organization it exists only to serve and assist the individuals within it. ... Its structure is as minimal as possible, a cluster is the best word for it, or perhaps a galaxy of individual stars. ... Dyonysus is its patron deity, the god of the self-oriented individual, the first existentialist”. (Handy, 1985).

Handy uses the term “Person Culture” for the last type, and suggests that “barristers’ chambers, architects’ partnerships, hippy communes, social groups, families, and some small consultancy firms, often have this ‘person’ orientation”.

Trompenaars (1993) uses colourful descriptions such as “Family” (hierarchical, power oriented), “Eiffel Tower” (highly structured, with well-defined roles), “Guided Missile” (egalitarian, reliant on intrinsic motivation) and “Incubator” (no formal structure, has values which stress self-expression and fulfilment) to identify culture types.

Schneider (1994) uses the terms Collaboration Culture, Cultivation Culture, Control Culture, and Competence Culture to define his four basic culture types. A control culture has to do with power, a collaboration culture is all about teams and teamwork, a competence culture focuses on achievement, and the cultivation culture is concerned with growth and potential. Schneider goes into great detail about the characteristics, strengths and weaknesses of the four culture types:

Control cultures are characterised by hierarchy, centralised goal-definition, emphasis on reward and punishment, and formal systems. “The individual motivation base for the control culture lies in people’s need for power”. Control cultures tend to be stable and secure, but can be arrogant and individual flair and innovation can be stifled.

Competence cultures are “based on the achievement motive”. They emphasise personal and organisational excellence, and can be sources of technological advance. They may, however, foster technical excellence at the expense of pragmatism, and people in them may feel insecure. “Of all the four core cultures, the competence culture has generated the greatest number of developmental works on the study and improvement of organizations. This is to be expected considering that most writers themselves belong to competence cultures such as universities and consulting firms (Schneider, 1994).

The collaboration culture emphasises teamwork, partnership and cooperation. It is “a natural at building and using diversity, an increasingly prevalent issue in the 1990s” (Schneider, 1994). It tends to be versatile and adaptive, individual talent is fostered, although it may not be recognised, and “employees feel ownership and pride”. Collaboration cultures “may be disadvantaged against a ruthless adversary” by slow decision-making, “short-termism” and vulnerability to “groupthink”. The collaboration culture’s way to success is to put a collection of people together, to build these people into a team, to engender their positive affective relationships with one another, and to charge them with fully utilizing one another as resources. (Schneider, 1994)

The cultivation culture values its people’s aspirations and hopes. It “taps and utilises individual talent” and is “amenable to change and adaptation”. People feel “fulfilled, inspired, enlivened” but it may lack direction and focus. It can be “weak at completing/finishing, blind to ‘hard’ data (and) poor at decision making if too many options” are available. The cultivation culture is characterised by free-flowing, flexible relationships,
"built on trust and commitment". "A feeling of freedom permeates the organization. People behave as if they have few things to worry about." "While D C McClelland researched and articulated the motives for the first three core cultures, the work of Abraham Maslow provides the cultivation culture with its intellectual motivation base" (Schneider, 1994).

Schneider's four culture types are placed in the quadrants of a matrix with axes Personal - Impersonal and Actuality - Possibility: "At the most fundamental level, every organization focuses either on what is actual or what is possible. Actuality has to do with what is; possibility has to do with what might be."

![Four culture types matrix](Schneider, 1994)

Researcher Jeffrey Sonnenfeld\(^2\) identified the following four types of cultures.

**Academy Culture** Employees are highly skilled and tend to stay in the organization, while working their way up the ranks. The organization provides a stable environment in which employees can development and exercise their skills. Examples are universities, hospitals, large corporations, etc.

**Baseball Team Culture** Employees are "free agents" who have highly prized skills. They are in high demand and can rather easily get jobs elsewhere. This type of culture exists in fast-paced, high-risk organizations, such as investment banking, advertising, etc.

**Club Culture** The most important requirement for employees in this culture is to fit into the group. Usually employees start at the bottom and stay with the organization. The organization promotes from within and highly values seniority. Examples are the military, some law firms, etc.
Employees don't know if they'll be laid off or not. These organizations often undergo massive reorganization. There are many opportunities for those with timely, specialized skills. Examples are savings and loans, large car companies, etc.

The competing values framework Cameron and Quinn (1999) can be used in constructing an organizational culture profile of an organization as:

- **Clan**: an organization that concentrates on internal maintenance with flexibility, concern for people, and sensitivity for customers.
- **Hierarchy**: an organization that focuses on internal maintenance with a need for stability and control.
- **Adhocracy**: an organization that concentrates on external positioning with a high degree of flexibility and individuality.
- **Market**: an organization that focuses on external maintenance with a need for stability and control.

### 3.1.8 Organization Culture as an Organizational Variable

In the present study we have taken motivation and organization culture as two variables. Motivation as a variable is well established like profitability of the organization, employee satisfaction, etc. What about the variability of org. culture and specifically its relationship with the motivation? The second part is the hypothesis of this research work. But that will come only if we establish the variability of Organizational Culture.

A variable is any factor that can be altered. Furthermore, a variable can commonly be measured. For any kind of culture, this poses the problem of how can culture be altered and how can any alteration be measured. Comparatively, organization profit can be measured as gross (or net) profit. The view of what gross (or net) profit actually is can be argued but, even so, a numerate measure can be placed on any definition. Likewise, profit can also be altered in a number of ways. Culture, however, is considered a qualitative value. Many, such as Peters & Waterman (In Search of Excellence, 1982), considered good culture to be 'strong' culture. But can any organization's culture be classed as 'strong' with little dispute?

Some academics argue that an organization's culture is fixed and stable or, at least, does not deviate greatly. If this was the case, then culture could be considered not to be a variable but a fixed factor that may be taken into account when committing to change. The flaw in this argument is that practical demonstrations of organization culture have shown that organization culture can be managed and is therefore a variable. Management of the manipulation can yield positive or negative results in the short and long-term.

Other key concepts, to which organization culture can be and is compared, include organization structure, strategy and control. These are indeed variable as they can be altered - an organization can change from one strategy or structure to another, for example. There are limitations upon the extent to which these variables can be manipulated, including the flexibility of the workforce, which affects any manipulation of culture, in particular. If the workers resist change, altering culture in any way is likely to produce a negative effect, in the short-term at least. At best, the workforce will be compliant but the underlining resistance is
likely cause morale and motivation problems. At worst, the workforce can take a whole range of action (or inaction).

In the 1980's, we saw an increase in the attention paid to organizational culture as an important determinant of organizational success. Many experts began to argue that developing a strong organizational culture is essential for success. While the link between organizational culture and organizational effectiveness is far from certain, there is no denying that each organization has a unique social structure and that these social structures drive much of the individual behavior observed in organizations.

To be able to classify organizational culture as a variable, we must be able to measure it. Since organizational culture is a vast concept, so far we are not able to find a single index or score defining the culture of an organization. The best we have achieved is identification of certain factors which can denote the culture of an organization in combination.

3.1.9 Factors/dimensions of Organization Culture

Various researchers have used various dimensions to measure Organization Culture. All the classifications are based on the basic definitions of Organizational Culture that we have elaborated earlier.

The following are the approaches/classification of dimensions to quantitatively express Organizational Culture.

Cameron and Quinn (1999) have developed an organizational culture framework built upon a theoretical model called the "Competing Values Framework." This framework refers to whether an organization has a predominant internal or external focus and whether it strives for flexibility and individuality or stability and control. The framework is also based on six organizational culture dimensions and four dominant culture types (i.e., clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy). In addition, the framework authors generated an "Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)" which is used to identify the organizational culture profile based on the core values, assumptions, interpretations, and approaches that characterize organizations (Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

The competing values framework can be used in constructing an organizational culture profile. Through the use of the OCAI, an organizational culture profile can be drawn by establishing the organization's dominant culture type characteristics. In this respect, the overall culture profile of an organization can be identified as:

- Clan: an organization that concentrates on internal maintenance with flexibility, concern for people, and sensitivity for customers.
- Hierarchy: an organization that focuses on internal maintenance with a need for stability and control.
- Adhocracy: an organization that concentrates on external positioning with a high degree of flexibility and individuality.
- Market: an organization that focuses on external maintenance with a need for stability and control.
Hofstede (1994) also attempted to express organizational culture in terms of six dimensions. (as against five dimensions of national culture). He also developed an instrument and measured 20 organizational cultures in Denmark and Netherlands, in a study known as IRIC Project. He says,

"...A research project into organizational culture differences, conducted by IRIC across 20 organizational units in Denmark and the Netherlands in the 1980s, identified six independent dimensions of practices: process-oriented versus results-oriented, job-oriented versus employee-oriented, professional versus parochial, open systems versus closed systems, tightly versus loosely controlled, and pragmatic versus normative. The position of an organization on these dimensions is partly determined by the business or industry the organization is in. Scores on the dimensions are also related to a number of other 'hard' characteristics of the organizations. These lead to conclusions about how organization cultures can be and cannot be managed."

1. **Process-oriented versus Results-oriented**

   In the process oriented cultures people perceived themselves as avoiding risk and spending only limited effort in their jobs, and they saw each day as pretty much the same. In the result oriented cultures people perceived themselves as comfortable in unfamiliar situations and as putting in maximal effort, and they felt that each day brought new challenges.

2. **Job-oriented versus Employee-oriented**

   In the employee oriented culture people felt that their personal problems were taken into account, that the organization took a responsibility for employee welfare and that important decisions were made by groups or committees. In the job oriented cultures, people experienced a strong pressure for getting the job done; they perceived the organization as interested only in the work employees did, not in their personal and family welfare; and they reported that important decisions were made by individuals.

3. **Professional versus Parochial**

   Members of the parochial culture feel that the organization’s norms, cover their behaviour at home as well as on the job; they feel that in hiring employees the company take their social and family backgrounds into account as much as their job competence, and they do not look far into the future (probably due to the assumption the organization will do it for them). Members of professional culture, consider their private lives their own business, they feel the organization hire them on the basis of job competence only, and they do think far ahead.

4. **Open systems versus Closed systems**

   This dimension describes the communication climate. In the open system cultures, members consider both the organization and its people open to new comers and outsiders. They believe that almost anyone would fit into the
organization and that new employees need only a few days to feel at home. In closed system organizations, the organization and its people are felt to be closed and secretive, even among insiders. Members feel that only very special people would fit into the organization and that new employees need more than a year to feel at home.

5. **Tightly versus Loosely controlled**

It refers to amount of internal structuring in the organization. People in the loosely controlled cultures feel that no one thinks of cost, meeting times are only kept approximately, and jokes about the company and the job are frequent. Whereas, in tightly controlled cultures, people describe their work environment as cost-conscious, meeting times are kept punctually, and jokes about the company and/or the job are rare.

6. **Pragmatic versus Normative**

It refers to the amount of structuring in the organization’s external contacts. Pragmatic organizations are market driven, normative units perceive their task toward the outside world as the implementation of inviolable rules. In the normative units, the major emphasis is on correctly following organizational procedures, which are more important than results, in matters of business ethics and honesty; the unit’s standards are felt to be high. In the pragmatic organizations, there is a major emphasis on meeting the customers’ needs, results are more important than correct procedures, and in matters of business ethics, a pragmatic rather than a dogmatic attitude prevails.

The number of studies of organizational culture is steadily increasing. Such studies have used different terms like values, ethics, beliefs, ethos, climate, environment, culture etc to measure and describe organizational culture. But reviewing all the questionnaires used by those researchers, we can define organizational culture in following six concerns and fifteen dimensions (called comprehensive framework by Uday Pareek, 2002)
Table 3.3
Dimensions of Organizational Culture, U. Pareek, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERNS</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS OF CULTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Relationship with nature</td>
<td>1. Internality (vs. externality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Orientation to the context</td>
<td>2. Ambiguity tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Time orientation</td>
<td>3. Contextualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Orientation to the collectivities</td>
<td>4. Temporality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Orientation to Sex differences</td>
<td>5. Collectivism (vs. individualism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Orientation to Power</td>
<td>6. Particularism (vs. universalism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Narcissism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Role-boundedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Other directedness (vs. inner-directedness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Androgyny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Power distance tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Conserving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Expanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six Concerns of Human Beings

1. Relationship with Nature
Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1981) have suggested this dimension. In the relationship either of the two may be regarded as dominating. If nature is seen as powerful and dominating and individuals as helpless, a fatalistic orientation may result, taking nature for granted. The opposite orientation, scientism, may result from the belief that man can manipulate and change nature. The concept of locus of control (Rotter, 1966) is relevant here.

2. Orientation to the Environment (Context)
The environment may be seen as structured and unchanging, resulting in a sense of satisfaction. Any ambiguity in the environment may therefore be disturbing. On the other hand, people may like and enjoy ambiguity. This dimension of 'ambiguity tolerance' (Adorno and Frankel-Brinlswich, 1983) or uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980) is a useful one. Another dimension may relate to the importance given to a context to understand the meaning of some phenomena, or the ignoring of the context in search of clear universal meanings. The term high context and low context cultures have been proposed (Hall, 1977). In high context cultures, events can be understood only in their contexts, meanings and categories can change and casualty cannot be unambiguously established. Such cultures are context sensitive.
3. **Time Orientation**  
Kluckhohn and Srodtbeck (1961) have proposed this dimension with an orientation to past, present and future. Time may also be seen as a collection of discrete units, or as flowing phenomenon.

4. **Orientation to Collectivities**  
The relationship between individuals and the collectivities to which they belong can be seen in dimensions: primacy and identity. What is primacy? Individuals or society? Self interest or larger interest (including self interest)? Own discretion or norms of the collectivity?

If the individual is seen as more important than and independent of the collectivities, an orientation of individualism may result. If collectivity is seen as primary, subordinating individuals, the orientation of collectivism may result. Hofstede (1980) has used this dimension in his study of cultures. Collectivities may be defined by their identities, and persons belonging to them may have stronger identification with them. This may be called as particularistic orientation, contrasted with universalistic orientation (Pareek) in which the individuals do not have strong ingroup versus out-group feelings.

Another dimension may relate to the use of norms in a collectivity. If norms are determined by the collectivity, and individuals feel obliged to follow these norms in deciding whether their behaviour is right or wrong, we have an other-directed orientation. If individuals evolve their own norms, and judge their actions against these norms, we have inner directed orientation.

5. **Orientation to sex differences**  
If the biological differences between men and women are over-emphasised, and social roles are divided according to gender, what has been termed as masculinity may result. If the differences are not over-emphasised in social allocation of role, we may have an orientation of femininity. Hofstede (1980) studied this dimension and called it masculinity and femininity. Androgyny may be a better term for integration of characteristics usually attributed to the two sexes. (Pareek, 1998)

Hofstede used the terms masculinity and femininity to refer to the dominant gender role patterns in the vast majority of societies, the patterns of male assertiveness and female nurturance. So a masculine culture will be one where the values like assertiveness, competitiveness, aggression etc. will be emphasized and encouraged. And in a feminine culture, values like nurturing, kindness, empathy, trust etc are considered desirable.

6. **Orientation to Power**  
In a collectivity, power is not distributed equally. However, in some collectivities there may be uneasiness about unequal distribution of power, associated with attempts to redistribute it. Other collectivities may tolerate the differences in power. Hofstede (1980) calls this power distance. The other aspect of power is the combination of the source and target of power resulting in four types of cultures. In
the expressive culture, emotional, verbal and artistic expressions are profound. There is also a variety of dishes and drinks. In the conserving culture there is an emphasis on long and sustained training, conserving traditions, cultivating arts and learning that require long training and perseverance. In the assertive culture there is an emphasis on accomplishing things through the use of talents, high competition and creation of wealth. The expanding culture emphasizes building of organizations and institutions to sustain and increase growth.

Dimensions of Culture:

1. **Locus of Control (Internality vs. externality)**
   If most members in an organization feel helpless in relation to nature and perceive nature as dominating and beyond human manipulation, an orientation of fatalism or external locus of control may develop. In contrast the orientation of scientism holds that nature can be changed and adapted for better use of human society. This can also be called internality (internal locus of control).

2. **Ambiguity Tolerance**
   This aspect was first studied by Adorno et al. (1950), and later used by Hofstede (1980), who calls it uncertainty avoidance. If members of an organization feel uncomfortable with ambiguity and try to structure situations to avoid it, their tolerance for ambiguity is low, or their uncertainty avoidance is high. Under ambiguity tolerance, situations that are unstructured, vague and unpredictable provide opportunities for using multiple approaches. Detailed and rigid structures, procedures and uniform behaviour and also beliefs in absolute truths, can help in avoiding ambiguity. Some characteristic beliefs of this cultural dimension are:
   - Several truths may co-exist, without causing disruptive conflicts. People not only tolerate but find the various truths mutually enriching.
   - Deviant behaviour and ideas are tolerated. These are seen as sources of creativity.
   - Time is seen and treated as cyclic, not deserving undue importance. Cultures with low ambiguity tolerance overstructure time.
   - Rituals create order in as society or organization.

3. **Contextualism**
   In a high-context culture, the meaning of events, phenomena and behaviour are interpreted in the context in which they occur. One behaviour may be right in one context, and not in another. The apparent contradictions in behaviour arise out of the different contexts. In lo-context culture, all events and behaviour are judged uniformly, by one standard, and there is an attempt to evolve universal rules or explanations.

4. **Temporality**
   Cultures may differ in their orientation to time. Past-oriented cultures think and indulge in events of the past (usually glory) and are oblivious of present demands and future possibilities and problems. Present orientation or temporality is reflected in the importance given by members of a culture to the present. Such people are involved in
immediate tasks. However, they may not ensure the endurance and continuity of these tasks. They live in discrete time periods, without strong links with the past or future. In such cultures where attention is paid to immediate tasks and groups, there is a tendency to switch from one to another.

5. Collectivism vs. Individualism
According to Hofstede (1985), individualism stands for a preference for a loosely knit social framework in society wherein individuals are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate families only. Its opposite, collectivism, stands for a preference for a tightly knit social framework in which individuals can expect their relatives, clan or other in-group to look after them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. The fundamental issues addressed by this dimension is the degree of interdependence a society/organization maintains among individuals.

In a collectivist culture, a person belongs to one or more cohesive collectivities, and is obliged to serve them, as much as the collectivities are obliged to protect the interests of its members. The following beliefs and behaviour characterize collectivism:

- Relations are moral and not contractual. In individualistic cultures, relations are treated more as contracts for a particular purpose. In collectivist cultures, mutual obligations between the individual member and the collectivities are sacred, and have moral undertones; neither can get out of this mutuality.
- Individuals have strong obligations towards their collectivities. This is a part of the moral nature of the relationship. Loyalty to the group is important in such cultures.
- Relationships take precedence over tasks. In a collectivist culture, maintaining relationships and fulfilling personal and communal obligations are more important than completing tasks.
- Harmony in a group must be preserved. Maintaining harmony is highly valued in a collectivist culture. This would mean not confronting a person and avoiding conflicts.
- Opinions are predetermined by the collectivity. In a collectivist culture, in most cases, individual opinions are influenced by the decision of a collectivity.
- Some tasks are accepted as collective tasks.

6. Narcissism
In a narcissistic culture, individuals are concerned about themselves — as individuals, families or groups. This is characterized by self-seeking behaviour, and concern is narrow (self).

7. Particularism vs. Universalism
In an organization, there are several groups whose identities are formed on some basis, ethnic, religious, caste, function etc. If such group have strong identities resulting in an in group / out-group feeling, we may have an orientation which is particularistic. This is the opposite of the universalist orientation in which the groups do not have insular and strong identities. In a particularistic culture, there is a tendency to classify persons as belonging one’s in-group or belonging to an out-group. Sinha (1980) has studied this dimension in
the Indian context. In a particularistic culture, an individual feels secure in his own in-group and tends to make the in-group stronger in comparison with out-groups.

8. **Role Boundedness**

In some cultures, the role taken by an individual may be seen as primary, and the individual may be bound by it. The individual is prepared to undergo inconvenience, and may even sacrifice his personal freedom and comforts in order to fulfill his role obligation (as a father, son, executive etc.)

9. **Other directedness vs. inner directedness**

Cultures and individuals differ on a scale which has two opposite poles. They could be inner-directed (behaviour is directed by internal standards), or other-directed (behaviour is directed by standards or opinions set by others). In an other-directed culture, a person is guided by the accepted standards of conduct of an organization, and saving face in the organization is critical. Often a contrast is made between guilt cultures and shame cultures. In the former, inner worth and sin are said to guide behaviour, while in the latter, honour and reputation are critical (Piers and Singer, 1953). Geertz (1973) suggests that shame cultures could be characterized by "stage-fright- usually a mild, though in some situations virtually paralyzing, nervousness before the prospect (and the fact) of social interaction, a chronic, mostly low-grade, worry that one will not be able to being it off with required fitness".

The following values/beliefs characterize other-directedness:

- Loss of face is very painful to individuals. Individuals do not like to be seen violating norms that are obligatory in a society. If some one points out such an instance in front of others, the concerned person feels he has lost his self respect. Generally confrontation is avoided for fear of losing face.
- Conflict must be resolved without loss of face for either party. Since loss of face is so critical to individuals, attempt is made not to create situations in which either of the parties loses face. Conflict situations have the potential for loss of face by one party. In an other-directed culture, conflict management strategies are dominated by considerations of saving face for all the parties involved in the conflict.
- Indirect communication is better than direct communication.
- Pleasant and pleasing behaviour towards seniors is more desirable than telling the truth, which may be unpleasant.

10. **Androgyny**

Societies have attributed different qualities to the two sexes. Men are attributed toughness, competition, aggression, perseverance, achievement, assertiveness. Women are seen as having qualities like compassion, empathy, harmony, collaboration, nurturance, a sense of aesthetics, creativity. If a society emphasizes the differences between sex roles, and allocates social roles according to such differences, it would expect men to work in areas of achievement and physical activities and women to work in areas requiring female virtues. In such a society, competitive-aggressive characteristics are valued and such a culture is termed as masculine Hofstede, 1980). In contrast, if there
is less differentiation between sex roles, and social roles are not allocated according to sex difference, and both the qualities that are attributed to men and women are valued and integrated, the cultural orientation ‘feminism’ (Hofsted, 1980) or Androgyny (Pareek, 1998) develops. But it is not really the sex differences that characterize a culture as such, rather the supposed qualities associated with the two sexes. So to generalize, masculine cultures are characterized by a predominant emphasis on and valuation of aggressiveness, toughness, competitiveness etc., whereas a feminism or androgyny culture values the so called women values like interpersonal trust, harmony, friendship, compassion etc.

11. **Power distance tolerance**

Hofstede (1980) defined this dimension as, “the extent to which the members of a society accept that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally. People in large power distance societies accept a hierarchical order in which everybody has a place which needs no further justification. People in small power distance societies strive for power equalization and demand justification for power inequalisation. The fundamental issue addressed by this dimension is how a society handles inequalities among people when they occur.

The following characteristics define a high power distance culture:

- Senior persons look after the interests of juniors, develop and guide them. Senior persons take the nurturing role.
- People respect and learn from elders. In a society with tolerance for power, younger people are not given respect because of their age.
- Hierarchical relations are seen as necessary, and useful to maintain order in an organization.
- Persons in power are regarded as knowledgeable and capable of protecting the interests of their members.
- Leaders are faithfully followed. Their wisdom is not questioned. In a society with low tolerance for power distance, leaders are questioned, and there is a critical attitude towards their behaviour.
- Procedures and systems laid down by seniors are faithfully followed. The cultures are usually ritualistic, following traditions more faithfully.
- It is believed that higher status in the hierarchy can be obtained with the help of elders. As a result, ascribed status is emphasized in comparison to acquired status by one’s own efforts. Manual work has low value, and is usually allotted to persons in the lower strata of the organization.

12. **Expressive**

Learning from other sources is highly valued. There is emphasis on verbal expression and aesthetics (drama, poetry, music etc.), and there is high verbal activity (talking, debating, eating, smoking and drinking)

13. **Conserving**

The emphasis is on conservation of traditions, discipline and conformity are stressed, frugality is valued and practiced. There is an emphasis on learning classical arts (requiring perseverance and long training)
14. **Assertive culture**

Emphasis is given to competition and achieving results. Assertive cultures are more vigorous exhibitionist — showing their affluence without inhibition. The emphasis is on creation of wealth and fighting for one's place in a large entity.

15. **Expanding**

Emphasises on creation of organizations and institutions to consolidate and sustain gains and achievements in the culture. Large and varied organizational forms develop. There is trend toward building empires, expanding influence through building organizations.

Since organizational culture is often expressed in terms of the dominant values, there have been many attempts to measure it through measuring the dominant values. Characterizing an organization's culture in terms of its central values requires identifying the range of relevant values and then assessing how strongly held and widely shared they are (e.g., Saffold, 1988). In a sample of U.S. firms, O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) identified the following seven dimensions of organizational culture using an instrument they developed, the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP):

1. Innovation,
2. Stability,
3. Respect for people,
4. Outcome orientation,
5. Detail orientation,
6. Team orientation,
7. Aggressiveness.

The same seven dimensions have been found to characterize firms across various industries (Chatman and Jehn, 1994) and also among a sample of international firms (Hofstede et al., 1990). The OCP dimensions also resemble the types of cultural knowledge that Sackmann (1992) found to exist across a single organization. Further, the OCP value dimensions resemble the values in Cameron and Freeman's (1991) model of organizational culture types. Since the existence of seven dimensions within and across industries has been confirmed in several situations, this study views organizational culture as characterized by the seven dimensions identified in OCP.

As we observed, many of the dimensions of organizational culture are same as those used for national culture. It is sometime obvious because, national culture is the broad contour within which the organizational culture develops. But the real problem lies with the lack of an universally agreed list of dimensions of culture. So in the present study, we will use the comprehensive dimension of Uday Pareek (1998) which includes all major classifications.
3.1.10 Cultures and Subcultures

Cultures arise within organizations based on their own histories and experiences. Starting with the founders, those members of an organization who have shared in its successful growth have developed assumptions about the world and how to succeed in it, and have taught those assumptions to new members of the organization. Thus, for instance Reliance, Tata, Birlas, and any other company that has had several decades of success, will have an organizational culture that drives how its members think, feel, and act. Shared assumptions also typically form around the functional units of the organization. They are often based on members' similar educational backgrounds or similar organizational experiences. It is well known and well documented that getting cross-functional project teams to work well together is difficult because the members bring their functional cultures into the project and, as a consequence, have difficulty communicating with each other, reaching consensus, and implementing decisions effectively. The difficulty of communication across these boundaries arises not only from the fact that the functional groups have different goals, but also from the more fundamental issue that the very meaning of the words they use will differ. The word "marketing" will mean product development to the engineer, studying customers through market research to the product manager, merchandising to the salesperson, and constant change in design to the manufacturing manager. When they try to work together, they will often attribute disagreement to personalities and fail to notice the deeper, shared assumptions that color how each function thinks. Another kind of subculture, less often acknowledged, reflects the common experiences of given levels within a hierarchy. Culture arises through shared experiences of success. If first-line supervisors discover ways of managing their subordinates that are consistently successful, they gradually build up shared assumptions about how to do their job that can be thought of as the "culture of first-line supervision". In the same way, middle management and higher levels will develop their own shared assumptions and, at each level, will teach those assumptions to newcomers as they get promoted. These hierarchically based cultures create the communication problems associated with "selling senior management on a new way of doing things," or "getting budget approval for a new piece of equipment," or "getting a personnel requisition through". As each cultural boundary is crossed, the proposal has to be put into the appropriate language for the next higher level and has to reflect the values and assumptions of that level. Or, from the viewpoint of the higher levels, decisions have to be put into a form that lower levels can understand, often resulting in "translations" that actually distort and sometimes even subvert what the higher levels wanted.

"Occupational communities" also generate cultures that cut across organizations. For example, fishermen around the world develop similar world views, as do miners, as do the members of a particular industry based on a particular technology. In these cases, the shared assumptions derive from a common educational background, the requirements of a given occupation such as the licenses that have to be obtained to practice, and the shared contact with others in the occupation. The various functional cultures in organizations are, in fact, partly the result of membership in broader cross-organizational occupational communities. Salespeople the world over, accountants, assembly line workers, and engineers share some tacit assumptions about the nature of their work regardless of who their particular employer is at any given time.
Classical organization theory provides several related approaches to organizations as coalitional entities which would appear to imply the existence of multiple, competing group cultures. March and Simon (1958), as well as Cyert and March (1963), have portrayed organizations as political entities, in that various groups or coalitions lobby for the organization's attention to their own vested interests and particular goals. March and Simon (1958) have further suggested that inter-group conflict may result from a "difference in goals or a difference in perceptions of reality". According to Van Maanen and Barley (1985), "even in the more pragmatic and managerially focused writings of Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), cultural understandings such as performance time-frames and forms of social relations among organizational units were seen to contrast both empirically and normatively". Pennings and Goodman (1979) have described organizations in the following manner: "Organizations are also seen as comprising internal interest groups, or constituencies, which make claims on the organization. An organizational constituency is any group within an organization whose members have identifiable common interests that they try to promote. Such a constituency can be delineated by departmental or hierarchical boundaries or, more generally, by clusters of members that share distinct values and interests." Clearly, if groups have different goals and interpretative systems, it seems highly unlikely that they will all develop the same set of understandings and assumptions which can then be described as the organizational culture. Tushman (1977) suggests the following:

"To understand organizational behavior, the unit of analysis must be the basic subunits which make up an organization. Following the systems framework, organizational behavior can be seen as a result of interactions among subunits within the organization."

Van Maanen and Barley (1985) have focused on subcultures and their formation within organizations. They have defined "an organizational subculture as a subset of an organization's members who interact regularly with one another, identify themselves as a distinct group within the organization, share a set of problems commonly defined to be problems of all, and routinely take action on the basis of collective understandings unique to the group" (Van Maanen and Barley, 1985) They maintain that there are multiple subcultures within organizations, each with its own agenda and perspective. Gregory (1983) has also recognized the existence of multiple group cultures within organizations. In fact, she suggests "that many organizations are most accurately viewed as multicultural (Gregory, 1983). Her position can be clarified further by the following statement:

Subgroups with different occupational, divisional, ethnic, or other cultures approach organizational interactions with their own meanings and senses of priorities. Ethnocentrism, the tendency to take for granted one's own cultural views and to evaluate others' behavior in terms of it, increases the tendency for misunderstandings and conflicts to occur (Gregory, 1983)

Clearly, this perspective differs substantially from the popular view of organizational culture as a monolithic and integrative phenomenon. In sum, there is limited research in the organizational culture area which focuses on the group or subunit as a carrier and possible creator of culture. Thus, by viewing organizational culture as a unitary attribute, it appears we have been "bartering away other conceptual opportunities" (Gregory, 1983). This is not to
imply that the monolithic and integrative conceptualization of organizational culture is inherently wrong, but it seems to present a rather limited and simplified version of the dynamics and attributes of culture. It has been suggested here that the concept of organizational culture can be (and should be) dismantled to reflect the underlying group cultures, and that our understanding of organizational culture in its current, unitary sense may be enhanced by paying attention to its multiple group cultural components. It is not enough to conceptualize organizational culture solely from a monolithic and unitary perspective. We must take into account the underlying group cultures which may contribute to the creation of the organizational culture through their own interactive processes.

Coopey (1994) refers to a survey carried out in 1988 by Jowell and Topf:

"A large discrepancy was reported between how people thought a large company would choose to use its profits and how they, themselves, thought profits should be used. Investment, workforce benefits and customer benefits were perceived to lose out significantly compared to shareholders' dividends and bonuses to top management. Such perceptions are likely to hinder trust-building which leaders must, in theory, achieve in order to enhance commitment. Given the scandals which have broken over British business since the survey was published, and recent confirmation of widening earnings differentials, it is unlikely that current public opinion would differ from that reported in 1988".

Humble, Jackson and Thomson's (1994) survey also found that, faced with a conflict between corporate values and "short term commercial gain (especially in a recession)" opinions were evenly divided about which would take priority. In organisations without written value statements commercial gain was the clear winner.

These discrepancies underline the fact that "Organizations are not one homogenous culture, but are 'multi-cultural', and culture can be a source of conflict" (Meek, 1988). This is to be expected, given that, as Hofstede (1991) points out "As almost everyone belongs to a number of different groups and categories of people at the same time, people unavoidably carry several layers of mental programming within themselves, corresponding to different levels of culture".

Hofstede lists number of such groupings, including national; regional; ethnic; religious; linguistic; gender; generation; social class and, for employed people, organizational or corporate levels. Morgan (1986) points out that "foremost among all organizational countercultures, of course, are those fostered by trade unions" although Guest et al (1996), in a survey of 1,000 people working in organizations employing twenty five or more people, found that "only 20% of union members feel a lot of loyalty to their union while 38% feel a lot of loyalty to their employer and 73% feel a lot of loyalty to their fellow workers.

Smircich (1983) complains that this complexity is given insufficient attention: "much of the literature refers to an organization culture, appearing to lose sight of the great likelihood that there are multiple organization subcultures, or even countercultures, competing to define the nature of situations within organizational boundaries."
3.1.11 National Culture

Hofstede’s research was into the national differences detectable between managers doing similar jobs in multinational corporations in various countries. He is concerned that

"...using the word 'culture' for both nations and organization suggests that the two kinds of culture are identical phenomena. This is incorrect: a nation is not an organization, and the two types of 'culture' are of a different nature."

"Organizational 'cultures' are a phenomenon per se, different in many respects from national cultures. An organization is a social system of a different nature than a nation; if only because the organization's members usually had a certain influence in their decision to join it, are only involved in it during working hours, and may one day leave it again."

Culture (national culture) consists in patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values. Hofstede defines national culture as “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another”. Culture manifests at various levels, values, rituals, heroes and symbols. Rituals, Heroes and Symbols are together known as practices. Symbols are words, gestures, pictures, dress, hairstyles, and objects etc. that carry often complex meanings recognized as such only by those who share the culture. These are most superficial and easily discernible part of a culture. Heroes are persons, alive or dead, real or imaginary, who possess characteristics that are highly prized in a culture and thus serve as models for behaviour. Rituals are collective activities that are technically unnecessary to the achievement of desired ends but that within a culture are considered socially essential, keeping the individual bound within the norms of the collectivity. In India, breaking coconut before starting any construction work is an example of a ritual.

National cultures are stable and self sustaining. Hofstede (1995) proposes a system for explaining how cultures maintain this stability.

The model Fig. 3.6 of Hofstede implies that cultural differences could not be understood without the study of History. Culture as mental programming is also the crystallization of history in the minds, hearts, and hands of present generation. Changes are supposed to come mainly from the outside, through forces of nature or forces of human beings. Norms change rarely through direct adoption of outside values; rather, changes occur through shifts in ecological conditions – technological, economical and hygienic.
Comparing Cultures:
Hofstede proposes five dimensions of national culture on which they can be compared with each other. These dimensions, when expressed in quantitative terms, combine in various proportions to give unique cultures of nations/regions.

The dimensions are:

1. Power distance: related to the different solutions to the basic problem of human inequality.
2. Uncertainty avoidance: related to the level of stress in a society in the face of an unknown future.
3. individualism vs. collectivism: related to the integration of individuals into primary groups.
4. masculinity vs. feminism: related to the division of emotional roles between men and women.
5. long term vs. short term orientation: related to the choice of focus for people’s efforts: the future or present.

The most common dimension used for ordering societies is their degree of economic evolution or modernity.

Naroll (1970) (cited by Hofstede, 1995) listed following characteristics on basis of which national cultures can be compared with each other.

- The command of the environment from weak to strong
- Occupational specialization from generalists to specialists
- Organizations from simple to complex
- Population pattern from rural to urban
- Distribution of goods from wealth sharing to wealth hoarding
- Leadership from consensual to authoritative.
- Behavior of elites from responsible to exploitative
- The functions of war from vengeance to political.

U.S. anthropologist Driver (1973) added to this list increases in population density, gross national or tribal product, knowledge, and the number of words in the language. Parsons and Shils have offered one multidimensional classification of culture, though the same can be applicable to individuals and groups or organizations also.

1. Affectivity (need gratification) versus affective neutrality (restraint of impulses)
2. Self-orientation versus collectivity orientation.
3. Universalism (applying general standards) versus Particularism (taking particular relationships into account)
4. Ascription (judging others by who they are) versus achievement (judging others by what they do)
5. Specificity (limiting relations to others to specific spheres) versus diffuseness (no prior limitations to nature of relations)

Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck (1981) have given following dimensions of culture on the basis of a field study in five graphically close, small communities in the south west U.S.

1. An evaluation of human nature (evil/mixed/good)
2. The relationship of man to the surrounding natural environment (subjugation/harmony/mastery)
3. The orientation in time (toward past/present/future)
4. The orientation towards activity (being/being in becoming/doing)
5. Relationships among people (linearity i.e. hierarchical positions/collaterally i.e. group relationships/individualism)
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Inkeles and Levison (1954), gave almost a similar list of cultural dimensions to that of Hofstede (1980).

Their dimensions are:

1. Relation to authority (power distance of Hofstede)
2. Conception of self, including the individual's concepts of masculinity and femininity. (Individualism and masculinity of Hofstede)
3. Primary dilemmas or conflicts and ways of dealing with them, including the control of aggression and the expression versus inhibition effect. (Uncertainty avoidance of Hofstede)

Kohls (1981) listed the differences between Western and non-Western cultures that can be used to clarify the impact of diverse value approaches on the motivation and training aspects of the management of international projects.

Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Cultural Values</th>
<th>Non-Western Cultural Values</th>
<th>Impact on Project Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Collectivism/Group</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Modesty</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality/Egalitarianism</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning</td>
<td>Collaboration/Harmony</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt (internal self-control)</td>
<td>Shame (external control)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Saving face</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for results</td>
<td>Respect for status/Ascription</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for competence</td>
<td>Respect for elders</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time is money</td>
<td>Time is life</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Doing</td>
<td>Being/Acceptance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic/Mechanic</td>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Relationship/Loyalty</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directness/Assertiveness</td>
<td>Indirectness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future/Change</td>
<td>Past/Tradition</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Fate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific/Linear</td>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(+ = Positive impact of combining both values on outcomes  (-) = Negative impact of combining both values on outcomes  (X) = No direct impact on outcomes (culture clash))

Adapted from Kohls (1981); Marquardt and Kearsley (1999)
Culture Maps:

Culture Maps are brief sketches of the customs of various countries related to their business practices and social interaction. Each includes cross-cultural comparisons on Hofstede's dimensions of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity, and language contextualism. They are not intended to be inclusive stereotypes, rather they are intended to help the student of international studies become more aware of the dimensions along which cultures differ. It is important to remember that all cultures have great variability within them, perhaps even more than the differences between them.

Followings are the few countries described in terms of the few of the above mentioned cultural dimensions.

(Source: http://faculty.css.edu/dswenson/web/CULTURE/CULTMAPS.HTM)

BRAZIL


Social Customs
Greetings are expressive and may involve hand shaking, embracing (embrazo), and kissing the air next to the cheeks. When leaving a group, take hands with everyone. A despechante (well-connected "facilitator") is usually needed to make things happen in business. Time is flexible and appointments may be late by as much as 15 minutes. Long relationships and commitments are preferred in Brazil. Relate to Latins personally in terms of himself, his family, town, country, and pride. The future is indefinite, and promises may be made to keep you happy although they cannot be kept. Machismo ("maleness") is translated into business with forcefulness, confidence, and enthusiasm. Risk taking is evident in speculation and gambling. The authority of status is expressed in the patron who makes decisions and must be consulted. Gifts are appropriate after a relationship has been formed. They should not be given during business, but after negotiations and preferably during the long lunch. Logo gifts from your company are appropriate. Avoid 13 of anything, black or purple (Lent related), knives (symbolizing a severed relationship), and handkerchiefs (related to tears). Thank you notes are also an important follow up. Topics of conversation include comments on their children, good jokes (avoid ethnic humor), and sports. Topics to avoid include politics, religion, and Argentina. The gesture of holding the ear between the forefinger and thumb indicates appreciation. The "chin flick" (fingers flicking off the chin) means "I don't know." The "OK" sign is obscene. Snapping the fingers means that something was done long ago or for a long time. The "fig" (thumb between index and middle fingers) and vertical horns (index and little finger extended) are symbols of good luck.

CHINA

Cultural Comparisons: (Not available for People's Republic. Those reported are for Taiwan/Hong Kong). Power distance=58/68 (US=40) Uncertainty avoidance=69/29 (US=46) Individualism=17/25 (US=91) Masculinity=45/57 (USA=62) Context=high/high (US=low)

Social Customs
At formal occasions, Chinese line up according to seniority, the seniors greeting first. Even when using interpreters, look at and address the senior person. Traditional greetings include a bow to show respect, and more recently, a handshake in formal situations. A common greeting is Ni hao ma? (how are you), or more informally, Chi le ma? (did you eat?). The response to the latter may be Mei yoh (not yet), or Chi le (have eaten). Full titles are usually used in introductions for guests. Chinese names have the family name first, usually followed by one or two given names. Xian Sheng (Mr.) is used with the family name, but between very good friends Lao (old) and Xiao (young) might be used. While formal occasions require announcement, informal and spontaneous visits are acceptable. Quiet, reserved, and polite speech is considered good conduct. Gifts such as chocolate, fruit, or wine are common among friends, but they are seldom opened until after the guests leave. Refreshments should be declined several times before accepting them.
Social activities often include cards, table games, Chinese chess, Mahjongg, tai chi (shadow boxing exercise) or discussion. Movies, theater, opera, ballets, gymnastics, and cultural monuments are also popular, during which there may be much discussion.

Topics often include personal experiences, travel, family, or business. Controversial topics such as politics, comparative wealth, Taiwan, recent history, the Cultural Revolution, sexuality, and criticism of the government and derogatory remarks in general are usually unacceptable.

Touching is generally not preferred in social contacts, especially pats on the back. Open hand is used to point, rather than a finger, and beckoning is done by waving the fingers with the palm down. Hugs, kisses, flirting, or holding hands is socially unacceptable. Although spitting has recently become recognized as a health problem, the habit continues widely in public. In contrast, tooth picking is politely covered with the hand.

Silverware is still uncommon in China, and most food is eaten with spoon or chopsticks. Small bowls may have several ingredients placed in them and then held close to the mouth for eating. At banquets there may be several toasts by the host and several courses of food. Tipping is considered an insult, although in some more cosmopolitan areas (e.g., Shanghai) it is becoming more acceptable.

FRANCE

Cultural Comparisons

Social Customs
On greeting the handshake is light and quick. Social status is important, and is reflected in educational level, house style, knowledge of literature and arts, and heritage.

Avoid topics of conversation that include personal questions (business and family are separated), politics, and money. The French may engage in animated criticism or arguments about their institutions, conditions, or people they are close to, but view it as a stimulating discussion. Humor is often used, sometimes combined with cynicism. They are not easily impressed, may be more interested in people who disagree with them, and do not need to be liked to engage others. Flair and style of logical presentation may be more important than the details. They prefer tact and subtlety over facts and directness.

Conflict is considered unavoidable, sometimes even enjoyable, and a source of respect to those who manage it well in business. They may also entertain apparent contradictions and inconsistencies. Trust is gained in relationships based on personality, achievements, others' recognition, and status.

Appointments, dates, schedules and deadlines may be changed as conditions change. Many activities may be occurring at once and there may be frequent interruptions. Long term planning is also difficult. Communication is often intense and animated, with strong, rapid gestures and close personal space. Snapping the fingers of both hands and slapping the open palm over a closed fist are both considered obscene.

GERMANY

Cultural Comparisons

Social Customs
Firm handshakes are customary for greetings (Guten Tag --* good day*) and leavings, with the woman or senior person offering first. Appointments and punctuality are essential, although in East Germany there are no appointments on Wednesdays. Polite forms of speech should be used (e.g., Herr or Frau), as well as titles. Third party introductions are also preferred.

Germans are often characterized as industrious, reserved, meticulous, and precise. They are exacting, organized, and efficient and dislike indecision or changed schedules. They expect decisiveness and preparation, even regarding dinner arrangements. Loud or pushy behavior is viewed as a weakness of the person or company.

Business and private life are compartmentalized, and personal affairs should be avoided in discussion. They make clear distinctions between acquaintances and friends, and they are often careful not to imply premature intimacy by using first names, appearing relaxed, or smiling with acquaintances or employees. Never borrow without permission, and generally avoid it since it also implies familiarity and poor preparedness. When friendships occur, they are considered much deeper than those in America.

Acceptable conversational topics may be controversial and range from religion and politics, to sexual freedom and nuclear energy.

Business presentations should provide excessive technical facts and details, exacting organization, specific meanings, and preferably be in German. The main point of business presentations may not be until the end. The business leader should be self controlled, extremely patient, and use a forceful voice.

Legs can be crossed at the knee, but not ankle on knee, and shoe should not face another person. Postures are generally erect and gestures are disciplined. Legs should not be propped on furniture, gum should not be chewed in public, and jewelry and cosmetics should be used sparingly. The gesture for luck is placing the thumb between index and middle fingers (an obscene gesture in several countries).
INDIA
Cultural Comparisons
Social Customs
The cultural varieties of India are difficult to clearly characterize, due to innumerable ethnic groups, 14 major languages, and more than 200 minor languages! The traditional greeting is a slight bow (to superiors and for respect) with the palms together while saying namaste (namaskaran in Southern India). With Westerners, handshaking is common. Informally, "hello" is also understood and accepted. Women's privacy is important, and they are not usually touched nor shake hands. With Muslims, the right hand is used for the salaam gesture for greeting and leaving. People are typically addressed using their titles including Shri (Mr.), Shreemati (Mrs.), Kumari (Miss), or the suffix ji to show respect. Invitations are evaded rather than directly declined. Rather than say "no," one should say "I'll try" to attend an occasion. Guests may receive flower garlands which they should carry in the hand as a gesture of humility. Gifts are often given to the host for the hospitality and commonly include special foods or items for children. After a few introductions, you may continue introducing yourself to other guests. Women are not often included in social activities or discussions as in the United States. However, foreign (American) business women may be extended greater courtesies. Acceptable discussion topics include education, families, food, Indian cinema, points of interest, and scenic beauty. Avoid topics of Pakistan, poverty, income, sex, religious strife, and negative stereotypes (e.g., snake charming and wife burning). In Southern India, "I understand" or "yes" is indicated by rapidly moving the head side to side. While courtesy is important, Americans tend to overuse "please" and "thank you." Be cautious of praising the children (unless a well educated family) since some believe it may draw the attention of the "evil eye." Also, don't pat children on the head. Beckoning is done with the of the palm turned down. Pointing is done with the chin or whole hand rather than the fingers. Whistling and winking is considered impolite, and to touch another with your shoes or feet requires an immediate apology. Pulling at your ear is a gesture of sincerity, remorse, or honesty. During meals, the right hand is used for eating, and handling dishes, rather than using utensils. Women eat only after the men, elders, and young children have eaten. Waiters may be called by snapping fingers or hissing for attention. In the North, getting food beyond the second knuckle of the right hand is considered impolite. Finishing eating is often indicated with the nemaste gesture, and guests should leave about a half hour after the meal. State that the meal was enjoyable and delicious rather than thanking the host (which may be interpreted as 'payment').

JAPAN
Cultural Comparisons
Social Customs
The traditional greeting is with a bow (ojigi) rather than handshake, lower bows indicating respect and humility. Formality is the norm, and with the exception of family and close friends, the family name is used with the suffix "san" (e.g., Matsushita san). Never attach san to your own name (it would be honoring yourself). Business cards are offered with the greeting, and are exchanged using both hands. Take a few seconds to carefully read the card, then inhale audibly to show you are impressed. You should never run out of cards, and neither take a card from a wallet in your back pocket nor place one there. A third party typically introduces people, but the introducer thereby takes some responsibility for the future relationship. The type of greeting depends on the relationship: A superior might be greeted with "Ohayogozaimasu" (good morning), a customer with "Hajimemashite" (nice to meet you), and peer with "Konnichiwa" (hello). Appropriate conversational topics include baseball, golf, food, travel, Japanese culture, impressions of the uniqueness of Japan, Avoid topics such as trade issues, family matters (they are personal), WWII, land possessions, politics, religion, and Japan's minorities. Gifts for the host are common and are a sign of respect. Food and drink are more common, since the small Japanese homes would soon become cluttered with durable items. Other typical gifts include Native American art, belt buckles, T-shirts with logos, pens, and American liquor. Artful wrapping is a requirement, and they may not be unwrapped until after the guest leaves. Avoid expensive gifts (they have to reciprocate), flowers, or even numbers of items. Yawning and chewing gum in public is considered impolite, and a hand should cover the use of a toothpick. Never blow your nose at dinner or in front of someone, and do not return dirty tissues to your pocket. Sitting postures should be upright with feet on the floor or crossed at knee or ankle, but not ankle over knee. Beckoning is done with the fingers down (fingers up position is considered disrespectful). "No" is indicated by shaking the hand from side to side with the palm forward. 3-52
MEXICO
Cultural Comparisons

Social Customs
Greetings customarily include smiles, greetings, nod of the head and/or handshake. Close male friends may embrace; women embrace and kiss the cheek. Common greetings are Buenos dias! (Good morning), Como esta? (How are you?), and the casual Hola! (Hello).

Unannounced visits are common, and hospitality is welcomed and included refreshments (which would be rude to refuse). When eating, keep both hands above the table. Gifts are not customary in exchange for hospitality, but may be appreciated. Avoid flowers that are yellow (symbolic of death for some classes), red (cast spells), and white (cancel spells).

Appropriate conversational topics include art, parks, museums, fashion, travel, and weather. Avoid unpleasant topics such as the Mexican-American War and illegal aliens. Relationships are important and one may stop for a conversation even if it means being late for an appointment. The theme of death is common and celebrated, and may seem unusual to Americans.

Most business meetings occur during the two to three hour lunch break, but relationships are built before business begins. Respeto (respect) is important and may involve a mixture of fair play, democratic spirit, power pressure, and love-hate affections. Status is important (social, age, class), and you may be told what makes you happy rather than objective facts.

The gesture for “no” is shown by extending the index finger with palm outward and shaking the hand side to side. Items should not be tossed to a person, but handed. Sneezing is responded to by Salud! (Good health). Only an animal's height is shown using the whole hand; use the index finger.

NIGERIA
Cultural Comparisons (based on a composite of Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Zambia)

Social Customs
Due to the large number of ethnic groups, a variety of customs are found. The Hausa are devout Muslims, Yoruba are highly festive, and Ibo are enterprising. English is widely used, and people often cheerfully shake hands and greet with “hello.” Inquiries about family are common. During visits, refusal of refreshments may be offensive.

“Sir” or “Ma'am” are appropriate when speaking to business people, officials, or elders. Discussion topics include their industrial achievements and future plans, African politics, contributions to international organizations, and sports (especially soccer, boxing, and horse racing). Conversational topics to avoid include religion, the civil war, prior colonization. Terms that imply backwardness should be avoided (e.g., “tribe, jungle, hut, costume.”), since Nigerians are proud of their advancements.

Business is formal and conducted face to face (telephone or mail indicates low importance), though at a slow pace that requires patience. Openly checking on something may produce suspiciousness. Some Moslems may mistrust innovation, be risk avoidant, and prefer tradition and rote learning over experiments and problem solving. Dress, titles, and promises are all important. Age commands respect, and there are usually strong family loyalties. Hospitality is emphasized, and relationships are quick to develop. Friendships carry strong expectations of support during times of need.

Personal space is much closer than for Americans. The sole of the foot should not be pointed at a person. Objects are handled or passed with the right or both hands, but not the left (the “toilet hand”). Pushing the palm of the hand forward with fingers spread is considered an obscene gesture.

RUSSIA
Cultural comparisons (most measures not currently available) Context=low (US=low)
Social Customs
When greeting, Russians shake firmly, friends may kiss on the cheek, and say, Zdravstvuyte or privet (“hello”). Kak dela (“how are you?”) is taken literally, and may require a lengthy answer. English is widely spoken by most citizens under the age of 35, but efforts to speak Russian are appreciated.

Russians have three names: Their first name, patronymic (father’s first name), and last name. At a formal first meeting, use the first name and patronymic (e.g., Dmitri Pavlovich—“son of Pavel”). Formal meetings require prior appointments and punctuality. Arrangements for visa, meetings, contracts and the like must be negotiated through level of bureaucracy and may take weeks or months. Business cards should include mention of the university degree, be printed in Cyrillic, and handed out to everyone in the meeting (so not to overlook someone important).

Informal visiting is a favorite pastime and conversational topics might include sports, travel, music, fashion, books, and current events in the Russian Republic. Topics to avoid include negative aspects of history (e.g.,
Stalinism), personal and family problems, and the alcohol problem. Political views and contemporary problems used to be suppressed, but recently are common topics. Gifts might include flowers, liquor, artwork, book, quality pens, blue jeans, cigarettes, baseball caps, printed t-shirts, and country and western tapes. Though appreciated, thanks will be subdued.

In formal occasions, postures and expressions may appear stiff and unexpressive, but privately this may shift to warmth and hospitality. A very close personal space is preferred, and backing away may be interpreted as rejection. Dinners are long, elaborate, and include many toasts during and after the meal—sometimes requiring boarding. In order not to disturb kibun—or business will not continue. Relationships are vertical and one must know status and position in order to give proper recognition to others. Elders, for example, are given highest regard and courtesy (unlike the United States). If these social rules are violated and kibun is lost, you can become a “nonperson” who is unworthy of any consideration!

The host takes the role of servant to the guest; women are seldom included in business entertainment. Most entertaining is conducted at bars and restaurants. When eating, show appreciation by slurping soup or smacking your lips. A healthy belch is a sign of satisfaction. Laying the chopsticks or spoon on the bowl means you are resting; on the table signifies being done. To clean the plate implies the host did not have enough food and you may embarrass him. The host will encourage you eat more food, and a firm refusal is expected.

To Korean businessmen, flattery is a common strategy. They begin on the periphery of an issue and subtly and delicately narrow the focus (high context language). Direct discussion of a proposal is considered rude and will usually lead to failure. Impatience is considered a personal fault, and negotiators move with deliberation, dignity, studied motions, and perceptiveness. Extreme modesty is expected on the part of both parties, and modestly decline compliments. Some may even make disparaging remarks about family members. Western business persons are sometimes puzzling to Koreans who have trouble understanding how contracts can be made on the assumption that the future will be predictable and stable. Not so the Koreans! They gamble that conditions will remain stable, but if not—the agreement is no longer binding! Changes in the economy, political environment, and personal situations may justify invalidation of the contract without a sense of impropriety. A written contract may have little value also, though this is changing.

Good topics for conversation include Korea's cultural heritage, scenic beauty, sports (baseball and Olympics), and the host's company and children. Avoid conversation on such topics as domestic politics, unification with the North, socialism, Japan, trade issues, Communism, criticism of the government, and the host's wife. Show respect of elders ("filial piety"), listen carefully to what they have to say, and do not interrupt. Generally avoid loud conversation or loud laughing. Be careful not to insult others by making jokes at their expense.

Remember that "yes" does not mean agreement—it is similar to our saying, "I hear you," or "I understand." To say "no" is considered rude. A person may therefore say "yes" and not carry out an action or evident agreement. To preserve your good feelings, they may also tell you what they think you want to hear rather than admit they don't know something. Laughter may indicate amusement, but can also cover hurt, shock, or embarrassment.

Gift giving is done for strategic purposes in business: to establish obligation, gain advantage, or elicit responsiveness. Koreans are very skilled at forming relationships that create obligation, and that can be a problem for Westerners. Returning a gift is an affront, but perhaps better than not to fulfill an obligation.
3.1.12 Organizational Culture Vs National Culture

Hofstede says “Organization cultures should be distinguished from national cultures. National cultures distinguish similar people, institutions and organizations in different countries. Organizational cultures, the way I use the term, distinguish different organizations within the same country or countries. Cultures manifest themselves, from superficial to deep, in symbols, heroes, rituals and values. My research has shown that organizational cultures differ mainly at the levels of symbols, heroes and rituals, together labelled 'practices'; national cultures differ mostly at the deeper level, the level of values. As a consequence, the five dimensions of national cultures identified in my cross-national research, which are based on values, are not suitable for comparing organizations within the same country. National cultures belong to anthropology; organizational cultures to sociology.”

A separate research project into organizational culture differences, conducted by IRIC across 20 organizational units in Denmark and the Netherlands in the 1980s, identified six independent dimensions of practices: process-oriented versus results-oriented, job-oriented versus employee-oriented, professional versus parochial, open systems versus closed systems, tightly versus loosely controlled, and pragmatic versus normative. The position of an organization on these dimensions is partly determined by the business or industry the organization is in. Scores on the dimensions are also related to a number of other 'hard' characteristics of the organizations. These lead to conclusions about how organization cultures can be and cannot be managed.

Managing international business means handling both national and organization culture differences at the same time. Organization cultures are somewhat manageable while national cultures are given facts for management; common organization cultures across borders are what holds multinationals together.

As Geert Hofstede (1994) highlights, "Organization cultures should be distinguished from national cultures", when managers consider how culture affects their operation, they consider their knowledge of the local culture instead of the individual organization's culture. This can lead to inaccurate assumptions about their own culture and imposing the wrong set of rules (formal and informal).

Hofstede states that Organizational cultures are entirely distinct from national cultures, the two concepts are complementary. Organizational cultures distinguish organizations while holding their national environments constant; national cultures distinguish nations while holding organizational contexts constant. Organizational cultures are the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organization from another. Nations and organizations represent two different levels of aggregation. (Hofstede, 1994)

At the national level cultural differences reside mostly in values and less in practices. At the organizational level, cultural differences reside mostly in practices and less in values. Though, even Hofstede does not deny that, values may be different between two organizations within the same national culture.

Hofstede argues that using the same term, cultures, for both organizational culture and national culture can be misleading, since the two are phenomena of a different order. But peter and waterman in their “In Search of Excellence” insist that shared values represent the
core of organizational culture. But, in contrast, Hofstede considers the shared perceptions of daily practices as the core of organizational culture. He justifies his position by citing that employees’ values among organizations vary more according to such criteria as their nationality, age, and education, than according to their membership in the organization per se.

At the same time Hofstede accepts that national culture affects organizational culture in fundamental ways as far as cross cultural application of management theories are concerned:

"Generally accepted U.S. theories, such as those of Maslow, Herzberg, McClelland, Vroom, McGregor, Likert,......might not apply, or only very partially apply, outside the borders of their country of origin - assuming they did apply within those borders. After the discoveries that employees are human, and that managers are human, the time had come to see that management scientists, theorists, and writers are human too. They grew up in particular periods, and their ideas cannot but reflect the constraints of the environments they have known. The success of businesses in East Asian countries that very evidently did not follow most of the generally accepted U.S. theories made this conclusion inevitable."

Fig. 3.7
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The wider culture to which employees belong inevitably has an impact on organisational culture. "Managers do not perform their duties in a vacuum. Their work and the way it is done are governed, directed and tempered by a set of values, beliefs, customs and systems which they - or those above them - create and sustain. Organisations ... are societies in miniature. Therefore ... they can be expected to show evidence of their own cultural characteristics" (Burnes, 1992).

Hampden-Turner (1990) makes the distinction, and the association, plain: "It is important to distinguish between the culture inside the organisation and the broader culture of the nation, economic group or geographical region. We shall call the first corporate cultures and the second macro-cultures. To investigate corporate cultures, we need to look at how people in an organisation behave; what assumptions govern their behaviour; and what bonds or glue hold the corporation together. ... But we cannot ignore the macro-culture because ... corporate
cultures act out themes and patterns of the wider culture. Corporate cultures are specific episodes of more general national and regional patterns."

The fact that the West and East—and more specifically, the United States and Japan—have vastly different cultural values is well-acknowledged. The U.S. is characterized by such values as assertiveness, decisiveness, innovativeness, and risk-taking which stem from its frontier-conquering history (Hall and Hall, 1990). The U.S. culture is also characterized by individualism—the belief in the power and autonomy of the individual (e.g., Goodman, 1981; Yeh, 1995) and emphasis on results and lack of flexibility. For instance, Easterners, particularly the Japanese, complain that Americans are too legalistic and less willing to be flexible (Thornton, 1993). The cultural value system in Japan, on the other hand, has been heavily influenced by Shinto, Buddhism, and Confucianism. As a result, the Japanese tend to emphasize the virtues of hard work and attention to detail (Rhody and Tang, 1995). Indeed, a detail orientation is a major factor that has attributed to the successes of prominent Japanese firms (Lazer, Murata, Kosaka, 1985; Song and Parry, 1997). Further, Japan has a consensus-bonded, group-oriented culture that emphasizes conflict avoidance, respect and concern for people, and the importance of close, long-lasting relationships with others (Sandelands, 1994). The culture focuses individual and corporate success criteria on harmony, uniformity, and subordination to the group (Hall and Hall, 1990). Thus, it is particularly important for Japanese employees to feel that they "fit in;" indeed, employees tend to identify with their firms, resulting in a relatively high level of company loyalty (Holden and Gross, 1992).

Research shows that national culture is not something apart from business, but determines its very essence (Maher, 1994; Rhody and Tang, 1995). Indeed, a study which surveyed over a thousand managers from U.S. and Japanese firms showed that corporate values reflect those of the national culture (Yeh, 1995). These cultural differences lead to specific behaviors within organizations, which are different for Japan and U.S. firms. For instance, as compared to Japan, the U.S. culture, which is high on individualism, predisposed the U.S. companies to use more communication and coordination and resort to short-term performance evaluations (Ueno, 1992). And in Japan, a people orientation and an emphasis on harmony and tolerance have led to humanistic management practices, worker loyalty, a noncompetitive workforce, lifetime employment, and slow evaluation and promotion (Burton 1989).

Maurice, Sorge, and Warner (1980), in a comparison of France, Germany, and Great Britain, analysed the mechanisms through which national cultures affected technologically similar organizations. Each of the three countries showed its own specific pattern on the following three blocks of variables:

1. The configuration of the organization: The kind of categories the labor force is broken into varied from one country to the next, as well as the relative size of the categories when these were made comparable.

2. Work structuring and coordination: The joining of individual tasks into work positions and the way in which work is coordinated.

3. The qualification and career system: Schooling, on the job training, and the way individuals progress in typical careers.
The three blocks are interrelated; they form integrated systems of which the elements reinforce one another.

3.1.13 Effects Of National/Social Culture on Organizational Culture

Though for rigorous academic pursuit and analysis, national and organizational culture can be construed as two different constructs at times, in practice they are intimately intertwined as can be seen from the discussions from previous section. To meaningfully analyze organizational culture, we have to consider the prevalent national culture.

The pervasive effects of national culture have important implications. For instance, the values that characterize organizations are likely to parallel those of the national culture in which the organization operates (Rhody and Tang 1995). Hence, Japanese firms, as compared to U.S. firms, are more likely to have cultures characterized by flexibility and people and detail orientations. Possibly, these cultural factors are the driving force behind the success of Japanese firms. That is, Japanese firms may rely heavily on the virtues of flexibility, people orientation, detail orientation, and team orientation to achieve greater business performance and customer satisfaction. And relative to Japanese firms, U.S. firms are more likely to have cultures characterized by innovation, outcome orientation, and aggressiveness. Further, these cultural values that characterize the U.S. firms are likely to impact their business performance, because their business strategies and the resulting successes are attributable to their cultural values. Just as Japanese firms utilize the cultural values that characterize them to achieve greater performance, U.S. firms will exercise the characteristics of innovation, outcome orientation, and aggressiveness as their competitive weapons to achieve greater business performance and customer satisfaction. Thus, it is expected that the relationships between specific organizational values and outcomes (both customer satisfaction and business performance) should vary across national cultures. Hofstede (1994) alluded to this when he pointed out that the academic community has been relatively slow in accepting that not only management practices but also the validity of organizational culture theories may stop at national boundaries.

It is expected that organizations whose cultures match those of their home country will experience lower outcome levels when they operate in other countries with vastly different cultural orientations. This is because the consumers in other countries with cultural orientations different from those of the organization may not completely understand and assimilate the operational procedures of the foreign subsidiaries, creating somewhat weaker impression about the firms from other countries. Thus, the cultural mismatch may lead to lower customer satisfaction and business performance. For instance, U.S. organizations whose cultures reflect those of the U.S. will experience lower outcome levels when they operate in Japan (i.e, U.S. subsidiaries) than when they operate in the U.S.

Work and organizational cultures are subsets of the larger societal culture. Briefly, societal culture consists of the assumptions, beliefs and values acquired and held by the majority of people in a geographical area for the purpose of a) adapting to the ever-changing environment and b) developing an identity in order to maintain continuity in the core areas of their life style. (Sinha, 1990) Assumptions and beliefs manifest themselves through values in physical artifacts and social systems, institutions and relationships as well as in the behaviour
of the members of a culture. According to Sinha, all these components of culture are interconnected through multidirectional influence process. Together, they enable people to develop their identity and to maintain continuity in their lifestyle. The relationships between the components are depicted as (Fig.3.8):
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Figure: 3.8
Components of Culture (Sinha,2000)

Sinha (2000) justifies the study of societal culture as a part of organizational culture on the ground that work organizations are concrete forms of society’s systematic efforts to realize various goals and objectives.

“Society fashions them in its own image, with the prototypical properties of its culture. Organizations, in other words, are like mini cultures within a larger culture, although in the process of formation they acquire additional properties that are necessary to enable them to realize their objectives. They too have a) physical artifacts in terms of structure and technology b) systems and procedures c) social and work relationships d) patterns of behavior of employees and e) underlying all these, a set of values, beliefs and assumptions about how people organize themselves, relate with each other and perform their roles.”
Organizational culture can be best understood if the culture of its place of location/majority of employees' national culture is studied. (Sinha, 1990)

One might consider what the adjustment problems might be for expatriates, implications team-building with multinationals, marketing strategies for culturally different groups, and negotiation strategies for various stake holders. The cultural values are considered too different. While there are exceptions, generally and on average, when compared to the developed countries, the people in the developing countries are:

(1) higher on uncertainty avoidance (or, low tolerance for ambiguity).
(2) higher on familism or collectivism (low on individuality).
(3) higher on power distance (high disparity between upper and lower ranks).
(4) higher on feminine orientation (want nurturing and emotional support).
higher on associative thinking that negates and violates policies, principles and
guidelines, in contrast to developed countries who are higher on abstractive thinking and
abide by principles and guidelines without violating them to suit the occasion.

context dependent (think themselves to be at the mercy of events in the environment) in
contrast to the people in the developed countries who see themselves as being in control of
nature and events around them.

tend to view human capacities as more or less fixed with limited potential, while the
developed countries tend to view humans as malleable and as having high potential.

oriented more to the present or the past, believing that life should be guided by the
customs and traditions and that past experience should be the guide to any change. People in
the developed countries on the other hand are future oriented.

short term oriented and tend to undertake short-term activities that do not involve much
planning.

have a being-orientation rather than a task-orientation. Being-orientation focuses on
experiencing life and upon the quality of life experience, and work is done in order to live,
with tasks receiving only a passive reactive response.( Kalburgi M. Srinivas,1994)

consider that success has to do with maintenance of the well being of the family and the
in-group, not achievement from endeavors.

In addition to the ways of thinking, as Lane and Distephano note, the developing countries
are afflicted with problems of managerial structure and practices: Organizational structures
are very rigid, hierarchical and status oriented. Planning is non-existent or based simply on
precedence. Decisions are made on non-rational criteria. Rewards are not based on
performance but on other criteria.

These structural and historical practices aspects by themselves are enough to present
difficulties to a smooth and straight transfer of any given management technique from the
developed to the developing countries. When coupled with a different pattern of thinking as
listed above, the difficulty of transfer is immensely magnified.

Implementation of OD intervention has thrown some interesting lights of effects of
nationality on organizational culture. Harrison as far back as 1970 and more recently Jaeger
cautioneod OD practitioners to guard against fundamental conflicts between the intervention
technology's underlying values and the host society's culture. They recommend great care in
the analysis and selection of intervention techniques and at the same time to be bold and
innovative in a search for new intervention technologies appropriate to the host culture.

With respect to Asian and Latin countries, Jaeger recommended that 'it is best to use
interventions in which direct confrontation can be avoided and data can be dealt with at arm's
length - such as through survey feedback and third party peacemaking... Though these types
of interventions may run counter to the traditional OD consultant's value of openness as the ultimate goal, it may be a necessary cultural adjustment in certain societies.

Cultural orientations in Brunei and Borneo were seen as the cause of problems in the introduction of change and management development by David Richards in 1991. Induction of more collaborative behavior was not successful. He goes on to recommend that appropriate general values and attitudes should first be cultivated through training and development before any organization development can be undertaken.

Johnson, based on his OD work in Venezuela, came to a conclusion in 1990 that his experience in that country does not support the application of any particular OD technique, even with adaptations, as the situation there, in his words, is 'far removed from the values of OD.'

With respect to the Philippines, Leticia Reyes-Sagun noted in 1988 that the local value system consisting of a predominant loyalty to one's group, unquestioning obedience to authority, resignation in the face of difficulty, and reliance on supernatural forces was inconsistent with the OD values of self-reliance, autonomy, systematic planning and experimentation.

Boss and Mariono reported in 1987 that various conflict management and confrontation and teambuilding designs, typically successful in the US, would not work in Italy. The Italian culture was seen not to be conducive to dealing with emotionally charged issues in a group context. The personal pride of the people and the potential loss of face in a group setting are too threatening. In their work on improving the quality of working life in the West Indies and the U.S. Virgin Islands, White and Herby observed that in the local culture, friendship and holidays came before business, punctuality was not important and that authority was regarded with hostility while concluding that these were not conducive to any type of OD intervention.

3.1.14 Organizational Culture: An Indian Context

According to Sinha, the Indian Cultural values interact with western technology, principles of management, systems and procedures to develop patterns of organizational culture. Sinha points out three cultural types of Indian Organizations which stand out. (Sinha 1990, 1999)

These are:

1. Soft culture
2. Technocratic Culture
3. Work-centric nurturant culture

Soft Culture:

A soft culture is found to be more prevalent in public sector organizations, although there are a no of exceptions. The nature of ownership is not necessarily be the determining factor. The basic characteristic and requirement for a soft culture to develop is when there are multiple and conflicting organizational objectives, to the extent that employees can selectively pursue
those objectives that serve their individual or sectional interests at the cost of the organization's interests. (Sinha, 2000). In an Organization with soft work-culture, employees believe that hard and sincere effort is less important than meeting social and personal obligations, that merit matters less than personal connections, that no one cares if work is not performed or if the quality of products and services is poor, and that everyone looks after his own sectional or individual interests. Furthermore, employees feel that they are invariably held accountable for their mistakes, but never given credit for good performance. Sinha (1990) quotes some employees of this type of organizations as saying

"It is a place where action, not inaction, has to be defended"; "It is a place where it is wise to mind one's own business"; "It is a place where donkeys and horses are treated alike"; "It is a place where some work seriously while others are praised and promoted".

Many small to medium public sector organizations represents this type of culture.

Technocratic Culture:

A technocratic culture is likely to develop in an organization which aims at providing the highest possible quality of products and services through the use of the latest technology. Not only are the best possible plants and equipment procured, but strict measures are taken to keep improving operational efficiency by cutting costs (e.g. by down-sizing or closing down loss making units), introducing new systems and managerial practices, innovating and pioneering products, penetrating new markets or claiming a large share of the existing market, and relating to the best in the world.

These type organizations are increasingly using management tools like Mission and Vision statements, Customer Satisfaction measures, Benchmarking, Paying for performance, Competitor profiling, Strategic alliance, Re-engineering, Core competency etc.

In such a work culture, social values such as in-group orientation, hierarchy and personalized relationships are considered as constraints and kept under control as much as possible. They do however gain entry through backdoor in the form of individual preferences in personal relationships.

Sinha cites the case of Modi Xerox as an example of this culture.

Work-centric Nurturant Culture (WCNC)

The WCNC shares with the technocratic culture the central importance accorded to work. Employees believe that management rewards hard work, recognizes merit, establishes clear norms of performance and gives employees an adequate workload. Superiors expect their subordinates to work hard, provide close supervision, and directions and differentially reward those who work harder. Formal systems are established to enable the organization to realize its goals. All works are however combined with a nurturing and caring orientation on the part of management. Employees' needs and expectations are met at times by stretching some of the rules and regulations. Personalized relationships are welcome, with superiors showing
paternalistic career progression of subordinates who accept them in the role of patrons. As they subordinates grow and mature, they are entrusted with greater responsibilities and encouraged to share their ideas, information and even differences of opinion with their superiors. Such a culture enables the organization to maintain a high level of productivity and competitiveness in the market. Sinha shows TATA Steel as a representative organization of this type of culture.

Table 3.5

Main features of Organizational Culture (Sinha,2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Soft Culture</th>
<th>Work-Centric Nurturant Culture</th>
<th>Technocratic Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Need, interests and relationships</td>
<td>Work-oriented relationships</td>
<td>Quality, costs and customer satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Inefficient and indifferent to work</td>
<td>Productive, paternalistic and participative</td>
<td>Efficient, demanding and competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Need-based and socially determined</td>
<td>Socio-technically determined</td>
<td>Technologically determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Neglected</td>
<td>Stat-of-the-art and suited to the employees</td>
<td>State-of-the-art and R&amp;D driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Non-work-oriented</td>
<td>Work-and people oriented</td>
<td>Outcome oriented and dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and objectives</td>
<td>Welfare and Profit(if possible)</td>
<td>Interests of all stakeholders</td>
<td>Market leadership, expansion and profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Heavy and usually bureaucratic</td>
<td>Socio-technically integrated</td>
<td>Lean, flexible and team based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distinct Indian Societal Culture:

Mr Gopalakrishnan (April 2002 issue of Indian Management)³ has brilliantly explained the uniqueness of Indian Management practices. The modern Indian manager represents a unique confluence. While his cultural moorings are strong, rooted in an ancient and proud society, his intellectual exposure is almost entirely to Anglo-Saxon management literature in the English language. This is not so among other Eastern managers.

1. Anglo-Saxon cultures over the years tended to view a company as a system, whereas Eastern cultures tend to see them as a social group. No wonder that Anglo-Saxon thinking has strongly influenced advancements in productivity management through time and motion study, system dynamics, etc. Eastern thinking, on the other hand, has strongly influenced advancements in human motivation management. In the traditional Anglo-Saxon view, the organisation is governed by ‘engineering’. In the traditional Eastern view, the organisation is governed by ‘biology’.

2. Due to the influence of rationalists, Western thinking abhors ambiguity. A manager must be adept at quickly sorting out issues into black and white. The zone of
ambiguity must be minimised. For Indians, ambiguity is accepted as an inevitable fact of life. One can try to reduce it, but the real skill lies in managing the ambiguous.

3. In MNCs, decision-making and conflict resolution follow a straight line. With the empowerment mantra picking up speed, MNCs try very hard to delegate by explicit specification of authority schedules and aggressive goal setting. If decisions are held up due to conflicting viewpoints, the issue is expected to speedily traverse up the line for a resolution. In Indian context, two possibilities exist. Sometimes there is no empowerment. Thus many decisions are taken by the owner, achieving speed. Or there is a form of delegation which requires consensus to be built, thus sacrificing speed.

4. Western companies largely practice leadership by system. They institutionalise succession planning though their systems, admittedly with varying levels of efficiency. They like their managers to be valuable and skilled cogs in a well-oiled wheel of systems (information, budgets, reviews). In the Indian milieu, leadership is by personality. It is the magnetism and personal charisma of the top man that is believed to make the difference. The systems surrounding him are not thought to be that important, though systems are perceived to have some value.

5. Many Anglo-Saxons believe that ascribing status for reasons other than achievement is quite archaic and inappropriate to business. The Indian mind accords status not purely by achievement but also by age, class, education and so on.

6. In Western companies there is a great deal of emphasis on getting things done by analysis, logic and intellect, sometimes even to a fault. There is a constant drive to get the most important facts and analysis on the table to take the right decision from among many alternatives. In local companies there is a desire to have more facts, but the means to get facts are often lacking because a system has not been institutionalised. Things get done subjectively, intuitively and through connections.

7. Being frank and open is a strong feature of Western companies. But in India being open is no virtue. It is more important to be nice about it.

8. "Westerners are often surprised that Easterners don't implement what is so obvious to them. Many Westerners marvel at Indians, whose minds they find scintillating both here and overseas. Indians know perfectly well what is required to be done for their company to prosper, or even for their country to progress. Where they fail is in doing what they know has to be done”.

Patterns of Work Culture:

Indian social ethos, religious and psycho social values, long colonial rule, 50 years of socialistic pattern of economic policy of govt etc and above all a 5000 years of dynamic, vibrant civilizational legacy with associated ups and downs have made Indian culture of today a distinct one. Though there is no single culture to be found through the length and breadth of this vast geographical entity called India, but still there are certain themes running common across all societies, all locations and all organizations. That generalization of Indian
Culture is risky, and fraught with the danger of ignoring the vital and exciting variant patterns to be found across various organizations.

Indian thought/Philosophy

Work and organizational culture in India are a part of the larger societal culture. The Indian culture possesses four streams of values which interact with external events and imperatives to shape organizational and work cultures. The most dominant of these values are social values such as in-group-embedded ness, hierarchy, personalized relationships, duty and harmony. The Indian Psyche invariably oscillates between the ideal and the real. Percept and practice have always been recognized as different. Day-to-day practices require to be guided by the ground-level realities, but one must not lose sight of the ideals which moderate behaviour and help maintain a balance between percept and practice. Many idealized Indian values are rooted in the ancient religio-philosophical traditions. The operative values have evolved through a process of interaction between the idealized values and the changing socio-economic realities of the country. They manifest themselves in people’s beliefs, practices and preferences and are known to affect organizational behavior. (Sinha 1990)

The idealized psycho-spiritual values are derived from the way psyche and the Ultimate Reality (Brahman) are conceptualized in Indian philosophy. It is postulated that there is one Brahman which manifests itself in all animate and inanimate beings. The soul or the psyche of individuals has been separated from Brahman, and hence strives to fuse with Him again. The psyche consists of Id like impulses, sensuousness, emotions and fantasies. Yet it has a built-in disposition to move towards Brahman, which can be attained by controlling the impulses, cultivating a ‘pure mind’, doing one’s duty and transcending this worldliness. Thus, while the reality of the psyche is its Id like properties, its ideal is the state of fusion with Brahman. It is the process of recognizing the salience of both that propels a person towards fuller self-realization.

Sinha (1990) contends that the psych-spiritual values of ancient times have been tampered by the events and experiences of the centuries to emerge as socially operative values. These operative social values are identified as the preference for

(a) Hierarchy  
(b) Embedded ness  
(c) Personalized rather than contractual relationships  
(d) Harmony and tolerance and  
(e) Duty and obligation rather than hedonism.

Indians tend to arrange things, persons, relationships, ideas and practically everything hierarchically. The large power distance (Hofstede, 1980), status consciousness, centralization of decision making, the need for a patron to depend upon, paternalism and so on are the manifestations of this preference for hierarchy (Sinha 1990, Virmani and Guptan, 1991). One may trace the roots of this value to the conceptualization of the universe in Hindu thought, according to which there is a hierarchy of cosmos. The inanimate occupies he
lowest level in this hierarchy. Insects, animals and human beings are ranked in progressively higher order.

In contrast with the western conceptualization of the ‘individual’, Indians are conceived as ‘individuals’ (Mariott, 1976). They do not possess unalienable components in their identity. In fact, people seek identity by referring to their collectives and intergroups. Names often indicate family lineage, caste and, in many cases, place of birth. People attach greater importance to their in-group’s needs, norms and expectations than they do to their own.

The preference for harmony indicates that strong emphasis is placed on maintaining good relationships within an ingroup, on co-operating with each other, making sacrifices, caring and being cared for, and so on. Roland(1988) labels this as 'affective reciprocity' - an intense emotionality in caring and being cared for without asking. N. K. Sngh and Paul (1985) call it the 'affective syndrome'.

In contrast with the western preference for contractual relationships, Indians prefer to maintain personalized relationships.

Discharging one’s duty is considered more important than doing as one wishes. The emphasis in Hinduism is on self control and the containment of impulses and desires in order to do the right things. According to the Hindu code of conduct, this helps maintain order in society. Duty is Dharma, i.e. conduct that maintains order and balance in an otherwise fluid universe (sanskar).

Implication of Indian thoughts/Philosophy on work values/organizational behaviour

Sinha (1990) examines the important aspects of Indian thoughts and philosophy and their probable impact upon various elements of organizational behavior. Let us briefly review few of such impacts as enumerated by Sinha (1990)

- Hierarchy:

Due to hierarchization, and consequent centralization, seniors are seen in a position of a patron, with a moral obligation to nurture his subordinates. The superior has to function as a father-figure, providing guidance, inspiration and direction to the subordinates. By doing this, the superior prepares his subordinate for assuming responsibility. In is also like a guru-shishya parampara.

- Embeddedness

Group embeddedness may drift into amoral familism – a tendency to think only in terms of family members and to favour them unduly over others. Such amoral familism may result in selfish in group orientation in the work setting causing indifference, distrust and even open hostility towards out group members, as well as gross disregard of the interests of the organization. Formal systems and procedures
are undermined to serve self and in group interests. Caste conflicts, family feuds and communal riots are some of the behavioral manifestations of amoral familism.

- Personalized rather than contractual relationships

Contractual relationships in the workplace are viewed as lifeless and mechanical. They do not have the potential to get others involved in common issues. In fact, work relationships are perceived as extensions of the social network outside the work setting. Kakar (1978) observes that Indians are ‘sensitive to (or concerned with) not the goals of work and productivity that are external to the relationship, but the relationship itself, the unfolding of emotional affinity’. Dayal (1976) finds that ‘visiting the home of the superior, doing personal chores for the family, sending him delicacies cooked in one’s home, etc. are the common manifestations of this kind of relationship;

- Harmony and tolerance

The preference for harmony and tolerance helps maintain solidarity in an in-group, induces acceptance of asymmetrical gains among its members, pre-empts any defiance even against unjust demand by a superior or a subordinate, and encourages the tolerance, protection and favoring of inefficient and even corrupt in-group members. Differences and conflicts are likely to be glossed over unless they cross limits. In such instances, third party mediation is preferred to confrontation (Sinha, 1990). Conflicts in some situations may not be resolved, but are kept in abeyance and allowed to simmer.

- Duty and obligation rather than hedonism.

As Hindu religion was not institutionalized, dharma was elaborated in terms of meeting one’s social obligations vis-à-vis relevant others such as family members, relatives, friends and even strangers. Hence, duty is interpreted as appropriate role behaviour towards others, respecting and obeying superiors, and loving and caring for juniors and dependents. To maintain face is of course important, but it is equally important not to let a respected superior lose face. Thus while the duty to one’s work is emphasized, in reality, it means doing the work of someone who is either an in-group member, a relative or a friend to whom one is obliged. If one has to work for those who are not in-group members (paraya), it is considered a favour (McClelland) that must be exchanged for either a tangible gain or a reciprocal favour.

The Cultural differences between developed and developing countries (India) in an organizational context can be understood in terms of the four dimensions suggested by Hofstede(1980). The dimensions are: Uncertainty avoidance, Power Distance, Individualism and Masculinity. Using these dimensions, Kanungo and Jaegaer (1990) have characterized the socio-cultural environment of developing countries when compared to the developed countries, as relatively high on uncertainty avoidance and power distance, and relatively low on individualism and masculinity. On the additional dimension ‘abstractive vs associative
thinking', suggested by Kedia and Bhagat (1981), developing countries are relatively low on abstractive and high on associative thinking.

Each of the five cultural dimensions represents a set of underlying beliefs and assumptions which people carry with them when they join an organization. These belief systems of the organization’s members, in turn, influence the internal work culture facilitating certain job behaviours and inhibiting others.

Management of work activities in an enterprise depends critically on the social values of its members which are culture bound. Moore (1961) has pointed out that the dynamics between organizational values and societal culture is like interface between sand and sea. Cultural values provide elaborate and generalized norms both for appropriate behaviour for the members and for activities and functions of the system. (Enz, 1988; Chatman, 1991). Values that operate within the organizational context are historical in character and they direct the preferences of members and their interactions with other members in the organizations. It has been contended that values are rooted deep in the very structure of Indian society and culture portrays a different kind of idealized human being. According to Chakraborty, values of Indians are anchored in the transcendental aspect of human existence. Accordingly he has suggested the following values salient to Indian socio-cultural ethos:

1. Respect for individuals
2. Cooperation and trust
3. Purification of mind
4. Top quality product and services
5. Work is worship
6. Containment of greed
7. Ethical-moral boundaries
8. Self discipline and restraint
9. Need to give
10. Renunciation and detachment

The traditional view of work in India was a duty which should be performed either in the family or within the inter-caste framework. Ganesh (1982) observed that:

“organizations in India have fuzzy boundaries. Essentially organizations have come to represent settings in which societal forces interact. Thus, our organizations have provided settings for interaction familial forces, interest groups, caste conflicts, regional and linguistic groups, class conflicts, and political and religious forces.”

Jai B. P. Sinha & Durganand Sinha (1995) have discussed the values prevalent in Indian organizations. They have also explained how these predominant values affect the work life and organizational effectiveness.
1. Hierarchical perspective:

Indian social systems are steeply hierarchical (Mumont, 1970; Kakar, 1978) and Indians are highly status conscious. They feel easier to work in superior-subordinate roles rather than with equals (Kothari, 1970). Peer group relationship induces anxiety until the peers are ranked on some real or imaginary dimensions. Once a hierarchy is established, juniors yield to seniors on every conceivable on-the-job or off-the-job occasion. The locus of control is shifted to the highest position in the organization (Dayal, 1987). The seniors on his part, must protect, help and provide patronage and affection to his juniors. In return he expects loyalty, compliance and total submission by the subordinates.

2. The power play:

Those who yield are bestowed with all kinds of favours., those who do not are discriminated against. In the positive sense, the relationship is characterized by sneh (affection) for the subordinates, and shraddha (deference) for the superior. There is an ‘affective reciprocacity’. Power plays freely in such a relationship. There is no resistance by the subordinates who in fact seek superior’s guidance and direction without which they feel dejected. Many times such a relationship degenerates into manipulation.(Tripathi, 1981). The superior still maintains a façade of being affectionate and the subordinates of being dependent; but both experience simmering tension and turmoil with both sides trying not to let the relationship breakdown.

3. Preference for personalized relationships

Indians prefer personalized relationships. What an Indian is sensitive to or concerned with are not the goals of work and productivity that are external to the relationship, but the unfolding emotional affinity. Kakar, 1978). Dayal (1976) reported that Indians work more sincerely in a person-to-person role than work roles. Even competency is overshadowed by personal relationships.

4. Social networking through own-other dichotomy

The preference for personalized relationships manifests in social networking based on the consideration of one’s own self and others (Kumar and Singh, 1976). The members of the in-group are own and personal. Family, relatives, friends, co-workers, caste men etc. are members of the in-group and are bound by personalized relationships. Others are strangers and must be distances.

5. Collectivistic orientation:

Preference for personalized relationships and networking is part of the collectivism of Indians. Indians are found to be collectivists. Every Indian is always linked to the rest of the social body by a network of incredibly diversified ties, with the result that no one in this gigantic country could ever be completely abandoned (Lapierre,1986)there embedded ness however goes beyond the family, caste, kinship, linguistic and religious groups.
Uday Pareek (2004) summarises the strengths and weaknesses of Indian Culture in clusters as follows:

**Strengths**

1. Universalism: In this cluster four strengths are included viz. universalism (love and respect for all forms of life and for ecology), extension motivation (involvement in large goals), and respect for learning and intellectual pursuits, and openness to learning from others.

2. Ambiguity Tolerance: This cluster has three strengths namely, context sensitivity (high ambiguity tolerance), diversity (leading to synergic pluralism), and androgyny (equal emphasis on and integration of cognitive and emotional aspects).

3. Self-restraint: This cluster includes three strengths – self restraint (willingness to postpone gratification of immediate needs for long term goals), role-boundedness (giving more importance to the role than the self) and equanimity (steering between two extremes and not being swayed by extreme emotions of sorrow or joy).

**Weaknesses:**

The weaknesses of Indian culture have been grouped into three clusters by Pareek as follows:

1. Narcissism: Narcissism is reflected both in self-seeking behaviour as well as in inward-looking tendency. In this cluster are included five weaknesses – in-group infatuation (concern for the self or family or kin only), unreality orientation (orientation towards fantasy or substitutes of reality), non-involvement (attitude of indifference and reluctance to engage in confrontation), lack of detailed planning and an oral culture (resulting in low reading and writing skills).

2. Power Concentration: The second cluster, power distance, has four characteristics in Indian context, namely – hierarchical orientation, critical orientation (excessive use of sanctions and 'don’ts', rather than the use of reinforcement and encouragement), non-confrontation and a non-work culture.

3. The cluster of attributional thinking has two characteristics – fatalism (resulting in ‘deadening efficiency in maintaining the status-quo’), and pessimism-rumination (expecting failures and misfortunes, and indulging in recollecting and mulling over bad experience)
3.2 MOTIVATION

In today's battle for excellent employees, management has to offer more than high pay to win employees' trust and motivate employees. Premium on employee loyalty is at an all-time high. Workers now focus on maintaining a portable skill set so they can move from opportunity to opportunity, rather than making a life time commitment. Managers are forced to learn motivational strategies to keep the best workers. There are many different theories and approaches that relate to motivation. But before delving into the theoretical discussion, let us briefly examine what many theorists have to say about the definition of motivation.

3.2.1 Definitions:

The word motivation can be traced back to the Latin word 'movere', which means 'to move'. There is a plethora of literature on motivation, yet the concept remains elusive. Different authors have described motivation in different ways.

Gellerman (1992) defines motivation as the "art of helping people to focus their minds and energies on doing their work as effectively as possible" Motivation is a human psychological characteristic that contributes to a person's degree of commitment. It includes the factors that cause, 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" (Stoner et. al 1995)

Motivation is the willingness to perform. It relates to the degree to which an individual both desires and is willing to exert effort towards attaining job performance. No combination of capacity and opportunity will result in high performance in absence of some motivation, or willingness to perform. (Ivancevich and Matteson,1998 ).

Motivation is a process that starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates a behavior or a drive that is aimed at a goal or incentive. (Luthans, 1992)

Motivation is the set of forces that causes people to engage in one behavior rather than some alternative behavior. From the manager's point of view, the objective is to motivate people to behave in ways that are in the organisation's best interest. (Moorehead & Griffin, 1999).

The underlying concept of motivation is some driving force within individuals by which they attempt to achieve some goal in order to fulfill some need or expectation. (Mullins, 1998).

Motivation is the willingness to do something, conditioned by the action's ability to satisfy some need. (DeCenzo & Robbins, 1997).

Every author describes motivation differently, yet there are some common threads running through all the definitions. The terms which commonly occur in most of the definitions are, desires, needs, wants, wishes, goals, aims, drives, motives, incentive, etc. Every author gives one, or more than one term, more importance than others. But these terms are always included in the definition in one form or another. There are some other common threads running through these definitions. All of them assume that even though it is difficult to do so,
people can be motivated; that it is a positive force; if not paid attention to, this force depletes over time and experience, and it is not the only factor which affects a person's performance.

The following definitions of motivation, as found in many psychology text books, reflect the general consensus that motivation is an internal state or condition (sometimes described as a need, desire, or want) that serves to activate or energize behavior and give it direction (Kleinginna and Kleinginna, 1981).

- internal state or condition that activates behavior and gives it direction;
- desire or want that energizes and directs goal-oriented behavior;
- Influence of needs and desires on the intensity and direction of behavior.

Franken (1994) provides an additional component in his definition:

- the arousal, direction, and persistence of behavior.

At a simple level, it seems obvious that people do things, such as go to work, in order to get things they want and to avoid things they don't want.

Overall, the basic perspective on motivation looks something like this:

In other words, we have certain needs or wants, and this causes us to do certain things (behavior), which satisfy those needs (satisfaction), and this can then change which needs/wants are primary (either intensifying certain ones, or allowing us to move on to other ones).

A variation on this model, particularly appropriate from an experimenter's or manager's point of view, would be to add a box labeled "reward" between "behavior" and "satisfaction". So that subjects (or employees), who have certain needs do certain things (behavior), which then get them rewards set up by the experimenter or manager (such as raises or bonuses), which satisfy the needs, and so on.

Part of a manager's job is to motivate everyone, at all times, and using every possible technique or approach available. There are many questions that have to be answered, such as who are the people, what are their job tasks, how do they get paid, with whom do they work?. Because of all the different and varying elements in motivation, this is not a simple or easy
task. The main reason for this difficulty is that all people are different; hence what might motivate one person does not necessarily work for another person.

3.2.2 Theories of Motivation

In organizational behaviour literature, work motivation is considered a basic psychological process which explains why employees behave as they do in the work place. Traditionally, work motivation theories have been categorized as the content and process theories (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976). Content theories like Herzberg’s two factor theory and Maslow’s need hierarchy theory explain work behaviour as the employee’s attempt to satisfy some needs. The content theorists postulate that when an employee’s need are not met or satisfied, the employee experiences tension which motivates him/her to act in order to satisfy those needs, and thereby relieve the tension. In this approach to motivation, it is the specific nature and content of an unfulfilled need which is the ‘cause’ or ‘reason’ for an employee’s behaviour. Process theories on the other hand explain work behaviour in terms of the cognitive process which the employee goes through before and during behavior. They seek to identify the process, i.e. how does an employee start, direct, and stop a behavior.

Work is performed by people, and for each of those individual people there is a complex interaction of reasons for them to do the work, to do it in particular ways, to particular standards and with particular levels of energy and enthusiasm. This complex interaction is often summed up in one word: “motivation”. In this review a variety of perspectives on this essential force is examined and the implications for organisational practice are considered.

Motivation concerns “those psychological processes that cause the arousal, direction and persistence of behaviour” (Ilgen and Klein, 1988). Whilst there is general agreement in the literature about these three components of “motivation” (eg, Korman 1974, or Kanfer, 1990), the nature and place of motivation in a work-related context has been the subject of a long and developing study. Theories have been propounded, tested and superseded at a pace which has left organisational practice often several steps behind the researchers.

The word motivate is frequently used in the context of management as a transitive verb: motivation is by implication something done by one person or group to another. A further implication of this usage is that the motivated parties need to be induced to perform some action or expend a degree of effort which they would not otherwise wish to do. That this is an issue of vital importance to the prosperity of commercial organisations is emphasised by Lawler (1972): “Those individual behaviors that are crucial in determining the effectiveness of organizations are, almost without exception, voluntary motivated behaviors”. Other factors also have a bearing:

“Consideration of questions such as; why do people go to work, why do people work hard? clearly shows that effort and performance at work are determined by ability, temperament and motivation. Despite the often complex interactions between these factors it is possible to develop theories and practical guidelines that focus specifically on motivation without losing sight of the influence of other factors”. (Robertson, Smith and Cooper, 1992).

Kanfer (1994) takes this somewhat further by listing a number of inter-related factors which she believes to lead to behaviour:
“On the broadest level, an individual’s motivation for a specific task or job is determined by environment, heredity, and their interactions (such as learning). These factors influence individual characteristics such as personality, motives, affect, attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, skills, and abilities. In turn, the intensity and character of effort, and the endurance of goal-directed behaviour over time”.

However, according to Kanfer, most motivational theories are “not intended to predict performance but rather to predict decision processes and volitional behavior”, which implies that managers and organisational theorists will not find easy answers to their practical needs in motivation theory. Campbell and Pritchard (1976) argue that “motivation does have a meaning if we take it merely as a summary label that identifies a class of independent variable/dependent variable relationships”.

Various taxonomies have been proposed for the organisation of motivation theories. Kanfer (1994) classifies theories according to their distal or proximal nature, that is, their immediacy in relation to observable behaviours. Kanfer remarks:

“To date, most distal theories of motivation have enjoyed their greatest success in predicting other distal constructs, such as predecision and decision processes and intentions, rather than behavior or performance. Proximal constructs focus on motivational constructs at the level of purposive action. Analyses of motivational processes in these theories tend to begin with the individual’s goals rather than with the factors which have shaped the individual’s objectives”.

Katzell and Thompson (1990) divide theories into exogenous theories, which “focus on motivationally relevant independent variables that can be changed by external agents” and endogenous theories which “deal with processes or mediating variables (expectancies, attitudes, etc. that are amenable to modification only indirectly in response to variation in one or more exogenous variables”. Among exogenous theories Katzell and Thompson list motive/need theories, arousal/activation theories, incentive/reward theories, expectancy/valence theories, reinforcement theory, and goal theory. Within the category of endogenous theories they include equity theory, attribution/self-efficacy theory, intention/goal theories, and other cognitive theories.

Deci (1992) finds it helpful to distinguish between “push” theories, in which “the person is said to be pushed by a drive and directed by an associative bond or cathexis”. and “pull” theories, in which “the person is said to be pulled towards desired outcomes”. Campbell and Pritchard (1976) consider various process theories, which “first try to define the major variables which are necessary for explaining choice, effort and persistence. For example, drive, reinforcement and expectancy are major variables appearing in various models” and content theories, which “are more concerned with trying to specify the substantive identity of the variables that influence behavior and less so with the process by which they do it. That is, what are the specific rewards people want? What are the basic needs they are trying to satisfy? What incentives are the most powerful?”

Jung (1978) is more concerned with questions of locus: is observed behavior caused by intrinsic or extrinsic factors? Kanfer (1990) clarifies terms: “intrinsic motivation has often been defined as behavior performed in the absence of any apparent external reward”, and remarks that “intrinsic motivation may be more aptly conceptualized as episodic and temporally bounded rather than continuous”. In this context, Deci (1992) observes that
“people can experience gratification from doing certain activities independent of any separable consequences that might accrue”.

As motivation research has developed, increasing emphasis has been placed on cognitive antecedents of observed behaviour. “Cognitive theories attribute the causes of behavior to individuals' processing of information. According to these views, behavior results from decisions or action choices” (Ilgen and Klein, 1988). These choices are “directed toward alternative tasks and effort directed at performance levels within tasks” (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976).

“Cognition plays an essential role in the analysis of motivation and emotion. The interpretation of the meaning of a situation, the appraisal of alternative responses, and judgements about the possible consequences of responses are all cognitive operations that influence our actions, our feelings before, during, and after our responses, and our judgement of and reaction to the behavior of other persons” (Jung, 1978).

Jung goes on to argue that debate about whether situational or individual factors are the prime influences on behaviour is meaningless, since “the cognitive appraisal of a given situation depends on the individual”. and “each person, depending on his or her set of personal constructs for perceiving the world, may define alternatives in a given situation in a different way”.

Kanfer (1994) notes that “cognitive choice theories emphasize two determinants of choice and action: (a) the individual’s expectations, and (b) the individual’s subjective valuations of expected consequences associated with various alternative actions”. Jung (1978) points out that for these factors to influence behaviour the individual must be able “not only to determine but also to act in accord with choices that provide the maximum combination of likelihood of occurrence and magnitude of payoff”.

Non-cognitive factors are still considered influential, although the emphasis has shifted towards considering these factors as they underpin the cognitive processes rather than as direct antecedents of behaviour. “Building on advances in personality psychology, researchers have shown that non-cognitive individual differences influence longer-term patterns of ... information processing and ... self-regulation” (Kanfer, 1990). Kanfer identifies “five basic personality dimensions, or traits; ... neuroticism; extroversion; openness to experience; agreeableness; and conscientiousness ... also called will to achieve” the latter of which she believes “represents the trait dimension most closely associated with motivation or volitional processes”. Kanfer argues that “noncognitive individual differences as diverse as impulsivity ... work orientation ... and dependability exert systematic effects on patterns of behavior and, ultimately, productivity”.

Individual differences are less important in motive-based work motivation theories, which place more emphasis “on the conditions which activate the motive” (Kanfer, 1990), and “focus on the influence of a small set of universal and psychologically-based motives, such as mastery, control, competence, and the desire to reduce psychological tension, created by perceptions of imbalance in social exchange” (Kanfer, 1990).
Early theories

Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek philosophers believed that behaviour was determined by knowledge and the will, which was developed through practice and experience (Korman, 1974; Bolles, 1975). These ideas were developed by early Christian thinkers such as St Augustine and St Thomas Aquinas into a dualist model: animal behaviour was determined by instinct and the physical senses, whilst human behaviour was determined by these and by rational application of the will. Descartes enhanced this model by proposing physiological determinants of the emotions, and thus of the will (Korman, 1974). Darwin effectively put an end to the dualist model by showing that “the basic human and animal processes were fundamentally the same” (Korman, 1974).

Hedonism

Lawler (1973) suggests that “the origins of most contemporary conceptions of motivation can be traced to the principle of hedonism” proposed by a group of early 19th century English philosophers, notably Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, and John Stuart Mill. Hedonism attributes all behaviour to a desire to achieve the greatest pleasure. Korman (1974) comments that “the idea that responsibility for the motivation of behaviour can be attributed to both the desire for pleasure and the knowledge of what will bring pleasure finds representation in contemporary theorizing”. However, Vroom (1964) and Lawler (1973) remark that there is virtually no empirical content in the assumptions of hedonism and the proposition is therefore untestable. Korman’s simple restatement (above) of the basic tenet of hedonism is, perhaps, no more than a truism; the questions for research revolve around the nature and origins of “pleasure” in the context of the individual, and the behavioural effects of its pursuit.

Instincts

Many of the early psychologists attempted to pursue the concept of instinct that had formed an essential element of dualist philosophical constructs. Bolles (1975), commenting that “the concept of instinct is introduced to account for the apparent intelligence of behavior when it does not seem reasonable to attribute intelligence to the organism”, reviews the development of theorising on this subject from William James (1890), via William McDougall (1914) to Tolman (1923). “Tolman thought that a new, empirically well-founded, teleological interpretation could meet all of the objections that had been raised against the older instinct doctrines. ... Tolman’s basic assumption was that the ends of behavior must be found in the organism that behaves”. (Bolles, 1975).

Korman (1974) records that James and McDougall, and others, “made lists of instincts that were seen as mainsprings of all kinds of behaviors, simple and complex, necessary and unnecessary, for biological survival” but turns his attention to the “effort to utilize the innate mechanisms of biological survival significance as a base on which to build frameworks and themes designed to explain human motivation of a complex, nonbiological nature”. Prominent among those attempting to explain aspects of human behaviour by this means was Sigmund Freud: “Freud’s answer as to the determinants of behavioral arousal, direction, and vigor lies, at least partially, in the assumption of the existence of innate needs, which may also be called instincts in a psychological sense”. (Korman, 1974).

Freud described four characteristics of each instinct:
1. A source: internal body stimulation. This differs from an external stimulation by coming from the body itself rather than from the environment, by being constant and recurring rather than episodic, and by being inescapable.

2. Impetus: force or energy, which is a function of the intensity of the need.

3. An aim to end the stimulation which gave rise to it. This is satisfying. Intermediary steps towards ending the stimulation may be sought if they are perceived as leading to the desired end state.

4. An object: anything that will abolish the stimulation. This assumes that there is no innate link between any instinct and any given object.

Bolles (1975) summarises the Freudian view as follows: “Instinctual drives are characterised by their energy or impulse to action. Men learn to attain certain objects, or goals that make possible the discharge of this energy”.

Perhaps the main criticism that can be levelled at instinct theories as explanations of motivation is that they add little to simple descriptions of behaviour: “To say that ... an individual takes a job because he has an instinct to work is merely to give a redundant description of the observed behavior that adds nothing to our understanding of why the behavior took place”. (Lawler, 1973).

**Drives**

During the first half of the twentieth century, much attention was devoted to the concept of *drive* as an explanation of behaviour. “The drive concept, as it is formulated by Freud, Lewin, or Murray, always operates homeostatically; the individual is constantly seeking to rid himself of tension that threatens his well-being” (Bolles, 1975). Drive in this context represents “the underlying forces that make (behaviour) happen” (Bolles, 1975). “For Freud, behavior ultimately depends upon one drive, sex; for Murray, there are a large number of social as well as biological drives; and for Lewin, there is nearly an infinite number of possible tension systems that could stir an individual to action”. (Bolles, 1975).

The drive mechanism formulated by Lewin (1926) rests on the assumption that a state of tension is created within an individual by the existence of any psychological need. A tension is “a state of a system which tries to change itself in such a way that it becomes equal to the state of surrounding systems. A psychological need may arise from a physiological basis, but “for Lewin, needs exist which are not related to bodily functions and survival” (Weiner, 1992), but Lewin did regard tensions with a physiological or at least a survival-value origin as “genuine” needs, whilst “tensions arising from acts of will, and other more or less arbitrary commitments of the individual person” (Bolles, 1975) were categorised as “quasi needs”, which are “purely psychic needs” (Lewin, 1926). Both forms of needs were causes of behaviour.

“In brief, Lewin asserts that a man’s actions are to be explained on the grounds that he perceives particular ways and means of discharging certain tensions. Those activities that an individual perceives as making possible the release of tension will attract him; they will have a positive valence for him, and he will experience a force moving him to engage in those activities. Certain other activities may have the opposite effect; they are seen as increasing
tension; they are said to have negative valence and to generate repulsive forces” (Bolles, 1975).

Not all activity is directed at an original need. “In the absence of a suitable goal object the tension to fulfil an intention may be discharged by a substitute action that attains the same end” (Bolles, 1975). Lewin also observed that “a task that is interrupted is likely to be resumed”, but “frequently we forget our intentions”.

In evaluating Lewin’s work on motivation, Bolles (1975) makes the following observations:

"Lewin went to considerable effort to develop a formal (or what might be called a preexperimental) structure that would be able to encompass the full richness and complexity of human behavior as the facts became known. The terms that constitute the formal language of the theory - that is, terms like 'valence', 'force', and 'tension' - are explicitly related to each other but are only poorly tied to observable events in the empirical world."

"The major inadequacy of Lewin's theory is its uncertain semantics. There is little indication of how one could possibly validate the constructs of the theory. How do we know what the needs of an organism are? How can we tell whether these needs have created tension? How do we know that the tension is reciprocated in a force or in a valence perceived by the individual? How can we know how the individual perceives his behavioral possibilities? The constructs of the theory are not even provisionally tied to empirical observations".

It is not clear how one might demonstrate a need in the absence of a corresponding tension or a tension without an underlying need. Moreover, in Lewin's writings, need and tension are frequently referred to almost interchangeably”.

None of these criticisms is likely to detract from Lewin’s overall reputation as one of the leading psychologists of his time, and in the organisational world as the original source of “virtually all models of change management” (Burns, 1992).

Murray (1938) proposed what Deci (1992) describes as “the earliest comprehensive theory of human needs”. Murray’s needs or drives have two components, an arousal mechanism that activates behaviour and a directional component that differentiates it from other needs (Korman, 1974). Korman remarks that “the conditions under which the arousal component actually becomes activated in Murray’s theorizing are not at all clear”. Needs may arise from physiological causes, but “more typically they are aroused by particular events in the environment that offer certain threats or promises to the individual” (Bolles, 1975). Murray refers to these stimuli as “presses”. The object of behaviour is to achieve some goal:

"Behavior ... generally serves to take the organism from some prior state to some subsequent state - that is what the unitary trend of behavior consists in. These trends are assumed to be due to a hypothetical force (a drive, need, or propensity), which operates homeostatically. That is, a motivating force carries the organism away from the prior or initiating condition into a state like satiation in which the force disappears. Because motivating forces are not directly observable, we have to infer them from observations of and communications with the individual" (Bolles, 1975).

Korman (1974) regards the goal-directed or purposive nature of Murray’s theories as being both important and useful. It allows attention to be focused on the variety of ways in which a particular need might be met. Bolles (1975) summarises the sequence of events in Murray’s model as follows: (1) A stimulus (desirable/undesirable) from the environment is detected;
A drive or need is aroused; (3) The organism is activated to engage in some activity, "motor, verbal, merely ideational, or even unconscious"; (4) The activity causes a trend in overall behavior which tends to restore equilibrium. Achieving a demotivated state may only be possible through attainment of a goal. "Goal objects acquire, through learning, a value, or valence, or cathectic. ... This re-establishment of equilibrium, dispelling the drive, arouses a pleasurable effect". "We can recognize in this simply stated homeostatic scheme the same conception of equilibrium that Freud had proposed and the same sequence of tension-force-release of tension that Lewin had proposed". (Bolles, 1975).

Clark Hull is the psychologist principally associated with the concept of drive, which he formulated as "singular, not plural, general not specific, and motivational not directional" (Bolles, 1975). Hull's construct is summarised by Jung (1978) in the following terms:

"(Drive) referred essentially to the level of deprivation of some primary biological need. Drive was equated with the sum total of all the sources of energy that activate an organism at a given moment. When the responses of the organism lead to drive reduction, such as the attainment of water by a thirsty rat, Hull viewed the situation as one in which an association had been formed between a stimulus and a response due to reinforcement"

According to Hull (1943), different needs, such as deprivation of food or water, or pain such as electric shock in animal experiments, constitute different sources of drive, but the drive itself is always the same. The various stimuli contribute in varying degree to the single construct. "Hence drive cannot direct behavior, it can only energize. All steering of behavior is done associatively by stimuli" (Bolles, 1975). Hull argued that behavior was directed according to its survival value to the organism. "The most basic property of Hull's drive concept is that it activates behavior - it energizes or augments whatever behavior the animal may be engaged in" (Bolles, 1975). Specific behaviors result from the innate characteristics developed through evolution, or from learned behaviors that had previously been associated with survival. Thus, two quite separate processes are involved in producing behavior:

"For Hull, the newborn organism possesses a set of receptors capable of being stimulated by such sources as external (to the organism) stimuli ... and internal stimuli of the type associated with biological states of a threatening nature. ... These stimuli, both internal and external, may give rise to an internal state marked by two major characteristics. The first of these is a general drive state ... that acts as a general stimulant to the arousal of behavior in that it stimulates activation of whatever behavior tendencies exist in the organism at the time. ... the second characteristic, which is that each of these biological states have associated characteristic sets of physical stimulation unique to each state" (Korman, 1974).

The objective of behavior in every case is to reduce drive, to the extent that an organism, including man, "is motivated to achieve an inert condition, that is, a condition without stimulation" (Korman, 1974).

Evaluation of Hull's ideas has mainly pointed to the conclusion that they are too simple to explain complex behavior. J Jung (1978) points out that a drive concept of motivation based on biological deficits would suggest that once all deficits were removed the organism would be quiescent". Lawler (1973) comments that "in Hull's theory, outcomes become rewards when they are able to reduce primary drives and thereby reduce homeostatic imbalance and the tension that occurs when organisms are in a state of ecological deprivation". However, Lawler goes on to point out, animals have not been found to acquire learned drives, and both
animals and man seem to be attracted by outcomes that do not seem to be related to primary drives. For example, rats show curiosity and seem to “enjoy” exploring, monkeys will solve puzzles without extrinsic rewards, and people will work to improve their skills and competences.

J Jung (1978) provides several examples of observations that were difficult to explain using drive theory:

"Harlow and his colleagues ... noted that monkeys would learn to bar press merely to be able to observe the environment (electric train set running) or to manipulate mechanical puzzles. Montgomery ... demonstrated in a series of studies that rats preferred the arm of a T maze that led to a complex rather than a simple path. Berlyne ... reviewed much of the Russian research on the orienting reflex and the conditions under which it occurs. In addition Berlyne ... summarized his own research, as well as that of others, on curiosity. As a result of these and other studies, concepts such as curiosity drive, exploratory drive, and manipulatory drive were developed; furthermore, it was maintained that these drives were analogous to hunger or thirst drives”.

Abstract values and goals were explained as having been “associated at some time with the satisfaction of primary drives”.

Bolles (1975) sums up current attitudes to Hull’s work in the following terms:

"the worst failure of the drive concept is that it provides little help in explaining behavior. By the time we have discovered what the associative determinants are for any particular behavior, there is very little left for (drive) to explain" (Bolles, 1975).

Campbell and Pritchard (1976) concur: “the concept of drive has not proven useful in explaining experimental results and the preponderance of opinion is that it should be discarded”.

Behaviourism and Stimulus-Response Theories

The behaviourist school of psychology holds that it is impossible to study the operation of the mind and that the only appropriate subject for psychologists’ attention is observable behaviour (Hayes, 1994). Watson (1913) defined behaviourism with his proposition that all behaviour could be explained by identifying associations between environmental stimuli and the organism’s learned responses. Watson argued that associations or links between a stimulus and a response would be learned if they were repeated enough times. Pavlov (1927) showed in his classic experiments with dogs that a natural or unlearned response to a basic stimulus, such as salivating when food was presented, could be transferred to a totally different stimulus, eg, ringing a bell, if the two stimuli occurred together, especially if the association were repeated. In due course the response would occur when only the bell ringing stimulus was presented in the complete absence of any food. This form of learned behaviour is known as classical conditioning.

Thorndike (1911) proposed a “law of effect” which held that “actions which are rewarded (i.e. produce a pleasant effect) tend to be repeated”. The “reward” associated with a specific behaviour is termed reinforcement. Skinner (1938) proposed that the “small actions” which characterise the behaviour of all living organisms all produce some effect, however minor, on the surrounding environment. If these effects are experienced as pleasant by the organism
they will contribute to larger and more complex patterns of behaviour. Skinner experimented with rats, rewarding them (ie, reinforcing the behaviours) with food when they performed certain actions such as pressing a bar. He found that the animals quickly learned how to obtain the rewards. Skinner called the “small actions” operants, and the behaviour-learning process is known as operant conditioning.

Reinforcement can occur in complex patterns, and cause behaviour to be shaped in a variety of ways. Skinner distinguished between positive reinforcement, which takes the form of a reward, and negative reinforcement, which occurs when an unpleasant condition ceases. Punishment, defined as an unpleasant or aversive consequence of behaviour, is not reinforcing within Skinner’s definition - it suppresses what the person or animal is doing at the time but does not strengthen tendencies towards any alternative behaviours. Skinner argued strongly against the use of punishment in the context of human behaviour and society on the grounds that: "because punishment is ineffective, its use in controlling human behavior is indefensible. He observes that it would be morally indefensible even if it were effective ..., but that it is all the more so because it is not effective, has undesired side effects, and frequently has unpredictable effects". (Bolles, 1975)

Behaviourist researchers into workplace motivation have concentrated on performance improvement and behaviour-shaping. Davis and Luthans (1980) state the behaviourist position:

"There is today a jungle of theories that attempt to explain human behaviour in organizations. Unfortunately, many of the theoretical explanations have seemed to stray from behaviour as the unit of analysis in organizational behaviour. There is a widespread tendency for both scholars and practitioners to treat such hypothetical constructs as motivation, satisfaction and leadership as ends in themselves. We think it is time to re-emphasize the point that behaviours are the empirical reality, not the labels attached to the attempted explanation of the behaviours".

Robertson, Smith and Cooper (1992) refer to the "fundamental principle” of behaviourism “that human behaviour is learnt. This does not mean learnt only in the narrow sense of classroom teaching but means that all of our behaviour and behaviour patterns emerge as we grow and mature from early childhood onwards. There are few, if any, innate human patterns of behaviour (instincts). 

"(Another) major principle relates to the process by which this learning takes place. Behaviourists argue that specific behaviours are strengthened or weakened as a result of the consequences of that behaviour".

This approach can be applied to the control of workplace behaviour, using Skinner’s principles, as summarised by Campbell and Pritchard (1976): “to understand behavior and to control it, what we need to know are the reinforcement contingencies to which an individual or class of individuals has been responsive in the past”.

The operation of reinforcement and conditioning has been explored extensively by psychologists of most schools, and the basic principles are not in dispute (see, for example, Dobson et al, 1981; Gross, 1992; Atkinson et al, 1993; or Hayes, 1994). However, the application of reinforcement and stimulus-response mechanisms in human, and workplace, motivation is not clear-cut. Korman (1974) lists a variety of research supporting the conclusion that individuals will perform (behave) in a manner consistent with previous
reinforcement patterns. Dulany (1968) however conducted a series of studies in which subjects first had certain "rules" explained to them and then received reinforcements for behaviours which were incompatible with the rules. Dulany found that subjects consistently tended to act in accordance with the cognitively-absorbed rules rather than the reinforcement patterns. The influence of cognition must therefore be acknowledged in applying reinforcement theory to the study of motivation. Later attempts to do this centre around social learning theory, which will be discussed below.

**Needs Theories**

According to Deci (1992) "The need theories, with their growth-oriented view of the person and their emphasis on the 'higher-order' needs, represented an important impetus for the development of the newer management theories". Needs theories postulate underlying human needs which human beings strive to satisfy, resulting in specific behaviours. The origins of the putative needs are explained in a variety of ways, or not at all, by the different theorists. Campbell and Pritchard (1976) observe that: "Much of the history of this class of theory is rooted in theories of instincts which ... fell into disrepute soon after the turn of the century because of the propensity to postulate a specific need for almost every human act. Relative to human behavior, instincts were again made respectable when they were transformed to the concept of needs acquired through learning".

One attribute of needs theories is their ability to explain both the termination or extinction of behaviour, and its intensification. Jung (1978) points out:

"In the case of satisfying biological needs such as food, the restoration of deficits will terminate the motivated behavior at least temporarily. In the case of more socially based motives such as gaining social approval or recognition, the behavior may be persistent and apparently insatiable. As each goal is achieved, the individual may reset his or her target higher so that absolute fulfilment is never achieved and persistent attempts may be made over many years against often difficult obstacles".

U. Pareek (2004) cites classification of needs as Intrinsic vs Extrinsic needs. Intrinsic needs or motives are derived from the internal source within an individual or task. Extrinsic needs or motives are external, tangible and satisfied by others. Individuals differ in their patterns of needs. Some have higher intrinsic motivation, while others have stronger extrinsic needs.

The needs can be analysed along following four dimensions:

1. **Expressed vs wanted dimension**

Schutz (1958) has postulated two dimensions of three interpersonal needs viz. inclusion, affection, and control. Inclusion is the need to socialize and interact with people, affection is the need to be close and relate personally to people, and control is the need to influence.

The above three needs along with two dimensions for each will give 6 type of needs. (Table 3.6):
Table 3.6
Two Dimensions of Motives, Schutz,1958

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Expressed</th>
<th>Wanted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Expressed Inclusion</td>
<td>Wanted Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Expressed Affection</td>
<td>Wanted Affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Expressed Control</td>
<td>Wanted Affection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Approach vs Avoidance dimension

The approach-avoidance model was originally proposed by Atkinson (1953). This model has been used mostly with regards to achievement motivation. But it can be used for other needs such as control, affiliation, extension and dependency (Pareek, 2004). Any of these needs can be satisfied either by striving for the positive attainment of the goal (approach) or by reducing the possibilities of deprivation from goal attainment (avoidance).

Following table briefly explains the approach and avoidance dimensions of each motive, based respectively on hope or fear of something. The behaviour of an employee can thus be analysed not only in terms of the various motives, but also on the basis of a positive aspect (approach) vs a negative aspect (avoidance), reflected as hope or fear. (Pareek, 2004) (Table 3.7)

Table 3.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Approach (hope of)</th>
<th>Avoidance (fear of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Irrelevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Impacting</td>
<td>Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Chaos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Loneliness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from U. Pareek, 2004

3. Personal vs Interpersonal dimension

Though most needs are interpersonal in nature, like the needs of affiliation and power, there are certain needs which do not require any interpersonal context. Example of such needs are need for achievement, creativity, curiosity etc.

4. Individual vs Social dimension

Prayag Mehta (1994) has proposed that achievement and power motives have both individual and social aspects. A person who has a high need for personal achievement may have great
concern for his or her career and will adopt all possible means to achieve personal excellence. On the other hand, a person with a high need for social achievement would strive to work with others towards a common goal. Similarly, the personal power motive may be reflected in attempts to control others whereas a need for social power may be found in attempts to overcome obstacles or in collective action. Mehta has reported a difference between the needs of workers and of managers in a public sector company, showing that the former are characterized more by the social dimension and the latter by the personal dimension.

Let us now discuss the four of the most influential need theories of motivation:

**Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory**

The major proponent of The Need Hierarchy Theory was Abraham Maslow though there were several people preceding Maslow who developed somewhat similar formulations, and in recent years certain variants on the basic theory have been put forth. Abraham Maslow proposed a hierarchy of, initially, five “needs”:

**The Physiological Needs:**
In the physiological category Maslow places the chemical needs of the body viz. sexual desire, hunger, sleepiness, activity needs, desired sensory satisfactions, and the like. When these needs are not satisfied, the individual becomes totally preoccupied with the object involved. (Miner, 1995)

**The Safety Needs:**
The need to be free of danger can have the same pervasive quality as the physiological needs. People are motivated to avoid things that might represent a threat to safety e.g. snakes, fire etc.

**The Love Needs:**
Maslow uses the word ‘love’ in a very comprehensive sense to include affiliation and general belongingness. (Maslow, 1943) This need includes the need for friends, spouses, children, parents, group membership etc. This need should be demarcated from sexual need which is in the domain of physiological needs.

**Esteem Needs:**
Esteem needs fall into two broad categories. There is first the type that is essentially internal in orientation like desires for such feelings as strength, achievement, adequacy, confidence, independence and freedom. In addition, esteem may derive from external sources, such as reputation, prestige, recognition, attention, importance, appreciation. In both internal and external cases, satisfaction of esteem needs results in self confidence and a sense of adequacy. Thwarting of esteem needs produces feelings of inferiority and helplessness.

**The Need for Self Actualization:**
It refers to the desire to realize or actualize one’s full potential, in Maslow’s words, “to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming” (Maslow, 1943)
While elaborating the construct of self actualization need, Maslow has outlined certain values espoused by the so called self actualized people and examples of the deprivation of such values. (Table 3.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Deprivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Truth</td>
<td>Dishonesty, disbelief, mistrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goodness</td>
<td>Evil, utter selfishness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Beauty</td>
<td>Ugliness, vulgarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transcendence of dichotomies</td>
<td>Black and white dichotomies, low synergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aliveness, process</td>
<td>Deadness, emptiness, robotizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unity, Wholeness</td>
<td>Chaos, atomism, disintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Uniqueness</td>
<td>Sameness, Uniformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perfection</td>
<td>Sloppiness, Poor workmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Necessity</td>
<td>Accident, Unpredictability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Completion, finality</td>
<td>Incompleteness, cessation of striving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Justice</td>
<td>Injustice, lawlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Order</td>
<td>Chaos, breakdown of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Simplicity</td>
<td>Overcomplexity, confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Richness, totality,</td>
<td>Poverty, loss of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Effortlessness</td>
<td>Fatigue, strain, gracelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Playfulness</td>
<td>Grimness, depression, cheerlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Self-sufficiency</td>
<td>Dependence, contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Meaningfulness</td>
<td>Meaninglessness, despair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Relationships among needs:
Maslow arranges the physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization needs in a hierarchy. Maslow calls this arrangement as a hierarchy of prepotency. In this hierarchy of prepotency, arranged physiological needs are most prepotent and hence to be satisfied first. In this order, self-actualization need comes at the last. When a need is satisfied it disappears for all practical purposes as a motivating force and is replaced by needs at a higher level.

The five needs propounded by Maslow can be summarized as follows:
Maslow's Five Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physiological needs</th>
<th>Safety needs</th>
<th>Love needs</th>
<th>Esteem needs</th>
<th>Self-actualisation needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>such as hunger, thirst or sex</td>
<td>for protection against danger, deprivation or threat.</td>
<td>to belong, to be accepted, to give and receive friendship and love.</td>
<td>(I) for self-esteem, self-confidence, achievement and independence. (ii) for esteem from others, status, recognition and (deserved) respect.</td>
<td>to realise one's full potential, for continuous self-development, to be whatever one is capable of being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To these five needs Maslow added the needs to know and to understand. According to Adair (1990):

"Maslow allowed that there are two other sets of needs which found no place in the ... hierarchical order, and he felt it necessary to recognize them while making it clear that at present psychologists had little to say about them. He suggested, however, that the principle of a hierarchy of prepotency might also apply in both cases, albeit in a shadowy form. In contemporary presentations of Maslow's theory of needs in management education, these two scales are usually and unfortunately omitted altogether".

The principle of prepotency argues that each need must be substantially satisfied before the next need assumes the major role in determining behaviour.

For example, once physiological needs are satisfied: "At once other (and 'higher') needs emerge and these, rather than physiological hungers, dominate the organism. And when these, in turn are satisfied, again new (and 'still higher') needs emerge and so on. This is what we mean by saying that the basic human needs are organized into a hierarchy of relative prepotency. ... One main implication of this phrasing is that gratification becomes as important a concept as deprivation in motivation theory" (Maslow, 1943).

Thus needs only emerge when more prepotent needs have been gratified. Needs "cease to play an active determining or organizing role as soon as they are gratified. A satisfied need is not a motivator - it has ceased to exist. ... This point ... has been either overlooked or contradicted in every theory of motivation I know". "Just as a sated man no longer feels hungry, a safe man no longer feels endangered" (Maslow, 1943).

The emergence of a new need after satisfaction of the prepotent need is "not a sudden, saltatory phenomenon but rather a gradual emergence by slow degrees from nothingness" (Maslow, 1943). There is also a degree of co-existence of needs from different levels of the hierarchy:
"The average member of our society is most often partially satisfied and partially unsatisfied in all of his wants. The hierarchy principle is usually empirically observed in terms of increasing percentages of non-satisfaction as we go up the hierarchy". (Maslow, 1943).

Maslow considered that needs were usually unconscious, although not necessarily so. Also, the order of the hierarchy is not fixed, "but actually ... is not nearly so rigid as we may have implied" (Maslow, 1943).

Maslow has some comments about individual needs groupings, beginning with physiological needs

"Undoubtedly these physiological needs are the most prepotent of all needs. ... A person who is lacking food, safety, love, and esteem would probably hunger for food more strongly than for anything else. ... If all the needs are unsatisfied, and the organism is then dominated by the physiological needs, all other needs may become simply non-existent or pushed into the background".

Safety needs are not explored in any depth, but social and belonging needs are accorded some clarification.

"If both the physiological and the safety needs are fairly well gratified, then there will emerge the love and affection and belongingness needs, and the whole cycle already described will repeat itself with this center. ... (the person) will hunger for affectionate relations with people in general, namely, for a place in his group, and he will strive with great intensity to achieve this goal. ... In our society the thwarting of these needs is the most commonly found core in cases of maladjustment and more severe psychopathology. If both the physiological and the safety needs are fairly well gratified, then there will emerge the love and affection and belongingness needs, and the whole cycle already described will repeat itself with this center. ... (the person) will hunger for affectionate relations with people in general, namely, for a place in his group, and he will strive with great intensity to achieve this goal".

Maslow also expands on the esteem needs, which:

"may be classified into two subsidiary sets. These are, first, the desire for strength, for achievement, for adequacy, for confidence in the face of the world, and for independence and freedom. Secondly we have what we may call the desire for reputation or prestige (defining it as respect or esteem from other people, recognition, attention, importance or appreciation"

"All people in our society (with a few pathological exceptions) have a need or desire for a stable, firmly-based (usually) high evaluation of themselves, for self-respect, or self-esteem, and for the esteem of others. By firmly-based self-esteem we mean that which is soundly based on real capacity, achievement and respect from others. Thwarting of (the esteem) needs produces feelings of inferiority, of weakness and of helplessness. These feelings in turn give rise to either basic discouragement or else compensatory or neurotic trends"

Maslow defines self-actualisation in the following terms: "What a man can be, he must be". Self-actualization "refers to the desire to become actualized in what he is potentially". He goes on to comment "Since, in our society, basically satisfied people are the exception, we do not know much about self-actualization, either experimentally or clinically".

The "additional" needs - the desires to know and to understand, are characterised by Maslow as needs to "systematize, to organize, to look for relations and meanings". These desires: "are
themselves conative, ie, have a striving character, and are as much personality needs as the 'basic needs' we have already discussed. Maslow acknowledges that

“reversals of the average order of the hierarchy are sometimes observed. Also it has been observed that an individual may permanently lose the higher wants in the hierarchy under special conditions. ... In certain people the level of aspiration may be permanently deadened or lowered”

"There are some people in whom, for instance, self-esteem seems to be more important than love. ... There are other, apparently innately creative people in whom the drive to creativeness seems to be more important than any other counter-determinant. Their creativeness might appear not as self-actualization released by basic satisfaction, but in spite of lack of basic satisfaction

"Another cause of reversal of the hierarchy is that when a need has been satisfied for a long time, this need may be underevaluated. People who have never experienced chronic hunger are apt to underestimate its effects and to look upon food as a rather unimportant thing".

"What we have claimed is that the person will want the more basic of two needs when deprived of both. There is no necessary implication here that he will act upon his desires. Let us say again that there are many determinants of behavior other than the needs and desires"

"Perhaps more important than all these exceptions are the ones that involve ideals, high social standards, high values and the like. With such values people become martyrs; they will give up everything for the sake of a particular ideal, or value".

Maslow contended that environmental conditions facilitated or impeded the satisfaction of basic needs. Amongst these “immediate prerequisites” he included: freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of self-defence, justice, fairness, honesty, “orderliness of the group”, and “danger to the cognitive capacities” (perceptual, intellectual, learning). “Danger to these is reacted to almost as if it were a direct danger to the basic needs themselves” and "any thwarting or possibility of thwarting of these basic human goals, or danger to the defenses which protect them, or to the conditions upon which they rest, is considered to be a psychological threat".

Evaluation of Maslow’s theory:

A number of logical criticisms have been raised against need hierarchy theory (Locke, 1976). For example, the inherent nature and logical consistency of the various need groupings have been questioned. The concept of self actualization is also vague and not easily amenable for scientific testing for validation.

But the invaluable contribution of Maslow is summarized by Miner (1995) thus: “... as a theoretical statement what Maslow has written leaves much to be desired. Yet one cannot read him without recognizing a genuine desire to grapple intellectually with extremely important topics and to consider anything that appears to offer contradictory evidence. His writings offer a stimulating portrayal of an outstanding mind in action and perhaps a self-actualizing person .........Even if parts of the theory are untestable and even unintelligible and major logical inconsistencies exist, there still remains a sizable body of the theory that does nor suffer from these deficiencies.”
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Maslow's ideas have been inspirational for many subsequent theorists, including "such prominent behavioural psychologists as Rensis Likert and Chris Argyris" (Adair, 1990), and to generations of managers. They have an "instinctive" appeal, which is all the more surprising since attempts to test them empirically have, overall, met with very little success. Korman (1974) remarks:

"As incredible as it may seem, considering the popularity of his arguments, there is little research support for (the hierarchy of motives) anywhere in the literature with which this author is acquainted. Of four studies that have directly tested his propositions, three found little or no support for them ..., while one found moderate support ... In addition, factor analyses of questionnaires aimed at measuring the Maslow needs have resulted in conflicting findings; some found that the items did not group together in the manner proposed by the theory ... whereas others have found the predicted relationships".

One reason for the difficulty of empirical verification is suggested by Robertson, Smith and Cooper (1992):

"Since Maslow appeared to be more concerned with the conceptual status of his theory and less concerned with its empirical referents, he did not define his needs with precision or practicality in mind. One obstacle to an empirical testing of his theory, therefore, is the difficulty of defining the various needs in operational terms. This means that not only can there be no guarantee of and exact equivalence between the original conception of such needs as esteem and self-actualization and attempts by later researchers to define them operationally, but there is also considerable variation among the definitions used in the empirical research field."

Robertson et al also mention Maslow's failure to deal with environmental issues "despite wide recognition among psychologists that behaviour can only be fully understood as a result of the interaction of individual and environmental characteristics". They go on to say: "One problem in trying to relate the theory to work process lies in the fact that people do not necessarily satisfy their higher-order needs through their jobs or occupation; to test this part of the theory in formal organizations would first of all require information about all the life areas in which people seek to satisfy their higher needs".

Adair (1990) complains of the difficulty in separating the various needs at a practical level, observing that "the needs for order, for closure, for completion of the art, for system, and for structure may be indiscriminately assigned either to cognitive, conative, or aesthetic, or even to neurotic needs".

Despite these difficulties, which tend to make the design of empirical tests of the theory problematic, attempts have been made to verify Maslow's postulation. Porter (1964) surveyed some 2000 members of the American Managers Association using a questionnaire asking respondents to assess how strongly each need in the hierarchy was felt, how much of each need there "should" be, and how important each need was believed to be. Porter found that managerial level had no significant impact at the "basic" levels (i.e., physiological, safety and love needs), but senior managers placed greater importance on the higher levels (defined as autonomy in this context, and self actualisation) than did the more junior managers. The size of the company did not appear to affect the findings. One explanation advanced for these results is that a prepotency mechanism is indeed operating, and lower-order needs are less likely to be satisfied at the junior levels of management than at the top. Campbell and
Pritchard (1976), however, suggest two other explanations. First, that self-selection is causing bias: “people with certain kinds of needs wind up in certain kinds of jobs”, and second, that “certain kinds of jobs provide certain kinds of outcomes that both stimulate and satisfy a particular kind of need”.

Hall and Nougaim (1968) measured the strengths of felt needs and the degree of need-satisfaction of a group of 49 managers, in the communications company AT and T, annually in a longitudinal study over five years. Their study ignored physiological needs but addressed the other four levels of Maslow's hierarchy. They found no evidence to support the prepotency principle and there were some indications that an opposite effect was occurring in some cases.

Lawler and Suttle (1972) conducted a longitudinal study on 187 (initially) managers in two organisations; one group re-surveyed after six months and another after twelve months. They also ignored physiological needs but inserted a separate category, “autonomy”, between Maslow’s esteem and self-actualisation needs. They formulated several hypotheses based on Maslow’s model, of which the following are especially notable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The satisfaction of needs in one category should correlate negatively with the importance of these same needs and positively with the importance of needs in the next higher level of the hierarchy”.</td>
<td>“There are only two significant correlations. ... when security is high its significance is low ... when security satisfaction is high social needs are more important. ... Otherwise the hypothesis is not supported”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Changes in the satisfaction of needs in one category should correlate negatively with changes in the importance of needs in the same category, and positively with changes in the importance of needs on the next higher level of the hierarchy”.</td>
<td>“There is a general tendency ... which indicates that increases in the satisfaction of a need are associated with decreases in its importance, but only two of the ten correlations are significant. ... This would indicate that changes in the satisfaction of lower level needs are not associated with changes in the importance of higher level needs”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“High satisfaction of the needs in one category ... should be associated with low importance of the needs in the same category ... and with high importance of the needs in the next higher category of the hierarchy...”.</td>
<td>“Neither table offers any support for the idea that the satisfaction of a need leads to it becoming less important in the future”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lawler and Suttle conclude that “the data from these analyses offered little support for the view set forth by Maslow and others that human needs are arranged in a multilevel hierarchy”. However, they qualify this view a little in the following terms: "Research on the effects of starvation and thirst shows that when people are hungry or thirsty they often can
think of little else and their social relationships deteriorate. ... This would seem to provide some support for the hierarchical need concept but only for lower-level needs.

Lawler (1973) later developed this idea to suggest that a “two-step hierarchy” might exist, with “existence and security needs” at the lower level and all the higher-order needs at the next:

"This line of thinking leads to the prediction that unless these lower-order needs are satisfied, the others will not come into play. However, which higher-order needs come into play after the lower ones are satisfied and in what order cannot be predicted. If anything, it seems that most people are simultaneously motivated by several of the same-level needs. On the other hand, people do not seem to be simultaneously motivated by needs from the two different levels".

Robertson, Smith and Cooper (1992) refer to the “two-factor aspect of the theory”, which is “reflected in the hypothesis that the lower needs decline in strength on satisfaction while higher needs grow in strength on satisfaction”.

Campbell and Pritchard (1976) conclude that “what data there are suggest that the Maslow hierarchy is not as powerful and robust a notion as some people assume”. Adair (1990) is a little kinder: “those academic psychologists and psychiatrists who have read Maslow have received his theory with cautious but unmistakable interest as a stimulating if puzzling contribution to our knowledge of man”.

**Alderfer’s ERG Theory**

ERG theory was developed by Alderfer (1969) to deal with certain of the shortcomings that have been noted in the original need hierarchy formulation. Alderfer (1969) developed a “threefold conceptualization of human needs”. These three “core needs that (a human being) strives to meet ... include obtaining his material existence needs, maintaining his interpersonal relatedness with significant other people, and seeking opportunities for his unique personal development and growth”.

In Alderfer’s theory, usually known as E R G theory, “lack of satisfaction at one level leads to stronger need at the level below” and “satisfaction at one level leads to stronger need at the level above”. Lawler and Suttle (1972) observe that, “Alderfer differs from Maslow in his hypothesis that the lack of satisfaction of higher order needs can lead to lower order needs becoming more important. He also assumes that all needs are simultaneously active and thus, prepotency does not play as major a role in his theory as it does in Maslow’s”.

Campbell and Pritchard (1976) provide a useful summary of Alderfer’s propositions, together with their own commentary:

"(a) the less a need is satisfied the more it is desired.

(b) the less a 'higher order' need is satisfied, the more lower order needs are desired

(c) the more a need is satisfied the more higher order needs are desired
The term higher order is not used in the Maslow sense but refers to the level of concreteness in the need objects. Existence needs simply have more concrete referents than relatedness needs and relatedness need objects are less ambiguous than growth need objects.

A rationale for (a) above is older than psychology. The explanation for (b) is not quite so self-evident and is based on the notion that if one type of need desire is frustrated the individual will seek to satisfy desires with more concrete referents. The progression up the hierarchy, as in (c), occurs because satisfaction of existence or relatedness desires frees the individual from the effort required to satisfy and he or she can then turn to relatedness or growth.

"Thus, contrary to Maslow's notion of prepotency, the need is always there and consciously recognized. It is the means to pursue it that is at issue here".

The ERG theory corresponds to Maslow's theory as shown in Table 3.10 (Miner, 1995):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alderfer</th>
<th>Maslow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence Needs</td>
<td>Physiological needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness Needs</td>
<td>Safety needs of a material type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety needs of an interpersonal type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Love or belongingness needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Needs</td>
<td>Esteem needs of an interpersonal type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esteem needs that are self-confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self actualization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its original form, ERG theory set forth seven basic propositions regarding need relationships (Miner, 1995):

1. The less existence needs are satisfied, the more they will be desired.
2. The less relatedness needs are satisfied, the more existence needs will be desired.
3. The more existence needs are satisfied, the more they will be they desired.
4. The less relatedness needs are satisfied, the more they will be desired.
5. The less the growth needs are satisfied, the more relatedness needs will be desired.
6. The more relatedness needs are satisfied, the more growth needs will be desired.
7. The more the growth needs are satisfied, the more they will be desired.

In order to test ERG theory against Maslow's ideas, Alderfer conducted a questionnaire study on "110 employees at several job levels from a bank". He found that "none of the
satisfaction scales, formed by summing the individual items, showed significant correlations ... in the direction predicted by Maslow's theory”. The results tended rather “to support ERG theory more than Maslow’s theory or the simple frustration hypothesis”, although Alderfer did acknowledge that he was researching in a single organisation and “there is no way of knowing what special conditions in that organization may have favored the particular outcomes observed here”. He was also unsure whether he had “adequately operationalized” Maslow’s constructs.

Revised ERG

In number of instances when the research data did not consistently support ERG propositions, Alderfer proposed several inductive revisions of his seven original theoretical statements which are as follows(Miner,1995):

2. When both existence and relatedness needs are relatively dissatisfied, the less relatedness needs are satisfied, the more existence needs will be desired.

4. When relatedness needs are relatively dissatisfied, the less relatedness needs are satisfied, the more they will be desired; when relatedness needs are relatively satisfied, the more relatedness needs are satisfied, the more they will be desired.

6. When both relatedness and growth needs are relatively satisfied, the more relatedness needs are satisfied, the more growth needs will be desired.

7. When growth needs are relatively dissatisfied, the less growth needs are satisfied, the more they will be desired; when growth needs are relatively satisfied, the more growth needs are satisfied, the more they will be desired.

Alderfer, Kaplan and Smith (1974) have provided confirmatory evidence for the revised proposition 4 in a carefully controlled laboratory study using practicing managers as subjects. The predicted curvilinear relationship between relatedness satisfaction and desire was obtained. Furthermore, Wanous and Zwanay (1977) obtained some evidence of curvilinear relationships in a study of 208 telephone company employees. This study is of additional significance because it utilized measures of ERG needs differing from those developed by Alderfer and still obtained a factor structure closely approximating the ERG classification.(Miner,1995)

Motivation Hygiene Theory by Herzberg

Following a literature review covering 155 books and journal articles, Herzberg concluded that, “there was a difference in the primacy of factors, depending on whether the investigator was looking for things the worker liked about his job or things he disliked” (Herzberg et al, 1957).

After two pilot studies, Herzberg and colleagues conducted an extensive study in and around Pittsburgh, interviewing 203 “engineers and accountants” working in eight companies involved in design and construction of machinery, and one “major utility”. Their definitions of the job titles are rather broad. In the category “engineers” they “included all individuals who had any design function whatsoever. ... Many ... did design or technical work only. Some
also had supervisory functions” (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959). Of accountants, Herzberg et al comment:

“Many individuals in industry are called accountants; they may or may not have genuine professional duties. Our solution was to include in the sample all personnel involved in the fiscal activities of the company ... down to the lowest rank at which judgmental functions are exercised”.

Herzberg et al adopted self-report as the most appropriate source of raw data: “We decided to ask people to tell us stories about times when they felt exceptionally good or bad about their jobs” (Herzberg et al, 1959).

Herzberg (1993) later referred to this approach as “the sequence of events (critical incident) technique”. Data were collected using “semistructured interviews” in which “the interviewer raises previously specified questions but is free to pursue lines of inquiry suggested during the course of the interview” (Herzberg et al, 1959).

Once the raw data had been collected, analysis began with the breaking-down of the “sequences” into “thought units”, defined as “a statement about a single event or condition that led to a feeling, a single characterization of a feeling, or a description of a single event” (Herzberg et al, 1959). The recorded “thought units” were then coded. Initially, a sample of 5000 were subjected to a simple affinity analysis: “put into the same pile the cards that seem to go together” (Herzberg et al, 1959), then appropriate labels were determined for the various kinds of thought unit identified. Consistency was assured by having the activities carried out independently by different members of the research team, then comparing results until an agreed set of criteria was established.

Herzberg et al identified three primary groupings of thought units, which they called first-level factors, second-level factors, and effects. “Each category included within itself many subcategories” (Herzberg et al, 1959). Effectively, they recorded (a) what happened, (b) what it meant to the individual concerned, and (c) what outcome resulted. The definitions of the factors and effects adopted by the research team are as follows:

First-level factors: “A description of the objective occurrences during the sequence of events, with special emphasis on those identified by the respondent as being related to his attitudes, eg, a promotion”.

"One of our most valuable analyses" “we define a first-level factor as an objective element of the situation in which the respondent finds a source for his good or bad feelings about the job”.

Second-level factors: “These categorize the reasons given by respondents for their feelings; they may be used as a basis for inferences about the drives or needs which are met or which fail to be met during the sequence or events; eg ... ‘I felt good because the promotion meant I was being recognized’”.

Effects: “Attitudinal effects beyond the behavioral level involved in productivity, turnover, or interpersonal relations. Specification of mental health effects was also attempted”.
A total of 14 first-level factors were identified:

Table 3.11
Herzberg et al, 1959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>&quot;Some act of notice, praise or blame was involved. ... Note that we had many sequences in which the central event was some act, such as a promotion or a wage increase, which was not itself accompanied by verbal recognition but which was perceived by the respondent as a source of feelings of recognition. These sequences were coded under &quot;recognition second level&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>&quot;Our definition of achievement also included its opposite, failure, and the absence of achievement. Stories involving some specifically mentioned success were put into this category&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of Growth</td>
<td>&quot;Changes in his situation involving objective evidences that the possibilities for his growth were now increased or decreased. ... included in this category were stories in which a new element in the situation made it possible for the respondent to learn new skills or to acquire a new professional outlook&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>&quot;Used only when there was an actual change in the status or position of the person in the company&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>&quot;All sequences of events in which compensation plays a role. Surprisingly enough, virtually all of these involve wage or salary increases, or unfulfilled expectations of salary increase&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>&quot;Restricted ... to those stories in which there was some actual verbalisation about the characteristics of the interaction between the person speaking and some other individual. We set this up in terms of three major categories: - superior; - subordinate; - peers. ... A sociotechnical story involves interpersonal relations that arise when people interact in the performance of their jobs. A &quot;purely social&quot; story would relate interactions that took place within working hours and on the premises of work but independent of the activities of the job ... as it turned out we had virtually no stories of the purely social kind&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-Technical</td>
<td>&quot;In which the competence or incompetence, fairness or unfairness of the supervisor were the critical characteristics&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>&quot;Includes those sequences of events in which the person speaking reported that he derived satisfaction from being given responsibility for his own work or for the work of others or being given new responsibility. It also includes stories in which there was a loss of satisfaction or a negative attitude towards the job stemming from a lack of responsibility. In cases, however, in which the story revolved around a wide gap between a person's authority and the authority he needed to carry out his job responsibilities the factor identified was 'company policy and administration'&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policies</td>
<td>&quot;Lines of communication crossing in such a way that he does not really know for whom he is working, in which he has inadequate authority for satisfactory completion of his task, or in which company policy is not carried out because of inadequate organization of the work. The second kind of over-all characteristic of the company involved not inadequacy but the harmfulness or beneficial effects of the company's policies. These are primarily personnel policies. These policies, when viewed negatively, are not described as ineffective, but rather as 'malevolent'&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>&quot;The physical conditions of work, the amount of work, or facilities for doing the work&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>&quot;The actual doing of the job or the tasks of the job as a source of good or bad feelings about it&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors in Personal Life</td>
<td>&quot;Situations in which some aspect of the job affected personal life in such a way that the effect was a factor in the respondent's feelings about his job&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>&quot;Only when the respondent actually mentioned some sign or appurtenance of status as being a factor in his feelings about the job&quot;. For example, having a secretary, company car, eating facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>&quot;Objective signs of presence or absence of job security&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"The material analysed for second-level factors came from a respondent’s answer to the question; ‘what did these events mean to you?’ " (Herzberg et al, 1959). A total of 11 such factors was identified (Herzberg et al, 1959):

1. Feelings of recognition
2. Feelings of achievement
3. Feelings of possible growth, blocks to growth, first-level factors perceived as evidence of actual growth
4. Feelings of responsibility, lack of responsibility, or diminished responsibility
5. Group feelings: feelings of belonging or isolation, socio-technical or purely social
6. Feelings of interest or lack of interest in the performance of the job
7. Feelings of increased or decreased status
8. Feelings of increased or decreased security
9. Feelings of fairness or unfairness
10. Feelings of pride or of inadequacy or guilt
11. Feelings about salary

Herzberg identified four kinds of “major effects”, although one is sub-divided. They are as follows:

1. Performance
2. Turnover
3. Mental health
4. Interpersonal relationships

Analysis of the data led to observations which Herzberg developed into the “two factor theory” which has been familiar to business and management students ever since:

"The findings of these studies, along with corroboration from many other investigations using different procedures, suggest that the factors involved in producing job satisfaction (and motivation) are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. Since separate factors need to be considered, depending on whether job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction is being examined, it follows that these two feelings are not opposites of each other".

"The opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction, but, rather, no job satisfaction; and similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction, but no job dissatisfaction” (Herzberg, 1968). Herzberg noted that: "When our respondents reported feeling happy with their jobs, they most frequently described factors related to their tasks, to events that indicated to them that they were successful in the performance of their work, and to the possibility of professional growth.... When feelings of unhappiness were reported, they were not associated with the job itself but with conditions that surround the doing of the job. These events suggest to the individual that the context in which he performs his work is unfair or disorganized and as such represents to him an unhealthy psychological work environment. Factors involved in these situations we call factors of hygiene, for they act in a manner analogous to the principles..."
of medical hygiene. Hygiene operates to remove health hazards from the environment of man. It is not a curative, it is, rather, a preventive. Modern garbage disposal, water purification, and air-pollution control do not cure diseases, but without them we should have many more diseases" (Herzberg et al, 1959).

These “Hygiene factors” are “rarely instrumental in bringing about high job attitudes” and “focus not on the job itself but rather on the characteristics of the context in which the job is done: working conditions, interpersonal relationships, supervision, company policies, administration of these policies, effects on the worker's personal life, job security, and salary. This is a basic distinction. The satisfiers relate to the actual job. Those factors that do not act as satisfiers describe the job situation" (Herzberg et al, 1959).

The breakdown of the factors into Hygiene factors and Motivators is illustrated graphically by Herzberg et al (1959):

In the chart, factors which occurred in stories relating low job-attitudes are shown to the left, and factors which occurred in stories relating high job-attitudes are shown to the right. The length of the bar indicates the frequency with which the factor was mentioned, and the (vertical) thickness of the bar indicates the frequency with which the factor led to “long-range attitude change”. Herzberg draws attention to the factors “Achievement” and “Recognition”, shaded differently in the diagram, which “portray a reversal in the long-range ratio. The attitudinal effects of both these factors were substantially more short-range” (Herzberg et al, 1959).
The chart illustrates Herzberg's findings that, with two exceptions, most of the factors are clearly associated either with high or with low feelings about the job. Of recognition, Herzberg explains the extension of this factor into the low feelings area with the comment: "Unless recognition gives accurate feedback on performance, it takes on hygiene dynamics, is seen as interpersonal evaluation, and is frequently a dissatisfier" (Herzberg et al, 1959). The implication that recognition only acts as a satisfier if the recipient believes it to be deserved is further explained by associating it with achievement: "Achievement can stand independently of recognition as a source of good feelings about the job. Recognition is somewhat more rarely independent of achievement" (Herzberg et al, 1959).

The factor of "Salary" also had potential to act as a satisfier and as a dissatisfier. Herzberg discusses this in the following terms:

"Salary ... appears as frequently in the high sequences as it does in the low sequences. This is true, however, only when we compare totals, combining short- and long-range attitude changes. If we examine ... duration of attitude change, we find that in the lows salary is found almost three times as often in the long-range as in the short-range sequences. For the high job-attitude stories salary is about equal in both directions. It would seem that as an affector of job attitudes salary has more potency as a job dissatisfier than as a job satisfier".

Herzberg found that 81% of the factors contributing to job satisfaction were motivators, that is: Achievement, Recognition for achievement, The work itself, Responsibility, and Growth or advancement whilst 69% of factors "contributing to employees' dissatisfaction over their work" involved hygiene elements: Company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status and security (Herzberg, 1968). He interpreted these findings thus:

"... the wants of employees divide into two groups. One group revolves around the need to develop in one's occupation as a source of personal growth. The second group operates as an essential base to the first and is associated with fair treatment in compensation, supervision, working conditions, and administrative practices" (Herzberg et al, 1959).

It follows that there is little or no connection between the two sets of factors. Herzberg positions this as follows:

"Theoretically, given an individual operating from a neutral point, with neither positive nor negative attitudes towards his job, the satisfaction of the factors, which we may call the 'satisfiers,' would increase his job satisfaction beyond the neutral point. The absence of satisfaction to these factors would merely drop him back to this neutral level but would not turn him into a dissatisfied employee. Contrariwise, there should be a group of factors that would act as 'dissatisfiers.' The satisfying of the factors, however, would not create a happy employee" (Herzberg et al, 1959).

and goes on to provide an explanation:

"The factors that lead to positive job attitudes do so because they satisfy the individual's need for self-actualization in his work.

... Man tends to actualize himself in every area of his life, and his job is one of the most important areas. The conditions that surround the doing of the job cannot give him this basic satisfaction; they do not have this potentiality."
... Factors in the job context meet the needs of the individual for avoiding unpleasant situations ... the job factors reward the needs of the individual to reach his aspirations. These effects on the individual can be conceptualized as actuating approach rather than avoidance behavior" (Herzberg et al, 1959).

"It is clear why the hygiene factors fail to provide for positive satisfactions: they do not possess the characteristics necessary for giving an individual a sense of growth. To feel that one has grown depends on achievement in tasks that have meaning to the individual, and since the hygiene factors do not relate to the task, they are powerless to give such meaning to the individual. Growth is dependent on some achievements, but achievement requires a task. The motivators are task factors and thus are necessary for growth; they provide the psychological stimulation by which the individual can be activated toward his self-realization needs" (Herzberg et al, 1959).

"Two different needs of man are involved here. One set of needs can be thought of as stemming from his animal nature - the built-in drive to avoid pain from the environment, plus all the learned drives which become conditioned to the basic biological needs. For example, hunger, a basic biological drive, makes it necessary to earn money, and then money becomes a specific drive. The other set of needs relates to that unique human characteristic, the ability to achieve and, through achievement, to experience psychological growth" (Herzberg, 1968).

This helps to explain why salary is listed among the hygiene factors, when the popular conception might hold it to be a motivating force. Herzberg argues that, except where it operates as “a reinforcement of the motivators of recognition and achievement”, salary meets avoidance needs; first “avoidance of the economic deprivation that is felt when actual income is insufficient” and second “and generally of more significance in the times and for the kind of people covered by our study, ... the need to avoid being treated unfairly” (Herzberg et al, 1959).

Herzberg’s ideas were received enthusiastically by American industry, and he devoted much of his subsequent career to consultancy work. His theory necessarily involved the concept that improved performance would follow from making jobs intrinsically more stimulating, and that rewards and incentives are not in themselves motivating. Such incentives, moreover, have to be continually reapplied and increased, otherwise they become simply part of the general hygiene of the job and lose their power to motivate. "Yet good hygiene cannot be an end in itself; it is merely a beginning. As we have pointed out, an overemphasis on hygiene carries within itself the seeds of trouble. It can lead to a greater and greater focus on the extraneous rewards that reside in the context of jobs. Our emphasis should be on the strengthening of motivators. The slogan could almost be raised, 'Hygiene is not enough' " (Herzberg et al, 1959).

Poor hygiene could have the effect of depressing performance below the notional norm, and improvements to hygiene factors in such a case would be likely to result in some improvement in productivity. This would, though, be misleading, since the norm would then be the maximum level attainable. Only by improving the motivaator factors could significant productivity gains be realised. “All we can expect from satisfying the needs for hygiene is the prevention of dissatisfaction and poor job performance” (Herzberg et al, 1959).

This was understandably popular with managers keen to improve productivity without increasing costs. Herzberg believed that “job enrichment”, meaning the redesign of jobs and
working conditions to maximise the motivating factors, would result in improved productivity. The emphasis on motivators would distract employees' attention from hygiene concerns:

"Implied in The Motivation To Work is the admonition to industry that the lack of 'motivators' in jobs will increase the sensitivity of employees to real or imagined bad job hygiene, and consequently the amount and quality of hygiene given to employees must be constantly improved" (Herzberg, 1966).

“There seems to be good evidence that when workers are forced to seek satisfaction only through hygiene, they must either strike or give up their motivators and become addicted to hygiene” (Herzberg, 1993).

Herzberg felt able to make the association between the “high job attitudes” he identified with the motivator factors, and improved productivity because of observations made during the Pittsburgh research: "Note that almost three out of four high sequences involved an improvement in performance as a result of an improved attitude on the job”. (Herzberg et al, 1959).

In this respect Herzberg’s findings confirmed his prior belief: “There is frequent evidence for the often suggested opinion that positive job attitudes are favourable to increased productivity. The relationship is not absolute, but there are enough data to justify attention to attitude as a factor in improving the worker's output. However, the correlations obtained in many of the positive studies were low" (Herzberg et al, 1957) which must be read in the context of his acknowledgement that “we have no quantifiable measure of changes in output” in the Pittsburgh studies. The findings were based on self-report, “accompanied, for many, by a fairly precise and circumstantial account of the way in which this effect on productivity was perceived” (Herzberg et al, 1959).

Robertson, Smith and Cooper (1992) observe that “Herzberg’s theory has been roughly handled by academic critics”, both on the grounds of inadequate methodology, and for the conclusions Herzberg and his colleagues drew from their findings. “They claim that the two-factor nature of the theory is essentially an artifact of the interview technique”. The "emphasis on satisfaction/dissatisfaction criteria to the extent of neglecting behavioral criteria such as performance, absenteeism and labour turnover” is also cited by Robertson et al as a “further methodological shortcoming of Herzberg’s approach”.

The identification of job satisfaction with motivation is criticised by Vroom (1966) who observes "he appears to be arguing that the satisfiers are also motivators" although little evidence is produced for this. House and Wigdor (1967) observe that "... no data are presented by Herzberg to indicate a direct relationship between incidents involving intrinsic job characteristics and incidents containing self-reports of increased job performance".

Herzberg himself (1966) acknowledged some “valid criticisms” of the Pittsburgh study: first, that the sample was restricted to engineers and accountants and the theory could be said to have been overgeneralised. Second, that "because of the unreliability of many of its findings, psychological research is more suspect than research in the hard sciences", due mainly to the large number of variables involved. He also recognised a “further problem with our technique”:
"... the necessity for indicating in some detail to the respondents the kinds of behavior we wanted them to talk about. It would clearly have been more elegant methodologically to leave completely open the question of the effects and their nature. However, we discovered early in our pilot procedure that the respondents themselves wished some guidance as to the kind of material in which we were interested" (Herzberg et al, 1959).

However, he claimed that the study had been successfully replicated, with substantially the same results: "At least 16 other investigations, using a wide variety of populations (including some in the Communist countries), have since been completed, making the original research one of the most replicated studies in the field of job attitudes" (Herzberg, 1968). Later (Herzberg, 1993) he referred to "twelve replications. These studies, along with many others, confirm evidence of the two independent sets of factors".

Studies reported by other researchers have tended to support Herzberg’s theory weakly or not at all. Burke (1966) reports a study of 187 students who were asked to rank the importance of five motivators and five hygiene factors:

"The results clearly indicated the absence of a unidimensional attribute underlying both the motivators and the hygienes and suggests that Herzberg's 2-factor theory may be an oversimplified representation of job satisfaction. A literature review also showed that these 2 factors may not be independent. Nevertheless, the basic distinction between intrinsic job characteristics and environmental job characteristics seems to be a useful one for purposes of research".

In a similar study, Wood and LeBold surveyed “a national sample of over 3,000 engineering graduates”. Each engineer evaluated “an overall job satisfaction index and 34 questionnaire items by the personal importance of each item and the degree to which each characterized his current professional position. Factor analysis suggests that job satisfaction is multidimensional. A general job characteristic factor and a specific factor, Professional Challenge, tend to be most related to overall job satisfaction” (Wood and LeBold, 1970). Burke also lists fourteen other studies attempting to replicate Herzberg’s findings. Overall he found qualified support for the underlying premise, but results varied with occupational level, age, sex and type of job. The same factor could be either a motivator or a hygiene factor. Sometimes "a given factor was found to cause job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the same sample".

Jung (1978) reports “a survey commissioned by the US Department of Labor and conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan on a nationwide sample of 1,533 workers in 1969”. In this “the findings of Herzberg et al were ... confirmed. The factor 'enough pay' was ranked fifth in importance, whereas the highest ranking factor was interesting work".

House and Wigdor (1967) review thirty-one studies attempting to replicate all or part of Herzberg's research using "methods other than the storytelling method". They reach four conclusions:

1. A given factor can cause job satisfaction for one person and job dissatisfaction for another person, and vice versa
2. A given factor can cause job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the same sample
3. Intrinsic job factors are more important to both satisfying and dissatisfying job events
4. These conclusions lead us to agree with the criticism ... that the Two-Factor theory is an oversimplification of the relationships between motivation and satisfaction, and the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction

Wilde (1970) studied “290 female workers” and found that work itself was the major determinant of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. He found “no evidence of Herzberg's 'principle of duality'”. Supervisors were a source of both support and motivation. In the same job, 30% of subjects were satisfied and 70% dissatisfied, which Wilde considered to point to individual differences as the main determinants of attitudes.

Adair (1990) complains that "Herzberg's general view that 'supervision' ... is a hygiene factor obstinately ignores the fact that in many circumstances human relationships are as much intrinsic to the job as they are extrinsic".

Several reviewers (House and Wigdor, 1967; Jung, 1978; ACAS, 1992) agree that pay can be a source of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, largely for the reasons suggested by Herzberg.

Vroom considers that, even if two groups of factors appear to emerge from the studies,

"It is ... possible that obtained differences between stated sources of satisfaction and dissatisfactions stem from defensive processes within the individual respondent. Persons may be more likely to attribute the causes of satisfaction to their own achievements and accomplishments on the job. On the other hand, they may be more likely to attribute their dissatisfaction not to personal inadequacies or deficiencies, but to factors in the work environment; ie, obstacles presented by company policies or supervision" (Vroom, 1964).

Overall, Herzberg's theory is widely regarded as, at best, over-simplistic (Wood and LeBold, 1970; Adair, 1990). Adair refers to the "danger that Herzberg's dichotomy between 'satisfaction' and 'dissatisfaction', job content and job context, can become a Procrustean bed upon which all experience, suitably lopped and trimmed, must be made to fit. Herzberg's dualistic framework has a value as a stimulating and introductory visual sketch-map in teaching, but it becomes an over-simplification if taken beyond a certain point".

**Hackman's Theory of Work Motivation:**

Ray Hackman followed Herzberg as Research Director at the Psychological Service of Pittsburgh. His theory evolved out of certain reanalyses of the original Herzberg data. Subsequently he applied other instruments to the concepts thus derived, relying heavily on the use of factor analysis to identify his major theoretical variables (Hackman, 1969).

In reanalyzing the Herzberg data, Hackman distinguished between feelings and the events or conditions that stimulate them. He accepts the view that the sources of satisfaction are qualitatively distinct from the sources of dissatisfaction, and thus the idea of two separate continua. However, he substitutes the term stimulus seeker for motivation seeker, and he views Herzberg’s hygiene seekers as essentially emotional responders, not really seekers (Miner, 1995). The basic dimensions proposed by the theory are:

1. The characteristic level of activation or stimulation
2. The extent to which this energy is directed to some work activity
3. The extent to which work is viewed as a medium for exercising one's social, intellectual, perceptual, and motor skills to achieve closure experiences and accomplishment of tasks.

4. The extent to which work is viewed as a medium for exercising responsibility over other people and their work.

5. The extent to which work is viewed as an instrumental means to gain goals extrinsic to the work, such as security, money, and status.

6. The extent to which the work situation is viewed as threatening and generates anxiety.

7. The extent to which the work situation is viewed as irritating and generates aggressive reactions and hostility.

The first five dimensions are associated with satisfaction and positively linked with each other, and the last two are, though also related positively with each other, are associated with dissatisfaction. It is noteworthy, states Miner (1995) that, item 5 is an extrinsic, job context factor, and is linked with satisfaction.

**McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y**

In 1950 Douglas McGregor wrote, "... we cannot successfully force people to work for management's objectives. The ancient conception that people do the work of the world only if they are forced to do so by threats or intimidation, or by the camouflaged authoritarian methods of paternalism, has been suffering from a lingering fatal illness for a quarter of a century. I venture the guess that it will be dead in another decade" (McGregor, 1950).

By 1957 he had begun to recognise that this “ancient conception” showed little sign of dying from natural causes and that some intervention from himself would be needed to hasten its demise. His conference paper under the title “The Human Side of Enterprise” (McGregor, 1957) outlined the ideas which were later expanded into the book of the same title.

McGregor was heavily influenced by Maslow: "McGregor's (1960) formulation of the now famous managerial styles, theory X and theory Y, relied heavily on the idea that human motives were arranged in a hierarchy of prepotency" (Alderfer, 1969). “McGregor, influenced by views such as Maslow's (1943) proposal of work as a means of achieving self-actualization, was promoting the conception of Theory Y as the appropriate view of work motivation” (J Jung, 1978). "McGregor's writings, still ranked as the most influential of their genre in the world of industry, and his persuasive lectures were not the only means by which Maslow's views have been propagated to management audiences" (Adair, 1990). McGregor when initially proposing Theory Y, used Maslow’s theory as a foundation. (Deci, 1992).

However, McGregor is concerned with the application of Maslow’s ideas in an industrial or organisational context. He begins with some “oversimplified” generalisations:

1. Man is a wanting animal - as soon as one of his needs is satisfied, another appears in its place. This process is unending. It continues from birth to death, Man continually puts forth effort - works, if you please - to satisfy his needs.

2. Human needs are organized in a series of levels - a hierarchy of importance.
3. A satisfied need is not a motivator of behavior! This is a fact of profound significance which is ignored in the conventional approach to the management of people. He observes that “for many wage earners work is perceived as a form of punishment which is the price to be paid for various kinds of satisfaction away from the job” and commented that “we would hardly expect them to undergo more of this punishment than is necessary”. He further remarked that most of the “rewards typically provided the worker for satisfying his needs through his employment” can only be used when the worker is not actually at work: “wages, for example, cannot be spent at work”. Because of this, McGregor argues that incentive schemes violate “natural law” as a means of controlling behavior at work, because the rewards they offer can only be enjoyed outside the work environment. For example, pay can only be spent when not at work, pensions benefits are enjoyed on retirement, and so on. Behaviour at work is influenced mainly by rewards in the workplace, such as the approval of fellow workers. Workers tend to distrust management promises of the integrity of piece-work schemes, often believing that consistent over-performance “will lead to higher targets”, and in any case become adept at beating the system. Total costs to companies of operating and policing such schemes often exceed the benefits delivered.

Safety needs are also prominent in McGregor’s positioning of his ideas: “when (someone) feels threatened or dependent, his greatest need is for protection, for security”. (McGregor, 1957)

Echoing Maslow, McGregor suggests that thwarted needs, whether the basic physiological and safety needs, or the higher needs, are the equivalent of physical illness: “The man whose needs for safety, association, independence, or status are thwarted is sick, just as surely as is he who has rickets. And his sickness will have behavioral consequences”. (McGregor, 1957). McGregor argues that work must provide opportunities to satisfy the higher needs: “Unless there are opportunities at work to satisfy these higher-level needs, people will be deprived, and their behavior will reflect this deprivation. Under such conditions, if management continues to focus its attention on physiological needs, the mere provision of rewards is bound to be ineffective, and reliance on the threat of punishment will be inevitable”. (McGregor, 1957)

McGregor recognises that control in some form is a necessary part of management: “Successful management depends - not alone, but significantly - upon the ability to predict and control human behavior”. (McGregor, 1957). However, he maintains that this viewpoint has a fundamental flaw, because “there is no superhuman source of authority. There is no sound basis for expecting the individual to sacrifice his personal goals or needs for the organization (except possibly under crisis conditions) and there is no successful way to enforce this expectation if it does exist”. (McGregor, 1957)

McGregor argues that the attitudes of managers towards their workers are inevitably based on theory. In the absence of more formal theory, informal assemblies of assumptions about people and behaviour are used to guide and determine action. These assumptions also place limits on the attitudes that it is possible for an individual to hold:

"Virtually all significant technological developments wait on the formulation of relevant theory. Similarly, in the management of the human resources of industry, the assumptions and theories about human nature at any given time limit innovation. Possibilities are not
recognized, innovating efforts are not undertaken, until theoretical conceptions lay a
groundwork for them”. (McGregor, 1957)

Not all such informal theory is necessarily dysfunctional: “it is possible to have more or less
adequate theoretical assumptions”. However; useful or not, it is inescapable: “it is not possible
to reach a managerial decision uninfluenced by assumptions, whether adequate or not”. The
assumptions that are held by managers are vitally important to the health of their
organisations:

"Perhaps it is now clear that the all-important climate of the superior-subordinate relationship
is determined not by policy and procedure, nor by the personal style of the superior, but by the
subtle and frequently quite unconscious manifestations of his underlying conception of
management and his assumptions about people in general". (McGregor, 1957)

The theory which McGregor identified as underlying the prevailing attitudes, assumptions and
behaviour of American managers he designated Theory X. He was concerned to make it plain
that:

"Theory X is not a straw man for purposes of demolition, but is in fact a theory which
materially influences managerial strategy in a wide sector of American industry today,
Moreover, the principles of organization which comprise the bulk of the literature of
management could only have been derived from assumptions such as those of Theory X.
Other beliefs about human nature would have led inevitably to quite different organizational
principles". (McGregor, 1957)

The assumptions of Theory X are as follows:

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

Managers who subscribe to Theory X are likely to find their expectations confirmed, because
their own behaviour will cause reactions in their subordinates that accord with their
assumptions and “Theory X will appear to be validated, but only because we have mistaken
effects for causes”. (McGregor, 1957)

It is this self-fulfilling nature of the Theory X orientation which has enabled it to dominate
management thinking for so long.

McGregor’s formulation of the alternative approach was Theory Y:

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
The average human being does not inherently dislike work. Depending upon
controllable conditions, work may be a source of satisfaction (and will be voluntarily
performed) or a source of punishment (and will be avoided if possible).
2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means of bringing
about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and
self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.
3. **Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.** The most significant of such rewards, eg, the satisfaction of ego and self-actualization needs, can be direct products of effort directed toward organizational objectives.

4. **The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.** Avoidance of responsibility, lack of ambition, and emphasis on security are generally consequences of experience, not inherent human characteristics.

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.**

A manager whose underlying assumptions conform to Theory Y will have "a contrasting set of attitudes": He has a relatively high opinion of the intelligence and capacity of the average human being. He may well be aware that he is endowed with substantial capacity, but he does not perceive himself as a member of a limited elite. He sees most human beings as having real capacity for growth and development, for the acceptance of responsibility, for creative accomplishment. He regards his subordinates as genuine assets in helping him fulfill his own responsibilities, and he is concerned with creating the conditions which enable him to realize these assets. He does not feel that people in general are stupid, lazy, irresponsible, dishonest, or antagonistic. He is aware that there are such individuals, but he expects to encounter them only rarely. In short, he holds to Theory Y. The climate of the relationship created by such a manager ... will be vastly different. Among other things, he will probably practice effective delegation, thus providing his subordinates with opportunities to develop their own capabilities under his leadership. He will also utilize them as resources in helping him solve departmental problems. His use of participation will demonstrate his confidence in them. (McGregor, 1957)

McGregor argues that Theory Y leads to a climate of "integration", in which conditions are created which mean that members of an organisation can "achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise". Security is downgraded as a predominant goal for members of such an organisation, provided that individuals are able to participate in decisions which affect them.

McGregor believed that his approach would be ultimately beneficial to organisations in every way:

"If ... we accept assumptions like those of Theory Y, we will be challenged to innovate, to discover new ways of organizing and directing human effort, even though we recognize that the perfect organization, like the perfect vacuum, is practically out of reach". (McGregor, 1957)

He accepted that "the assumptions of Theory Y are not finally validated" but maintained that "they are far more consistent with existing knowledge in the social sciences than are the assumptions of Theory X".

The implementation of Theory Y as a management style is almost untestable, depending as it does upon a system of attitudes and assumptions on the part of the managers involved which
would be practically impossible to operationalise. Maslow himself observed a "well-meaning experiment run on its principles in a California electronics factory" (Kennedy, 1991) and found that Theory Y did not altogether live up to expectations. Some people did indeed seek the need for certainty and direction which are implied by at least a partial Theory X orientation. McGregor’s book is perhaps better regarded as a philosophical work. Nevertheless, the terms he coined; “Theory X” and “Theory Y”, have “become part of the international vocabulary of management” (Haire, 1967) and are as familiar today as they were in the 1960’s, when McGregor’s ideas were fresh and controversial. Warren Bennis (1985), writing a foreword to the 25th anniversary edition of “The Human Side Of Enterprise”, asserts that: “this book, more than any other book on management, changed an entire concept of organizational man and replaced it with a new paradigm that stressed human potentials, emphasized human growth, and elevated the human role in industrial society”.

Expectancy Theory

“One of the most influential current theories of motivation” (Robertson et al, 1992), expectancy theory is rooted in the cognitive capacity of humans “to represent future consequences in thought” (Bandura, 1977). Expectancy approaches “emphasise information processing and cue utilization rather than reinforcement” (Bolles, 1975), and are consistent with earlier findings that “an individual could take action directly counter to his reinforcement history if some new influence (eg, new information) led him to assign a higher (value) to it” (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976, summarising Lewin’s views). William James observes that "as present pleasures are tremendous reinforcers, and present pains tremendous inhibitors of whatever action leads to them, so the thoughts of pleasures and pains take rank amongst the thoughts which have most impulsive and inhibitive power" (James, 1890).

This combination of the principles of hedonism with predictive intelligence is expressed by Vroom, the most prominent of the early expectancy theorists, in the following terms:

“Whenever an individual chooses between alternatives which involve uncertain outcomes, it seems clear that his behavior is affected not only by his preferences among these outcomes but also by the degree to which he believes these outcomes to be probable. Psychologists have referred to these beliefs as expectancies ... or subjective probabilities” (Vroom, 1964).

The basic parameters of Vroom’s model are present in virtually all revisions and elaborations (Kanfer, 1990) of expectancy theory. Vroom “specifically exclude(s) from the realm of motivated behavior reflexes or tropisms as well as responses mediated by the autonomic nervous system” and views as “motivated only the behaviors that are under central or voluntary control” (Vroom, 1964).

Vroom describes expectancy as an “action-outcome association” which can vary in strength from the “subjective certainty that an act will be followed by an outcome ... (to) subjective certainty that an act will not be followed by an outcome. Vroom assigns this association numerical values “ranging from zero, indicating no subjective probability that an act will be followed by an outcome, to 1, indicating certainty that the act will be followed by the outcome” (Vroom, 1964).

According to Bandura (1977), expectancy has two aspects. "An outcome expectancy is defined as a person's estimate that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes. An efficacy
expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes”.

The attractiveness of an outcome; its “psychological value” (Deci, 1992), is termed its valence. Vroom “begin(s) with the simple assumption that, at any given point in time, a person has preferences among outcomes or states of nature. For any pair of outcomes, x and y, a person prefers x to y, prefers y to x, or is indifferent to whether he receives x or y” (Vroom, 1964). Valence is defined by Vroom (1964) as “the anticipated satisfaction from an outcome”, and is distinguished from value, which is “the actual satisfaction that it provides”.

"we use the term valence ... in referring to affective orientations toward particular outcomes. In our system, an outcome is positively valent when the person prefers attaining it to not attaining it (ie, he prefers x to not x). An outcome has a valence of zero when the person is indifferent to attaining it or not attaining it (ie, he is indifferent to x or not x), and it is negatively valent when he prefers not attaining it to attaining it (ie, he prefers not x to x). It is assumed that valence can take a wide range of both positive and negative values”. (Vroom, 1964).

In a work context, valence is “the perceived positive or negative value ascribed by the individual to the possible outcomes of action on the job” (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976). It may be immediate, such as performance on the job, or consequential, for example, promotion, or recognition. "The most important feature of people's valences concerning work-related outcomes is that they refer to the level of satisfaction the person expects to receive from them, not from the real value the person actually derives from them" (Pinder, 1984).

This emphasis on the abstract cognitive quality of valence allows Vroom (1964) to observe: "we might speak of a person's satisfaction with his present job but not with jobs that he has never performed. No such restriction has been placed on the concept of valence".

The concept of instrumentality "hypothesizes that a person's attitude toward an outcome ... depends on his perceptions of relationships (instrumentalities) between that outcome and the attainment of various other consequences toward which he feels differing degrees of liking or disliking (preferences)” (Graen, 1969). Put more simply, "Something is said to be instrumental if it is believed to lead to something else, if it helps achieve or attain something else" (Pinder, 1984).

“There are many outcomes which are positively or negatively valent to persons, but are not in themselves anticipated to be satisfying or dissatisfying. The strength of a person’s desire or aversion for them is based not on their intrinsic properties but on the anticipated satisfaction or dissatisfaction associated with other outcomes to which they are expected to lead. People may desire to join groups because they believe that membership will enhance their status in the community, and they may desire to perform their jobs effectively because they expect that it will lead to promotion” (Vroom, 1964).

Instumentality is described by Vroom (1964) as a “probability belief”, and as an “outcome-outcome association”, to which a numerical value can be assigned, “ranging from -1, indicating a belief that attainment of the second outcome is certain without the first outcome and impossible with it, to +1, indicating that the first outcome is believed to be a necessary and sufficient condition for the attainment of the second outcome” (Vroom, 1964).
Pinder (1984) adds that these values pass through zero, “meaning that there is no likely relationship between the attainment of the first outcome and the attainment of the second”. He argues that “each of these components” of expectancy theory; valence, instrumentality and expectancy, “is, in fact, a belief” and goes on to make the point that “because beliefs may not be valid or accurate, the person’s behavior may not seem appropriate to observers. It also follows that because these three beliefs are merely beliefs (as opposed to intentions) they may not result in any specifically predictable behaviors” (Pinder, 1984).

The above three concepts are all vital to an understanding of expectancy theory, and for this reason it is common to refer to expectancy approaches as VIE theories. There is a fourth concept in such theories; that of force, explained by Pinder (1984) as “the strength of a person’s intention to act in a certain way”, and by Graen (1969) as “the relative probability that the action will be emitted”. Vroom (1964) contends that “behavior on the part of a person is assumed to be the result of a field of forces each of which has a direction and a magnitude”. This concept of potentially contending forces, interacting to “push” or “pull” behaviour towards particular observable manifestations has links with the work of Lewin (eg Lewin, 1958) and from a modern perspective can be seen as systemic in concept (see for example, Checkland, 1984; Checkland and Scholes, 1990; and von Bertalanffy, 1968).

A useful explanation of the distinction between force and valence is provided by Bolles (1975):

"As a general rule, the perception of the possibility of engaging in some activity, the desirability of that activity (its valence), and the tendency to engage in it (the force it exerts) all go together. The conceptual differences emerge principally as a matter of emphasis. Valence helps to account for choice, but force may be more useful if we are concerned with the speed or persistence of behavior. A force makes something happen, whereas a valence is passive; it is an abstract value that is merely correlated with action".

The underlying premise of Vroom’s theory is that “the choices made by a person among alternative course of action are lawfully related to psychological events occurring contemporaneously with the behavior" (Vroom, 1964). "In other words, people’s behavior results from choices among alternatives, and these choices (behaviors) are systematically related to psychological processes, particularly perceptions and the formation of beliefs and attitudes" (Pinder, 1984).

The theory itself is presented in the form of two algebraic expressions, as follow:

\[ F_i = f \sum_{j=1}^{n} (E_{ij}V_j) \quad \text{and} \quad V_j = f \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{n} I_{jk} V_k \right] \]

Where:

- \( F_i \) = the psychological force to perform an act (i) (such as strive for a particular level of performance)
- \( E_{ij} \) = the strength of the expectancy that the act will be followed by the outcome j
- \( V_j \) = the valence for the individual of outcome j
- \( I_{jk} \) = instrumentality of outcome j for attaining second-level outcome k
- \( V_k \) = valence of second-level outcome k

(Vroom, 1964, p 18)
Vroom puts this in the form of two "propositions":

"Proposition 1: The valence of an outcome to a person is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valences of all other outcomes and his conceptions of its instrumentality for the attainment of these other outcomes"

"Proposition 2: The force on a person to perform an act is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valences of all outcomes and the strength of his expectancies that the act will be followed by the attainment of these outcomes"

(Vroom, 1964).

This means that there will be little "force to perform an act" if one or more of the following conditions obtains:

(a) the specified outcome(s) do not have positive valence for the person;
(b) the person does not believe, or doubts in some degree, that he can perform that act successfully;
(c) the person does not believe, or doubts in some degree, that successfully performing the act is likely to lead to the specified outcome(s):

"An outcome with high positive or negative valence will have no effect on the generation of a force unless there is some expectancy (ie, some subjective probability greater than zero) that the outcome will be attained by some act" (Vroom, 1964).

"Vroom's model is one of extrinsic motivation" (Shapira, 1976). Behaviour is caused by its association with outcomes, either in a simple relationship where the outcome is itself desirable for hedonistic reasons, or in an indirect relationship where an intermediate outcome is desirable because it is believed to have the potential to lead to a self-valent outcome (ie, is instrumental). This is because the expenditure of effort is basically abhorrent; there must be some 'reward' to justify activity: "In effect, we are suggesting that means acquire valence as a consequence of their expected relationship to ends" (Vroom, 1964). However, Vroom acknowledges that this view is not universally accepted:

"Virtually all general theories of behavior postulate that dissatisfaction results from energy expenditure. ... This principle of 'least effort', as it has frequently been called, has received considerable support, primarily in research using animals as subjects. ... Some writers, however, have suggested exactly the opposite notion. They propose that the expenditure of effort is basically satisfying rather than dissatisfying" (Vroom, 1964) and accepts the possibility that some activity might be intrinsically rewarding:

"We do not mean to imply that all the variance in the valence of outcomes can be explained by their expected consequences. We must assume that some things are desired and abhorred 'for their own sake' " (Vroom, 1964).

The incidence of activity which is rewarded purely intrinsically may be low. It would be difficult to demonstrate convincingly that no outcome valence of any kind was involved, such as a sense of achievement on completion of a puzzle, or a feeling of well-being or self-mastery on completion of a physical activity. However, Vroom's mathematical model does not seem to preclude contribution to the sum of valences of hedonistic intrinsic elements, although this is not explicitly mentioned by Vroom. In this way, activity which was
unpleasant would have a negative influence on the sum of valences and might, if stronger than the positive valence of the outcome(s), deter the subject from performing the activity. Conversely, an activity which was intrinsically pleasurable might be performed even though the outcome valence(s) were very weakly positive or even negative.

There is evidence (Deci, 1971, 1972) of a relationship between outcome-related rewards and intrinsic rewards: "Typically, subjects ... work on interesting puzzle games ... The experimental treatment had to do with whether or not external rewards (eg, money, verbal reinforcement, punishment) were also provided and whether or not they were contingent on performance. The general conclusion ... is that extrinsic rewards which are contingent on performance decrease the valence of intrinsic rewards. ... extrinsically rewarded subjects tended to spend less time working on the puzzles during their free time ... no actual performance data are reported". (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976)

Kanfer (1990), whilst remarking that “the undermining effects of extrinsic rewards on task interest and free-choice behavior have been shown in numerous studies”, argues that “findings over the past decade ... clearly indicate that the presence of rewards does not automatically decrease intrinsic motivation”. Deci (1972, summarised by Korman, 1974) found that “the more we obtain an extrinsic type of reinforcement (eg money) for performing a task, the more likely we are to lose our intrinsic motivation to perform that task. On the other hand, the more we receive verbal reinforcements, the more we come to develop intrinsic motivations to perform the task". Deci (1992) cites a study by McGraw (1978) which found that “rewards facilitate performance of overlearned (algorhythmic) tasks but impair performance of heuristic tasks, such as problem solving”. Kohn (1993), reviewing financial incentive schemes, reports various studies in support of his arguments. He found that 16 out of 28 studies reviewed showed evidence of improved performance where incentive schemes were in operation, but all these referred only to quantity; quality was not analysed. Five studies did assess quality of performance and none of these showed any benefit from use of incentives. Kohn also cites a meta-analysis (by R A Guzzo) of 98 studies showing by statistical analysis that financial incentives produced no significant effect overall. Financial incentives were unrelated to absenteeism or turnover. Training and goal-setting programmes did, however, have a positive impact on productivity. "The recipient of the reward assumes, 'if they have to bribe me to do it, it must be something I wouldn't want to do'. In fact, a series of studies published in 1992 by psychology professor Jonathan L Freedman and his colleagues at the University of Toronto, confirmed that the larger the incentive we are offered, the more negatively we will view the activity for which the bonus was received" (Kohn, 1993).

Gray (2000) found evidence that outcome-linked additional rewards, such as bonus payments, came to be regarded as part of the anticipated reward package. The possibility of such additional payments being withheld if performance did not reach the required standard was then perceived as a threatened penalty rather than an incentive. In Gray's study, threats of various kinds were strongly correlated with reduced levels of performance.

Kohn reports that in Freedman’s study the actual nature of activity involved seemed to be irrelevant. Kohn concludes that “research suggests that, by and large, rewards succeed at securing one thing only: temporary compliance”. This view is supported by Block (1993): "Even though we know that pay is not a 'motivator', we still believe that we can barter for behavior and that managers can evoke the actions they desire by manipulating pay to
subordinates. ... Why is it so hard to accept that pay and productivity are strangers to each other?"

Whilst the studies of reward systems do not exclude non-financial outcome valences (praise, selection for training, and other forms of recognition are clearly outcomes and therefore extrinsic rather than intrinsic rewards), they do focus attention on the content of the activity as being a significant contributor to motivation.

Expectancy theory is not regarded as a very effective means of predicting performance, although it has been more successful in predicting choices, such as job selection (Kanfer, 1994). Vroom’s own research, and his conclusions from reviewing the research of others, such as Rosenberg (1957) and Walster (1963), suggested that the relationship between the valence of a job or occupation to an individual before entering into that occupation and the valences of outcomes once embarked upon that occupation is complex and iterative. “Choice of an occupation reduces the valence of outcomes not provided by the occupation and ... choice of an occupation tends to change ratings of its valence” (Vroom, 1964).

The relationship of expectancy theory to standards of job performance or productivity is summed up by Campbell and Pritchard (1976):

1. “The greater an individual's expectancy that effort will accomplish task goals, the greater the effort expended, other things being equal.

2. The greater the instrumentality, or the perceived probability that reward is contingent on performance, the greater the effort expended, other things being equal.

3. The greater the valence of a performance contingent outcome, the greater the effort expended, other things being equal.

4. If expectancy, instrumentality, or valence is zero, then effort in the direction of performance is zero.

5. ... if we think of job satisfaction as the extent to which important needs are satisfied by rewards, then satisfaction is a resultant of performance (that leads to rewards), but not vice versa. There will exist a correlation between performance and satisfaction if and only if the relevant instrumentalities are not zero, other things being equal”.

Korman (1974) remarks that

"the acceptance of the expectancy-value approach to achievement motivation is so embedded within us that to a great extent it provides the theoretical basis upon which most of the administrative practices commonly found in our formal organizations have traditionally rested. ... the administration controls and increases achievement by making the attainment of ... rewards contingent upon effective performance. Thus, it is believed, the promise of such value attainment will result in increased performance, ie, these possible outcomes will serve as incentives for better performance provided the individual involved believes the rewards actually are attainable on the basis of his efforts. If he believes that such rewards are not contingent on his performance, he will not react to them as incentives"

and suggests that the “commonly found lack of responsiveness to incentives offered by today’s large work organizations” can be explained by the “expectancy-value framework”. The “large size, complexity, and pyramidal structure” of these organisations “seems to encourage lower expectancies of success, the lower one goes in the organization".
Campbell and Pritchard point out that “performance has a number of other determinants besides effort”. Pinder (1984) refers to the work of Porter and Lawler (1968), which he summarises as follows:

“effort may or may not result in job performance, which (Porter and Lawler) defined as the accomplishment of those tasks that comprise a person’s job. The reason? The level of ability the person has to do his job, and his role clarity, the degree of clarity of understanding the person has concerning just what his job consists of. Thus, a person may be highly motivated (putting out a lot of effort), but that effort will not necessarily result in what can be considered performance, unless he has both the ability to perform the job as well as a clear understanding of the ways in which it is appropriate to direct that effort”.

Vroom (1964) acknowledges that “work roles” do more than merely “provide financial remuneration”. Amongst other aspects he mentions that they “permit or require social interaction” and that they “affect the social status of the worker”. He goes on to say that “we have no basis for judging the relative influence of these different properties of work roles on the strength of preference for working”. Elsewhere he accepts that “Difficulties in measuring amount of motivation with any degree of precision make any very accurate determination of the nature of the functional relationship between amount of motivation and level of performance impossible. At best we can measure or manipulate motivation on an ordinal scale, ie, we can specify that one level is higher than another but not how much higher it is” (Vroom, 1964).

Extensions and developments of Vroom’s original model have been devised to include additional variables. Examples are Porter and Lawler (1968), who attempt to incorporate intrinsic rewards; Graen (1969), whose model includes attitudes, roles and interpersonal influences; and Campbell and Pritchard (1976), who present a composite model based on all the earlier representations:

Fig. 3.12

Reproduced from Campbell and Pritchard (1976).
Another theory using the expectancy hypothesis has been put forward by Smith and Cranny (1968). According to them, work motivation can be explained in terms of the interaction amongst three main variables – effort, satisfaction, and reward. As the following exhibits no ... shows, performance is influenced only by effort, but performance in turn influences both satisfaction and rewards. The significant part of this model is that all other relationships are two-way relationships.

Another model which has used the expectancy theory and which is based on achievement motivation is that of Patchen (1970). According to Patchen, two-level motivations are important to explain work motivation, achievement motivation at the first level, and approval motivation at the second level. Patchen uses the general expectancy paradigm suggested by Atkinson (1953): he regards work motivation as a function of achievement motivation, achievement incentive (amount of success possible in a situation), and expectancy (that effort will lead to achievement).

At the second level, Patchen uses different elements to explain the three elements in the first level. Achievement motivation has been explained in terms of expected intrinsic satisfaction, expected satisfaction in the approval that achievement will bring, and other expected satisfactions. This is analogous to Vroom’s idea of instrumentality. If achievement motivation (first level) is seen as instrumental in getting the approval and other satisfactions such as Promotion (second level), this achievement will result in job motivation. The achievement incentive has also been explained by four different elements:
The difficulty of the task, the availability of resources, self-confidence and previous experience of success build up the expectancy that effort will lead to achievement. Patchen further explains each of the second-level element (of intrinsic satisfaction, approval motivation, and other satisfaction) in terms of other elements. His theory can be summarized as indicating that the motive to achieve is the basis for work motivation. The motive works according to the incentive value and expectancy in the situation. The motive to achieve also depends on the expected approval and other expected satisfactions a person can derive as a result of achieving a goal, and these in turn depend on certain on the job factors of the job and goals, and the approval motivation. (Pareek, 2004)

Evaluation

Attempts to test Vroom's theory, and other presentations of essentially the same basic ideas, have had mixed success. Campbell and Pritchard (1976) remark that "... Vroom's theory was originally designed to make within individual not between individual predictions ... almost all the research designed to test VIE theory has used between individuals comparisons".

Graen (1969) studied 169 young women taken on for part-time temporary jobs. He reports that: "Results of this experiment, conducted in a realistic but carefully controlled work setting, show that instrumentality theory predictions of particular levels of job satisfaction and/or job performance are confirmed under only a few rather narrowly specified conditions".

Lawler and Porter (1967) compared the performance of a group of managers in industrial and government organizations who felt that pay was a probable outcome of performance with another group who felt that there was little relation between performance and pay. They found the rated performance of the former group to be significantly higher than that of the latter.

Goldthorpe et al (1968) conducted a study of 229 manual workers in Luton, initially to test Maslow's theory. They found that the workers' efforts were largely instrumental; their work provided few intrinsic rewards and was performed almost exclusively in order to gain financial rewards.

Heneman and Schwab (1972) reviewed the literature and found: "nine published studies ... that investigated one or more hypotheses of expectancy theory using various measures of employee performance as the dependant variable.... Generally, valence, instrumentality, and role perceptions were significantly related to performance, while ability was not. Little support was obtained for hypothesized (ie, by expectancy theory) interactions among these variables".

The finding that ability was not significantly related to performance might be considered interesting in its own right, but unfortunately is not explored further. Korman cites a variety of studies leading to the view that: "it has generally been concluded that the adequacy of this
type of expectancy-value theory can be fairly useful in accounting for performance variation in achievement situations. However, for the most part, the correlations tend to be of a low to moderate level at best ... and sometimes they are even insignificant despite the rationality of the approach" (Korman, 1974).

Shapira (1976) conducted a study testing "people's choice behavior in a situation where there is salient monetary reward": "Vroom's theory led to the prediction that subjects choose the easiest task when equivalent extrinsic rewards are attached to the completion of each task. The present experiment provided support for Vroom's prediction in that subjects who were offered $2.50 for solving the puzzle of their choice selected relatively easy tasks. They did not, however, choose the easiest tasks. Thus, it seems that subjects tend to choose easy paths for extrinsic rewards, though they may desire some intrinsic satisfaction from doing challenging tasks, so they select tasks which have a fairly high probability of success but provide slightly more than minimal challenge".

This illustrates the complexity of the inter-relationships between valences which makes expectancy theory difficult to operationalise. Vroom himself argued that: "it is important to note that a model of the sort that has been proposed is testable only in conjunction with a particular set of empirical interpretations. It is impossible to subject it to a 'pure test' " (Vroom, 1964) and acknowledged that “the consistency between predicted and observed relations does not mean that our model can account for all of the findings reported in this book". He specifically mentioned as exceptions not “directly interpretable in terms of the model ... those studies showing that the affective consequences of a given level of reward depend on the level that was expected” and “studies dealing with the concept of equity" (Vroom, 1964).

Korman (1974) maintains that: “there are simply too many cases where predictions generated by the theory are not supported. There are too many research studies in which people have been classified by their predominant motive pattern, have been provided with an opportunity to achieve some significant values relative to their motives, and the resulting predicted positive behavior and affect has simply not occurred" and suggests: "One reason may be that people behave not only as a result of values they believe they can obtain from the situation, but also as a result of what they believe to be normal and appropriate for them at the 'time, independent of the personal values to be obtained" (Korman, 1974).

Kanfer (1994) makes the further point that “most E x V models are considered episodic. That is, these models account for behavior change in terms of changes in the individual's expectancies and anticipated valences. However, ... episodic models cannot readily account for behavior change when expectancies and incentives do not change".

Overall, expectancy theory provides a useful focus on various components of motivation, but may be considered inadequate as an explanation, and certainly as a predictor, of subsequent behaviour. Several references have been made above to the complexity of the interactions between factors which may impel or restrain behaviour, and it is clear that a mathematical model such as Vroom’s could only provide reliable predictions of behaviour if all the factors were known, if their precise strengths of impulse or restraint were known, and if all their interactions could be precisely mapped. There would appear to be no practical way in which such a situation could be even remotely approached. Bolles (1975), discussing the doctrine of empirical determinism, remarks: “the doctrine ... maintains that a piece of behavior is
Behavior may be explained when its survival value has been determined, when the motivational or instinctive forces producing it have been specified, when its history of reinforcement has been discovered, or when its goal and purpose have been indicated. Empirical determinism is the only system that provides a broad enough frame of reference to explain the greatest puzzle: the mind of man and how it works".

Expectancy orientations led to an increasing emphasis on the nature of desired outcomes: researchers began effectively to ask "what are people trying to attain or avoid by specific behaviours?" Several ideas are prominent in this area of enquiry, focusing individually on particular kinds of outcomes. In this context, an "outcome" might be so immediate as to be virtually intrinsic to the activity. Vroom (1964) remarks that "we must assume that some things are desired and abhorred 'for their own sake' ". In such a case the outcome may be considered as contemporaneous with the activity.

Need for Achievement

The work of McClelland and Atkinson (McClelland, 1955; Atkinson, 1964; McClelland et al, 1976) turned the focus of expectancy theory towards intrinsic factors (Korman, 1974; Shapira, 1976). Central to their ideas is the view that "there are basically two types of people in a theoretical sense" (Korman, 1974). For some people, pleasure results from achievement. For others, pleasure results from the avoidance of failure.

"we may distinguish ... two kinds of motives by the symbols n for need and f for fear. Thus we speak of n achievement when the person's primary goal is to enjoy the glories of success, and of f failure when the person's primary goal is to avoid the misery and disgrace of failure" (McClelland, 1955).

This has an important effect on the motivational value of expectancies. Atkinson holds that a high expectation of success reduces the valence of the outcome, since there is little sense of achievement in successfully completing something that was fairly certain to be accomplished. Equally, where the expectation of success is low, the "reward" in terms of a sense of achievement which accrues from a successful outcome is high, and the motivation to perform the action is increased. Conversely, the "misery and disgrace of failure" in not accomplishing something where there was a high expectation of success would be considerable, and the motivation to take that risk would be low for someone with a bias towards f failure, in Atkinson's terms, whereas failure to accomplish something which was in any case unlikely to be achieved does not cause too much distress. "The incentive value of success on a task is an inverse linear function of its expectancy" (Shapira, 1976). Thus as well as being essentially an intrinsic model of motivation, Atkinson's model also incorporates personality differences.

Atkinson's work was largely laboratory-based, "concentrating more on manipulable experimental variables as opposed to real-life complex social variables" (Korman, 1974). McClelland and his associates were rather more interested in those "social variables", and developed their ideas from observation: "the data came first and the theory second" (McClelland et al, 1976).

McClelland takes the view that pleasure, and therefore motivation, is essentially a product of limited variations from some norm. Therefore people will be motivated to achieve end states which show relatively small discrepancies, or differences, from the previous state to which
they were accustomed or adapted. Small variations are pleasurable and will be actively
sought, whilst large variations produce discomfort and will be avoided if possible. Positive
affect is the result of smaller discrepancies of a sensory or perceptual event from the
adaptation level of the organism; negative affect is the result of larger discrepancies. The
achievement motive develops out of growing expectations. ... pleasure from anything ...
depends on a moderate degree of novelty, which has to become ever greater as expectations
catch up with it. (McClelland et al, 1976).

That is, when expectations become certainties (that something will happen) interest wanes.
"Exactly confirming certain expectations produces boredom and a tendency to discontinue the
act unless enough minor variations are permitted to produce positive affect" (McClelland et
al, 1976). This can be observed in practice in animal experiments, for example, rats vary the
path taken to food when either path is equally efficient, choose a path with a barrier in it over
an unobstructed one, or prefer seeds which are difficult to crack open over ones that are easy
(McClelland et al, 1976) This emphasis on change, in small doses, as being a powerful
stimulus arises from a common objection to simple reinforcement theory, restated by
McClelland in the following terms:"If some stimuli are inherently pleasant and rewarding ... it
is difficult to see why responses producing these stimuli should ever stop, short of extreme
fatigue or other shifts producing unpleasant stimulation. Allport's repeated objection to the
law of effect has been that it ought to lead people to repeat monotonously things they have
done with reward before ... . Our notion of what produces pleasure takes care of this
objection. As we have shown, pleasure is dependent on adaptation level or expectation which
can be changed in a number of ways, not least of which is the occurrence of the pleasant event
itself" (McClelland et al, 1976).

Failure of the anticipated change to occur produces negative feelings which are stronger and
more influential than any putative feelings of deprivation that might have been experienced by
the simple absence of reward as certainty increases and the amount of pleasure anticipated
grows greater, nonconfirmation produces a larger discrepancy from expectation and negative
affect is necessarily larger. (McClelland et al, 1976).

Once the kinds of outcomes which are likely to produce pleasure, or "positive affect", have
been established, McClelland makes the connection between outcomes and motive. For
McClelland, all motives are the result of learning: "a motive is formed by pairing cues with
effective arousal or with the conditions ... that produce affective arousal" (McClelland et al,
1976). Cues in this sense are perceptions, which may be individually very insignificant, which
"get associated with the affective state so that they can partially redintegrate it on a later
occasion" (McClelland, 1955). (Redintegration is defined by Korman (1974) as "a reminder
by a stimulus cue that a change in affect is going to take place").Certain stimuli or situations
involving discrepancies between expectation (adaptation level) and perception are sources of
primary, unlearned affect, either positive or negative in nature. Cues which are paired with
these affective states, changes in these affective states, and the conditions producing them
become capable of redintegrating a state ... derived from the original affective situation ..., but
not identical with it. (McClelland et al, 1976).

From this McClelland was able to derive a "contiguity principle": "stimuli that have
previously been associated with positive affect come to stimulate approach behavior, and
those associated with negative affect lead to avoidance behavior" (McClelland et al, 1976).
Thus, motivation to perform an act will be at its highest if that act is expected, in some sense, to lead to a moderate positive change in affect. "Affect is dependent on the relation of stimulation to (adaptation level). (McClelland et al, 1976). This is firmly grounded in arousal theory: "the theory and evidence on achievement motivation catches up with the Yerkes-Dodson Law and agrees with the proposal of many others that the relationship of strength of motivation to efficiency of performance is curvilinear. As a motive increases in intensity it first leads to an increase in the efficiency of instrumental activity and then to a decrease. Thus it would appear that as far as adjustment is concerned there is a certain optimum level of motive intensity, a level of 'creative anxiety', which leads to maximum problem-solving efficiency. Too little motivation leads to sluggishness and inertia, too much to disruption and defense against anxiety. The theoretical problems still unsolved are the discovery of what this area of optimum intensity is and why higher intensities lead to inefficiency" (McClelland et al, 1976).

Bandura (1977) argues that "high arousal usually debilitates performance" - which is consistent with Yerkes-Dodson - and for this reason "individuals are more likely to expect success when they are not beset by aversive arousal than if they are tense and viscerally agitated. Fear reactions generate further fear of impending stressful situations through anticipatory self-arousal. People judge their physiological arousal largely on the basis of their appraisal of the instigating conditions. Thus, visceral arousal occurring in situations perceived to be threatening is interpreted as fear, arousal in thwarting situations is experienced as anger, and that resulting from irretrievable loss of valued objects as sorrow". (Bandura, 1977)

McClelland rejects the idea that some motivation results from biological sources, or drives. The motivation to eat or drink results, not from internal physiological needs, but from the cues that have been learnt as a result of previous eating or drinking behaviour.

In practice, McClelland's ideas lead to the proposition that individuals differ in the extent to which they will find achievement a satisfying, and therefore motivating, experience. People who have a high need for achievement will prefer, and work harder in, situations that have moderate levels of risk, linked with feedback and personal responsibility (and therefore credit for successful results) (Korman, 1974).

Deci (1992) interprets McClelland's work as suggesting that the need for achievement can be increased through appropriate training, and can lead to increased productivity, although McClelland warns that "there is no necessary connection between high achievement motivation and more efficient performance" (McClelland et al, 1976).

McClelland extended his ideas from the individual level to the macro-sociological scale: "In addition to ... laboratory experiments, McClelland has made more speculative correlational analyses based on historical evidence, literature, and cross-cultural comparisons of economic growth, which he presents in support of his theory about the effects of achievement motivation on individual risk-taking and achievement" (J Jung, 1978). These analyses include consideration of the Minoan civilisation of ancient Crete (Korman, 1974). Like other expectancy propositions (and, indeed, other motivation theories) McClelland's discrepancy hypothesis is difficult to operationalise (Korman, 1974). McClelland's preferred research method was the use of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), in which subjects are shown pictures and are asked to tell a story based on what they see. This enabled McClelland to draw inferences about the strength of achievement orientation and other variables in the individual
subject, on the grounds that "an excellent place to look for and measure the effects of motivation is fantasy" (McClelland et al, 1976). This has been open to some criticism on the grounds that it is impossible to know all the influences that cause a story to take a particular form. The subjective nature of the evidence leads Korman to express doubts: "most support for the moderate risk-taking notion, a key aspect of the theory, is highly controversial at best ... The reason for this is that in experimental studies in which this aspect has been supported, the level of difficulty has been defined by the experimenter, that is, he is the one who has decided what should be labelled a hard task, a moderate task, and an easy task" (Korman, 1974).

Some studies have tended to support the propositions of achievement theory. For example, work by Smith and colleagues found that high achievement motivation in executives was related to "better results", more noticeably in "entrepreneurial organisations that bureaucratic ones" (Robertson, Smith and Cooper, 1992). There are, however, a number of related studies which fail to support the theory. "While these studies vary in quality and relevance, the large number of negative findings leaves room for pause and considerable doubt" (Korman, 1974).

**Goal Theory**

To the extent that "goals provide the individual with a cognitive representation of desired outcomes" (Kanfer, 1994), goal theory may be considered as a sub-theory of the expectancy approaches; a view broadly taken by Campbell and Pritchard (1976). The leading exponent of goal theory, E A Locke, describes his model as "a partial model of task motivation" (Locke, 1968). The concern of the model is primarily with the direction of behaviour "rather than the context of motivation (ie, the specification of what it is that people want)" (Deci, 1992), an apparent contradiction which is clarified by Campbell and Pritchard (1976): "a conscious intention, or goal, is defined as a goal the individual has consciously decided to pursue ... stating a goal or intention is synonymous with giving behavior a direction".

In this context the term "goal" has a definite meaning which is more precise and more forceful than the semantically similar term "intention": "The exact process by which intentions becomes goals that are infused with sufficient potency to enable cognitive control over action, is the least well understood, and perhaps the most important of all processes in motivation/volition" (Kanfer, 1994).

"Goals affect arousal by regulating the intensity of effort the individual expends on the task and they affect its duration by leading people to persist in their actions until the goal is reached. They affect choice by leading people to direct attention to and take action with respect to goal-relevant activities while ignoring non goal-relevant activities" (Locke and Latham, 1990).

In the organisational context, interest in goals has centred on the effects of goal-setting on performance. Locke contends that "persons assigned (and adopting) difficult and specific goals outperform persons provided 'do your best' (vague and non-specific) goal assignments" (Locke, 1968; Locke and Latham, 1984). "Locke's fundamental idea is that realistic, hard, specific goals produce better performance than easy goals or no goals. Goals have been demonstrated to affect performance through four mechanisms (a) directing attention and action (b) mobilizing effort, (c) increasing task persistence, and (d) motivating the search for appropriate performance strategies" (Robertson, Smith and Cooper, 1992).
Kanfer (1994) cites a variety of research evidence, and meta-analyses, in support of this contention, but cautions that “difficult and specific goal assignments facilitate task performance in many, but not all, situations”. The fact that “research has shown that as a goal difficulty increases so does performance” (Locke et al, 1981) is in apparent contradiction to expectancy theory, which would suggest that, to the extent that expectation of success correlates negatively with goal difficulty, the opposite effect might be anticipated, but seems consistent with achievement theory, which would suggest that the more difficult the goal the greater the achievement involved in its attainment - a motivator to greater effort for some, but not all, people. Wright (1994) claims that “more than 30 years of research (including more than 400 studies in 1990) demonstrate the efficacy of goal setting as a motivational tool” The key to the success of goal-setting approaches in stimulating performance improvements lies in Locke's parentheses: “persons assigned (and adopting) difficult and specific goals” - “Difficult goals lead to higher performance only when an individual is committed to them” (Locke and Latham, 1990).

Kanfer (1994) suggests that goal-setting operates by influencing the allocation of resources, such as energy or attention, towards a specific outcome and, by implication, away from other, alternative, outcomes. “Effort is concentrated on particular goals, and some goals require more effort expenditure than others” (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976). In this paradigm, motivation is defined as “the process of allocating personal resources in the form of time or energy to various acts in such a way that the anticipated affect resulting from these acts is maximised (Kanfer, 1994). This leads to a clear distinction between goals and intentions, because goals represent intentions to which resources have been assigned. If these views are correct then the acceptance of the goal would be crucial in affecting performance, since during the process of acceptance other contending goals would have to be discarded, or at least subordinated. If these other goals had greater valence for the individual than the imposed goal there would be significant conflict. “Research suggests that, for many people, a goal set and delegated by others serves as a disincentive” (Robertson, Smith and Cooper, 1992). On the other hand, "considerable research has shown that when regulation is through choice (ie, is self-determined) people are not only more intrinsically motivated but they are more creative, display greater cognitive flexibility and conceptual understanding, have a more positive emotional tone, are healthier, and are more likely to support the autonomy of others” (Deci, 1992).

However, Latham et al (1988) suggest that participation in goal setting is not crucial so long as a determined effort is made to 'sell' the goals after they have been decided upon". In other words, it is the acceptance, or adoption, of the goals which is the vital element.

The case for goal-setting is not absolutely clear-cut. Research by Kanfer and colleagues in the late 1980s found some negative effects: "When engaged in novel and complex tasks, the provision of difficult goal assignments was posited to impede performance due to the diversion of critical resources away from task processing. Empirical results ... provide support for the model” (Kanfer, 1994).

Wright (1994) cites research showing that goal-setting leads to increased quantity but reductions in quality. This may, of course, be a function of the specific goals chosen, but this is not clear. Wright also makes some general observations about goal-setting: "one of the major problems with goal setting - and particularly with setting difficult goals - is that it can produce a dysfunctional inertia, encouraging individuals to cling to ineffective approaches
rather than developing better ways of doing things" (Wright, 1994). Wright goes on to mention the "goal only effect" - blinkered behaviour which ignores other needs -, the "end justifies the means effect" and the "easy goal effect" as examples of organisationally dysfunctional behaviours arising from dependence on goal-setting as a management tool.

**Equity Theory**

Several writers have suggested that the valence of an outcome may be, at least in part, a function of its perceived fairness or "rightness" in relation to the effort expended to attain it, benchmarked against various external factors. The most prominent exponent of such an "equity theory" is J S Adams. Adams (1963) presents a "theory of inequity, which is based upon Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance and is, therefore, a special case of it". Adams uses a generalised concept of other people, used for comparison, which he refers to as "Other", and refers to the person making the comparison as "Person": 

(a) The presence of inequity in Person creates tension in him. The tension is proportional to the magnitude of inequity present. 

(b) The tension created in Person will drive him to reduce it. The strength of the drive is proportional to the tension created, ergo, it is proportional to the magnitude of inequity present. In short, the presence of inequity will motivate Person to achieve equity or reduce inequity" (Adams, 1963).

Korman (1974) remarks that "Dissonance theory has actually turned out to be highly useful for understanding achievement motivation ... If we look at (studies by those working within a dissonance framework) as a total group, they provide impressive support for the notion of consistency as an important motivating influence in achievement behavior. It appears clear that under some conditions, we achieve at a level that will achieve a just, or equitable, or balanced outcome, even though such consistency may have to be achieved at the cost of various kinds of external rewards".

In this Korman is linking equity theory with the consistency theories of researchers such as Heider (1958), who restated cognitive dissonance theory to argue that an individual will seek cognitive or perceptual balance in perceptions of relationships between himself, another and a third party. If any perception is inconsistent, one or other of the perceptions involved will be adjusted to restore balance.

Essentially, equity theory suggests that "people will be most satisfied and work most effectively when they believe that their rewards or outcomes are in balance with their inputs" (Deci, 1992). The norms used in this process are often derived from social comparisons: "Social comparison among individuals is a natural process. When such comparison reveals that similar persons are better off than oneself is, a state of relative deprivation may arise" (Jung, 1978). "The basic premise of organizational justice theories is that individuals seek fairness and justice in the employee-employer social exchange relationship" (Kanfer, 1994). Fairness in this context takes two basic forms: "distributive fairness pertains to perceptions with respect to the distribution or allocation of outcomes; procedural fairness refers to perceptions about the organizational procedures used to make outcome decisions" (Kanfer, 1994). Adams (1963) emphasises that the employee-employer relationship is not "usually perceived by the former purely and simply as an economic matter. There is an element of relative justice involved that supervenes economics and underlies perceptions of equity or inequity".
Kanfer (1994) lists "five norms that contribute to perceptions of fairness: a) adequate consideration of an employee's viewpoint, b) suppression of personal bias, c) consistent application of criteria across employees, d) provision of timely feedback after a decision, e) providing employees with an adequate explanation for the decision". And Pinder (1984) argues that "it is not the absolute amount of reward that follows performance which determines whether it is satisfying; rather, the amount, however large or small, must be seen by the employee as equitable in order for it to be satisfying".

Perceived fairness on a wider and longer-term scale may also have an effect on attitudes: "The age distribution within an organization forms an implicit career timetable, and people use this timetable to decide whether their own career is on or off schedule. In one study, managers who saw themselves as 'behind time' had more negative attitudes to work than other managers". (Robertson, Smith and Cooper, 1992).

Equity theories predict dissatisfaction from over- as well as under-reward. Adams (1963) argues that a worker has a drive to equate production with the perceived fairness of reward. Thus, a worker who believes himself to be overpaid will strive to produce more, in order to redress the inequity, and a worker who believes himself underpaid will produce less. The evidence for the overpayment effect is rather mixed. Adams' own experiments showed that hourly paid systems did produce the predicted results. However, piece-rate systems did not produce greater quantity for overpayment, but did produce better quality. This was interpreted as a means of redressing the inequity by giving better value.

Adams and Rosenbaum (1962, cited by Vroom, 1964) observed subjects where varying wage rates were paid for the same work. Some subjects were informed that they were being overpaid, whilst others were told that they were being paid the appropriate rate. "It was predicted that the 'overcompensated' group would be more highly motivated to perform the task effectively than the 'equitably-compensated' group since effective performance was, for them, a means of decreasing the inequity in their wages. The results support this prediction" (Vroom, 1964).

Equity theory assumes that the worker's feelings of over- or under-compensation, which he or she forms by comparing his or her pay with that of other workers or some internal standard, is the key factor. If the worker feels underpaid, he or she will work less effectively, whereas the opposite is predicted if the worker feels overpaid. A number of studies attempted to test (the theory) but the overall findings are equivocal. In part this is due to some vagueness in the concepts of expectancy and equity and also because factors other than pay affect the individual's work performance. (Jung, 1978).

Social Learning Theory

"Social learning theory adopts a similar position (to expectancy theory). In fact there are many striking similarities between social learning theory and expectancy theory in their joint emphasis on expectancies, individual goals and values and the influence of both person and situation factors. In fact, if we remember that social learning theory also embodies many of the ideas of operant theory, these similarities ... provide the basis for a synthesis between two previously irreconcilable positions concerning motivation: the behavioural, reinforcement based, operant view and the views of expectancy theory which are more concerned with internal psychological processes" (Robertson, Smith and Cooper, 1992).
The most prominent exponent of social learning theory is A Bandura: "it has now been amply documented that cognitive processes play a prominent role in the acquisition and retention of new behavior patterns. ... much human behavior is developed through modelling. From observing others, one forms a conception of how new behavior patterns are performed, and on later occasions the symbolic construction serves as a guide for action" (Bandura, 1977). Thus goals and outcomes may be formulated through experience, and expectancies developed through cognitive processes, rather than simply through direct experience: "Since consequences affect behavior through the influence of thought, beliefs about schedules of reinforcement can exert greater influence on behavior than the reinforcement itself. ... Both the anticipated satisfactions of desired accomplishments and the negative appraisals of insufficient performance thus provide incentives for action" (Bandura, 1977).

This is the view of goal-setting through role modelling suggested by Robertson, Smith and Cooper (1992), quoted above. There are, however, other factors which will impact on behaviour. "Expectation alone will not produce desired performance if the component capabilities are lacking. ... Given appropriate skills and adequate incentives ... efficacy expectations are a major determinant of people's choice of activities. How much effort they will expend, and how long they will sustain effort in dealing with stressful situations" (Bandura, 1977).

Efficacy is the belief of the individual that a certain behaviour will, in fact, lead to a desired outcome and the belief that he or she will actually be able to perform the necessary behaviour both affect the probability that an action will be performed. This is entirely consistent with the instrumentality concept in expectancy theory. These beliefs may be fragile, and personality differences play a part. Social learning is based upon observations of others, but such observations only act on expectations, which lead to practical "trials" of behaviour. The results of these experiments reinforce or undermine the behaviour and so influence future behaviours: "Weak expectations are easily extinguishable by disconfirming experiences, whereas individuals who possess strong expectations of mastery will persevere in their coping efforts despite disconfirming experiences".

Seeing others perform threatening activities without adverse consequences can generate expectations in observers that they too will improve if they intensify and persist in their efforts. Vicarious experience, relying as it does on inferences from social comparison, is a less dependable source of information about one's capabilities than is direct evidence of personal accomplishments. Consequently, the efficacy expectations induced by modeling alone are likely to be weaker and more vulnerable to change. (Bandura, 1977).

Korman (1974) links this directly to expectancy theory: "behaviors actually oriented to fulfilling one's needs and values are a positive function of one's success (at this) in the past." "The more a person has been punished in the past, the less he will work toward achieving rewards in the future and the less he will change his behavior to maximise the possibility of receiving such rewards in the future". Social learning theory, however, does not interpret this reinforcement history as the direct determinant of behaviour, but as input to a cognitive process: "Reinterpretation of antecedent determinants as predictive cues, rather than as controlling stimuli, has shifted the locus of the regulation of behavior from the stimulus to the individual" (Bandura, 1977).

It should be noted that beliefs about efficacy may arise from previous patterns of reinforcement. If an individual's experience has produced an external locus of control
(discussed above in some detail as a factor in stress) then belief in his or her own capability to perform instrumental activities may be weak. “The subjective feeling of control, or the lack of it, is an important experience that may influence our behavior. Loss of hope and the feeling that one’s life is under the external control of other persons or factors such as luck may sometimes lead to withdrawal, apathy, and lack of effort. Behavior that may appear irrational or deviant to others is often the consequence of the feeling of powerlessness” (Jung, 1978). This has an important influence on the persistence of behaviour: “how long we will keep trying at something” (Hayes, 1994), as well as on choice.

The evidence to support social learning theory has come mainly from the field of personality studies, rather than workplace motivation. In a series of experiments investigating aggression in the early 1960s, Bandura and colleagues (Bandura and Walters, 1963; Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1963) demonstrated that children would “store” observations of the behaviours of others, reproducing those behaviours on later occasions when it appeared advantageous to do so. Bandura (1969) obtained similar results in later investigations into the effects of reward. He found that children would imitate behaviours which they had observed to be rewarded in others, sometimes after long periods had elapsed. From these observations, Bandura was able to link self-efficacy beliefs with the cognitive evaluation of effective behaviours in others and apply his findings to the field of motivation.

Towards an integrated Theory of Motivation

Rabindra N. Kanungo and Manuel Mendonca (1994) presents a generalised model of work motivation taking both content and process theories together. The model has following six elements:

1. Employee needs
2. Employee Outcome expectations
3. Employee self efficacy expectations
4. Job Behaviour
5 Employee Experience of Outcomes
6. Feedback

![Diagram](image-url)

Fig. 3.14 The basic Motivational Cycle
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Theresa M. Welbourne, Steven B. Andrews, Alice O. Andrews have presented a summary of major motivation theories in a comparative fashion. The same is reproduced in Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>EXEMPLAR</th>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>TOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motives and Needs</td>
<td>Maslow (1954),</td>
<td>Innate drive to fulfill needs, which are hierarchical</td>
<td>Motivators should meet needs, such as growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herzberg, et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1959)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>Vroom (1964)</td>
<td>Given set of preferences, probabilistic cognitive choices are made from set of alternative actions, based on perceptions of returns gained</td>
<td>Enhance perceived returns associated with desired outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Adams (1963),</td>
<td>Perceptions of inequity generate internal tension, which motivates effort to resolve tension based on cost-benefit analysis of alternatives; socially contextualizing the rational calculator of expectancy theory</td>
<td>Avoid de-motivators and perceptions of inequity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thibaut &amp; Walker,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Locke (1968),</td>
<td>Specific and difficult goals motivate behavior</td>
<td>Set goals, provide feedback to maintain intended behaviors and goal commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locke &amp; Latham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Evaluation</td>
<td>Deci (1971)</td>
<td>Replace tension-reduction approach with intrinsic motivation concept; given a preference structure, people seek stimulation from their environment, challenges provide motivation, competence provides reward</td>
<td>Enhance mechanisms leading to moderate challenges and gains in competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Design</td>
<td>Hackman &amp; Oldham</td>
<td>Characteristics of job associated with outcomes, such as satisfaction</td>
<td>Job redesign to motivate desired outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operant Conditioning</td>
<td>Skinner (1969),</td>
<td>Motivation is learned response to positive reinforcements</td>
<td>Reinforcements and sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luthans &amp; Kreitner (1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self concept</td>
<td>Sullivan (1989)</td>
<td>Motivation for behavior is to act in ways consistent with perceptions of one's self, which leads to diversity of behaviors</td>
<td>Match desired behaviors with perceptions of self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Welbourne (1995)</td>
<td>Moderate levels of fear, combined with effective coping techniques, motivate behavior</td>
<td>Evoke moderate sense of fear, with effective coping techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.3 Effects of Organizational Culture on Motivation

George B. Whitfield, III, a Technical Advisor with Executive Orientation Services of Jakarta writes:

"An expatriate manager asking about Indonesian employee motivation recently sent me the following question: Can you advise me how I can motivate my employees towards work without giving them financial alteration? ... I keep trying to explain to them how I work. Why we need to build our company and make money. They never understand WHY they are working and what for.... I believe in this world that 'motivation' is the key to having a direct effect on change and a company's growth and financial outcome in the long term."

Then George proceeds to expound the Motivational Profile of Indonesian employees as follows:

"...Indonesian managers are working in their own country and are working in their own cultural support systems. Motivation differs between Indonesian business culture and standard Western business culture. In Indonesia, where business is always personal, motivation depends strongly, but not unsurprisingly, on more personal factors than those of the West. Family, religion, health, and other so-called personal factors often determine an Indonesian manager's performance on a daily basis. Western preoccupation with money as the prime mover in work performance does not apply well to Indonesia. In Indonesia, money is, of course, very important. It is closely tied to position, being an indicator of one's status. However, it is not the sole indicator, nor is it closely tied to one's job performance in many Indonesian managers' perceptions. Status comes from the position. When one has a senior, powerful position, one gains the accoutrements of power. These include company cars and handphones, golf club memberships, nice houses and vacations, and, of course, money. These indicators of wealth stem and flow from the position, not from the performance.

Indonesian employees are motivated by the appearance of increasing status. Indonesian managers are also motivated by their loyalty to a superior. By maintaining and developing personal relationships between superior and subordinate, you develop the basis for the motivation of the employee to contribute more to the success of the company as embodied by his or her superior. ...The cause and effect of performance for bonuses is often vaguely understood. If an Indonesian employee has enough money to cover present expenses and desires, offering more money solely based on future performance will not usually affect motivation. It is often the case that an employee who receives a performance bonus will not continue at a high level of performance until further funds are needed thus confusing the expatriate manager expecting a Pavlovian stimulus-response reflex.... In summary, most Indonesian employees are motivated by two factors: Gengsi (appearance), here being the appearance of increasing status; and, Asal Bapak Senang, (keep the boss happy) in this case working diligently to please their superior."

This type of country specific strategies for motivating employees have recently proliferated general media, business circles and even lay-men's conversation. The quality of discussions range from bland, even sometimes prejudicial generalization to sophisticated research based analysis.
In previous chapters we have seen that national culture varies significantly from nation to nation. And along with it we have seen a distinct type of Organizational culture developing in various organizations. The organizational culture of an organization being broadly guided by the national culture of the country of its existence/operation/origin, we should be interested in other variation of various organizational factors.

Like Organizational culture varies from nation to nation and from organization to organization, does the motivation profile of employees of such organizations? If yes, then do they correlate? And if yes, how?

**Work Motivation and Culture**

Synonyms of "work," according to the American Heritage Dictionary include, "toil, drudgery, labor, travail. These nouns refer to the exertion of physical or mental faculties in order to accomplish something, contrasted with play or recreation" (Morris, 1970.) The implication of this idea of work in Western society is that people are inherently unmotivated to work. Motivating employees in Western society is based on this understanding of work motivation. Managers seem to believe that work itself is not and cannot be intrinsically motivating and so seek methods of improving workers' personal satisfaction through incentives. Likewise in classrooms everywhere, instructors scramble to locate means to motivate learners through incentives such as grades, certificates and degrees. And yet, work is such a large part of most adult's lives. People seem to measure their worth in what they do. When meeting someone for the first time, a common conversation starter is, "and what do you do?" In Eastern cultures, the concepts of work and work motivation are viewed somewhat differently and motivating employees is not the same issue that it is in Western civilizations. In these societies, motivating people comes not from extrinsic incentives, but from "such nonmaterialistic properties as trust, altruistic sentiments, norms of reciprocity, and a moral duty obliging them to act and perform out of a spirit of spontaneous consensus" (Munroe, Schumaker & Carr, 1997, p. 121.)

In China, the focus of motivating individuals in the workplace is on moralistic duty. Beginning in adolescence, young learners are instilled with a consciousness of moral obligation and familial role. Individuals are encouraged to recognize their moral duties to perform, whether in the workplace, the classroom, or at home. In this culture, all people work together for the good of the many, versus the Western approach of working primarily for the self. In Chinese culture, workers are fulfilling their expected roles in the workplace and are motivated from an inner acceptance of their place in society (Munroe, Schumaker & Carr, 1997.)

The anchor of the Japanese motivational approach is trust. In a study by Dore, workers in the Japanese factory Hitachi were found to be highly motivated and committed to their jobs and their company in spite of low work satisfaction (cited in Munro, Schumaker & Carr, 1997.) The workers seemed to experience a devotion to their company because of the belief in a future reward for all as a result of their commitment. The belief seemed to be that Hitachi was a family to them and it was logical to support that family for the benefit of all included.
"The Hitachi case illustrates further the orientation of Oriental workers. They are motivated not only out of individualistic striving for self-interest but also by a collectivistic consciousness of the 'commonwealth' that the work enterprise epitomizes. There is an altruistic belief in a durable job tenure, a degree of mutuality of trust and a felt obligation shared by the individuals to contribute to company solidarity and survival..." (Munro, Schumaker & Carr, 1997)

The impact of the success of this approach to worker motivation seems clear. Eastern industry has developed a reputation for excellence and longevity. A stereotype has developed in our culture that the oriental student has a predisposition to excel at science and mathematics. Interestingly, the approach is not so different from Western cultural expectations from years past. A few short generations ago, men worked because it was their moral obligation to themselves and their families. Companies took care of their own and loyalties between employers and employees were strong. Companies retained employees by providing lifetime career opportunities for workers much like the commitment demonstrated by Japanese Hitachi.

Most motivation theories in use today were developed in the United States by Americans and about Americans. Of those that were not, many have been strongly influenced by American theoretical work. Americans' strong emphasis on individualism has led to the expectancy and equity theories of motivation: theories that emphasize rational, individual thought as the primary basis of human behavior. The emphasis placed on achievement is not surprising given Americans' willingness to accept risk and their high concern for performance. The theories therefore do not offer universal explanations of motivation; rather, they reflect the values system of Americans.

Maslow's need hierarchy argues that people start at physiological level and then move progressively up the hierarchy. This hierarchy, if it has any application at all, aligns with American culture. In countries like Japan, Greece, and Mexico, where uncertainty avoidance characteristics are strong, security needs would be on top of the need hierarchy. Countries that score high on quality-of-life characteristics - Denmark, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, and Finland - would have social needs on top. We would predict, for instance, that group work will motivate employees more when the country's culture scores high on the quality criterion.

Another motivation concept that clearly has an American bias is the achievement need. The view that a high achievement need acts as an internal motivator presupposes two cultural characteristics - a willingness to accept a moderate degree of risk (which excludes countries with strong uncertainty avoidance characteristics) and a concern with performance (which applies almost singularly to countries with strong quality-of-life characteristics). His combination is found in Anglo-American countries like the Unites States, Canada, and Great Britain. On the other hand, these characteristics are relatively absent in countries such as Chile and Portugal.

Goal setting certainly is also culture-bound. It is well adapted because its key components align reasonably well with American culture. It assumes that subordinates will be reasonably independent (not too high a score on power distance), that managers and subordinates will seek challenging goals (low in uncertainty avoidance), and that performance is considered
important by both (high is quality of life). Goal settings recommendations are not likely to increase motivation in countries such as Portugal and Chile, where the opposite conditions exist.

American as well as non-American managers have tended to treat American theories as the best or only way to understand motivation. They are neither. American motivation theories, although assumed to be universal, have failed to provide consistently useful explanations outside the United States. Managers must therefore guard against imposing domestic American management theories on their multinational business practices.

Motivation is a construct; it is an assumed force explaining behaviours. Culture enters the motivation picture in the behaviors themselves that differ and in the explanations for behaviours that differ as well, even where behaviors are the same. In explaining why she puts in extra effort on her job, an American may note the money she receives, a French person may mention her honour, a Chinese person may point to mutual obligations, and a Dane may mention collegiality.

The founding father of motivation theory is Sigmund Freud, though he is rarely quoted in the U.S. management literature of motivation. Freud was an Austrian. The Austrian culture is characterized by the combination of small power distance with strong uncertainty avoidance. The low power distance means that there is no powerful superior who will take away one’s uncertainties: One has to carry these oneself. Freud’s super-ego is an inner uncertainty absorbing device, an interiorized boss. High uncertainty avoidance indicates intolerance of deviance. Fairly low individualism implies an obligation to in-groups. Finally, a very high masculinity score sheds some light on Freud’s strong concern with sex.

The U.S. culture profile differs from the Austrian by a much lower uncertainty avoidance score and a much higher individualism score. The strong individualism implies a calculative involvement in of Americans in organizations. This explains the popularity in the U.S. of “expectancy” theories of motivation, which see people as pulled by the expectancy of outcomes, mostly consciously (Vroom, 1964), rather than as pushed by unconscious drives. A combination of uncertainty avoidance and masculinity was the best predictor of “need for achievement” as a country level motivator, as identified by McClelland(1961) in his content analysis of 1925 children’s readers.

The combination of high individualism, low uncertainty avoidance, and high masculinity also explains the popularity of Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of human needs. Maslow’s highest level of need, self actualization, is a highly individualistic motive. It has been found that only Americans, out of 16 countries surveyed, ordered their needs almost exactly in the order of Maslow’s hierarchy (Haire, Ghiselli, Porter, 1966).

Hofstede has classified countries according to their motivational profile which in turn was derived from his findings on cultural variations. He has suggested the following four typologies of motivational profiles:

1. Weak uncertainty avoidance and masculine: Motivation is based on personal, individual success, in the form of wealth, recognition, and “self actualization”.

2. Strong uncertainty avoidance and masculine: Motivation is based on personal, individual security. This can be found in wealth and especially in hard work.
3. Strong uncertainty avoidance and feminine: Motivation is based on security and relationships. Individual wealth is less important than mutual solidarity.

4. Weak uncertainty avoidance and feminine: Motivation is based on success and relationships. In this category success is measured partly by the quality of the human relationships and of the living environment.

Schuler and Rogovsky (1998) used three data sets about national compensation practices for the employed population in general together covering 24 countries and found following correlations:

1. Power distance was related negatively to workplace child care for managers, professional, and technical staff, and to non-managerial employee stock option and ownership.

2. Uncertainty avoidance was positively correlated to pay based on seniority and skill and negatively related to pay based on performance.

3. Individualism was positively related to pay for individual performance and to stock options and ownership for managers.

4. Masculinity was positively related to payment of commission to non-managerial employees and negatively related to flexible benefits, workplace child care for clerical and manual workers, and maternity leave.

The MAO-C instrument of Uday Pareek (1998) widely used among Indian researches for analyzing organizational culture, has expressed organizational culture in terms of six motives. The details are given in previous chapter.

McGregor’s theory X and theory Y carry a strong humanistic missionary flavor characteristic of the 1950s. These theories had a great impact on practicing managers, firstly, due to their simplicity and secondly due to their commonsense appeal. But, in the back ground of these theories, lies a strong US centric bias. The basic assumptions of both the theories are (Hofstede, 2001):

1. work is good for people,. It is God’s will that people should work.

2. People’s capacities should be maximally utilized. It is God’s will that people should use their capacities to the full.

3. There is “organizational objectives” that exist apart from people.

4. People in organizations behave as unattached individuals.

These assumptions reflect the value positions of an individualistic, masculine society.

As against theory X and Theory Y, there are theory T, theory T+, Theory Z, Theory i (all for explaining motivation of people) to accommodate various cultural diversities.

Theory T and T+ were propounded by Hofstede (2001), for South East Asian countries. Theory Z was developed for Japan and theory i was for India.

Assumptions of theory T are (Hofstede, 2001):

1. There is an order of inequality in this world in which every one has his or her rightful place. High and low are protected by this order which is willed by God.
2. Children have to learn to fulfill their duties at the place where they belong by birth. They can improve their place by studying under a good teacher, working with a good patron, and/or marrying a good partner.

3. Tradition is the source of wisdom. Therefore, the average human being has an inherent dislike of change and will rightly avoid it if he or she can.

Assumptions of Theory T+ are as follows, which are not necessarily contradictory to Theory T:

1. Inspite of the wisdom in traditions, the experience of change in life is natural, as natural as work, play or rest.

2. Commitment to change is a function of the quality of leaders who lead the change, the rewards associated with the change, and the negative consequences of not changing.

3. The capacity to lead people to a new situation is widely, not narrowly, distributed among leaders in the people.

4. The learning capacities of the average family are more than sufficient for modernization.

Similarly, theory Z of motivation encompasses the cultural characteristics of Japanese organizations. In the 1980s, William Ouchi researched how corporations in Japan are run differently from U.S. companies.

The Japanese management approach, called TYPE J, involved:

a. Lifetime employment.
b. Consensual decision making.
c. Collective responsibility for the outcomes of decisions.
d. Slow evaluation and promotion.
e. Implied control mechanisms.
f. Nonspecialized career paths.
g. Holistic concern for employees.

The American management approach, called TYPE A, involved:

h. Short-term employment.
i. Individual decision making.
j. Individual responsibility for the outcomes of decisions.
k. Rapid evaluation and promotion.
l. Explicit control mechanism.
m. Specialized career paths.
Segmented concern for employees.

Ouchi realized that American managers could not be expected to accept a concept based on another culture. Ouchi recommended a hybrid of the two approaches, THEORY Z based on:

- Long-term employment.
- Collective decision making.
- Individual responsibility for the outcome of decisions.
- Slow evaluation and promotion.
- Moderately specialized career path.
- Holistic concern for employees.

Theory i (Choudhary, 2002) is one of the many attempts recently made by researchers to unravel the mystery of Indian Organizational culture and work motivation.

The Principles of “Theory ‘i’ Management” are:

- Most Indians value bonds, emotions, and long-term relationships.
- Most Indians value growth opportunities and commitment.
- Our cultural roots (of tolerance, etc.) often make us complacent.
- Lack of patriotism at a macro level leaves us aimless.

The perceived impact of organizational culture on individual behavior has been articulated for many years. M. P. Carrol observed in 1982 that culture, like morals, laws, and customs, shapes behavior, and is something that older generations hand down to younger ones.(Carrol, 1982) Hofstede likened culture to a collective programming of the minds of one group that differentiates them from other groups. He believes this programming derives from one’s social culture. (Hofstede, 1991) The advent of the computer has provided additional convenient metaphors for explaining the impact of culture on individuals. Hall likened culture to a large complex computer that programs the responses and actions of people. He argues that individuals must learn the programs of their organization’s culture if they are to make the system work. (Hall, 1987)

The impact of culture on behavior has been postulated for many years and its impact continues to be demonstrated. For example, 103 human resource professionals at major U.S. based organizations were asked to identify the most important factors influencing the management development programs in their organizations. Four factors were mentioned by over two-thirds of the respondents:

- The Chief Operating Officer’s vision and values
- The organization’s strategic plan
- The operating needs of the line organizations, and
- The organization’s culture
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There are four basic ways in which a culture, or more accurately members of a reference group representing a culture, creates high levels of cross individual behavioral consistency. They are:

1. Social Norms

Social norms are the most basic and most obvious of cultural control mechanisms. In its basic form, a social norm is simply a behavioral expectation that people will act in a certain way in certain situations. Norms (as opposed to rules) are enforced by other members of a reference group by the use of social sanctions. Norms have been categorized by level.

- Peripheral norms are general expectations that make interactions easier and more pleasant. Because adherence of these norms is not essential to the functioning of the group, violation of these norms general results in mild social sanctions.

- Relevant norms encompass behaviors that are important to group functioning. Violation of these norms often results in non-inclusion in important group functions and activities.

- Pivotal norms represent behaviors that are essential to effective group functioning. Individuals violating these norms are often subject to expulsion from the group.

Reasons for compliance with norms:

- Self-concept
  Individuals more dominant in self-concept external source of motivation (those motivated primarily by means of acceptance, worth and status and other forms of external validation) would be most likely to comply with social norms. Since social sanctions involve the withholding of acceptance, these individual are most likely to comply. Likewise, those characterized by high/week self-concepts would be more likely to comply with social norms than with those with strong self-concepts. Those with strong self-concepts or less likely to need the acceptance and other forms of affirmation contingent upon compliance with norms.

- Identification
  Individuals who identify with the group, that is to define their social identity in terms of the group, are more likely to comply with the group's norms.

- Internalization of norms
  One of the most powerful bases of compliance or conformity is internalization, that is, believing that the behavior dictated by the norm is truly the right and proper way to behave. Over time, many group members began to internalize pivotal and relevant norms. This represents the development of a cognitive schema.
2. Shared Values

As a cultural control mechanism the keyword in shared values is shared. The issue is not whether or not a particular individual's behavior can best be explained and/or predicted by his or her values, the conscious, affective desires or wants of people that guide their behavior, but rather how widely is that value shared among organizational members, and more importantly, how responsible was the organization/culture in developing that value within the individual.

Private/internal values- When individuals have internalized values, compliance with values is based on eliminating guilt feelings associated with noncompliance with values. For example, individuals internalizing the value of honesty, feel guilty when cheating or stealing. This negative affect state stops them from acting in a way inconsistent with their internalized value.

Public/espouse values- When we believe that everyone around us holds a certain value (social value), we often acting ways consistent with that value even though we don't personally hold that value. This is done to gain acceptance and support from the group.

Abraham Maslow (A Theory of Human Motivation, A. H. Maslow (1943) Originally Published in Psychological Review, 50) says, “Motivation theory is not synonymous with behavior theory. The motivations are only one class of determinants of behavior. While behavior is almost always motivated, it is also almost always biologically, culturally and situationally determined as well.”

There is a growing body of research findings that show motivation varies between individuals, between groups, and between cultures. Karen Legge and Neil Millward (in Millward 1968) reported an interesting example when they were asked to study a television components factory in the north-west of England. The objective of the study was to help management understand why some staff responded well and were highly motivated by the incentive bonus scheme in operation, whilst others showed no interest in it at all. The explanation lay in the family situation of the employees. Those who were recent school-leavers were expected, in that community, to give their unopened pay packet to their mother, and receive "spending money" out of it. Those who were a little older kept their own pay packet and gave their mother an allowance for their lodgings at home. Consequently the younger staff had no interest in any extra money which might make its way into their pay packet, as their mother would keep this. The situation changed, and they become more highly motivated by the incentive bonus scheme, when they started to keep their own pay packet.

Other researchers have reported variations in motivation. Michael White (1973) found UK managers in a sample of 2246 showed six distinctive patterns of motivation (material rewards, status and prestige, security and social issues, job interest, variety and challenge, and leadership). Blackburn and Mann (1979) found in a sample of 1000 low skilled workers a wide range of "orientations", or motivations to work. These included such things as pay, hours of work, promotion opportunities, autonomy, working indoors, intrinsic features of the work, how worthwhile the work was, relationships with colleagues, and working conditions.
These kinds of studies certainly support the "contingency theory" approach, which says that management strategies (including payment systems) should be designed specifically to suit the host organisation and its employees and managers.

One global high-technology firm based in the Silicon Valley in California thought it had the answer to the question 'What causes high employee productivity and job satisfaction? What energizes employees to behave in certain ways? ' . The firm created the "Dragon Slayer Campaign" with posters encouraging employees to "Slay the Dragon." Unfortunately, the American management had not realized that dragons symbolized good luck to the Chinese and that their campaign was not encouraging Chinese employees to cut costs and beat the competition but rather to destroy their good luck. Understandably, Chinese employees forced the firm to take down the posters and to end the campaign.

Numerous motivation theories address these questions and most have been developed and tested in the United States. Each attempts to explain why human beings behave in the ways they do and what managers can do to encourage certain types of behavior while discouraging others. Let's look at a few of the historically better-recognized motivation theories and determine if they are universal or culture bound.

**ERG Theory**

Claydon Alderfer of Yale University has reworked Maslow's need hierarchy to align it more closely with the empirical research. His revised need hierarchy is labeled ERG theory.

Maslow's need hierarchy is a rigid steplike progression. ERG theory does not assume that there exists a rigid hierarchy where a lower-need must be substantially gratified before one can move on. All three need categories could be operating at the same time. ERG theory also contains a frustration-regression dimension. ERG theory counters by noting that when a higher-order need level is frustrated, the individual's desire to increase a lower-level need takes place. Inability to satisfy a need for social interaction may increase the desire for more money or better working conditions. So frustration can lead to a regression to a lower need.

ERG theory is more consistent with our knowledge of individual differences among people. Variables such as education, family background, and cultural environment can alter the importance or driving force that a group of needs holds for a particular individual. The evidence demonstrating that people in other cultures rank the need categories differently - for instance, natives of Spain and Japan place social needs before their physiological requirements, would be consistent with ERG theory.

**McClelland's Three Motives**

Comparative research on McClelland's achievement motivation has shown it to be relatively robust across cultures. For example, managers in New Zealand appear to follow the pattern developed in the United States. However, similar to his analysis of Maslow's need hierarchy, Hofstede questions the universality of McClelland's three needs. Hofstede begins by pointing out that the word achievement itself is hardly translatable into any language other than English. In his research, Hofstede found that countries with a high need for achievement also have a high need to produce (Hofstede's masculinity dimension) and a strong willingness to accept risk (Hofstede's weak uncertainty avoidance). Anglo-American countries such as the
United States, Canada, and Great Britain (weak uncertainty avoidance combined with masculinity) follow the high achievement motivation pattern; and countries such as Chile and Portugal (strong uncertainty avoidance combined with femininity) follow the low achievement motivation pattern. Although helpful in explaining human behavior, McClelland’s three motives have not been shown to be universal.

The achievement motivation training programme conducted in India (McClelland and Winter, 1969) to foster entrepreneurship was not sustainable and the little effect that it may have had was ephemeral, perhaps owing to the lack of social support for personal achievement orientation in the cultural setting. Machungwa and Schmitt (1983) have reported limited usefulness of western constructs in understanding motivation to work in a developing country like Zambia. The simplistic adoption of specific western formulations on work motivation is grossly inadequate because they exclude critical variables indigenous to specific cultural contexts. Any meaningful analysis of work motivation in developing societies has to be juxtaposed with an analysis of the physical and socio-cultural environment as well as the stable attributes of the individual who is a product of such an environment. (Mishra and Kanungo, 1994)

Vroom's Expectancy Theory

A recent review of understanding of motivation underscores that "whether the driving force is thought to be prior reinforcement, need fulfillment, or expectancies of future gain, the individual is assumed to be a rational maximizer of personal utility." Unfortunately, this individual, calculative view of motivation has questionable applicability outside of the United States and "could be a fundamental omission in our motivation theories."

For example, in countries where individualism dominates, employees see their relationship with the organization from a calculation perspective, whereas in collectivist societies, the ties between the individual and the organization have a moral component. Clearly people become committed to organizations for very different reasons in individualistic than in collectivist societies. Employees with collectivist values make organizational commitments due to their ties with managers, owners, and co-workers (collectivism); and much less because of the nature of the job or the particular compensation scheme (individualistic incentives). Given its individualistic orientation, it is not surprising that the United States has the most executive search firms and the highest level of executive and managerial mobility in the world.

People in different cultures vary in the amount of control they believe they have over their environment. Most Americans strongly believe that they control their environment. American managers believe that they directly influence the world in which they work (that is, they have a high level of internal attribution). Americans believe that "Where there is a will, there is a way." By contrast, many managers in other parts of the world believe that they only partially control their work environment and the outcomes of their own behavior (that is, they attribute the causes of some events to external circumstances). For example, Moslem managers believe that things will happen only if God wills them to happen (external attribution); Latin American managers believe that it is important to be from the right family and social class (external attribution); Hong King Chinese believe that there is an element of "joss," or luck, involved in all transactions (external attribution); whereas most American managers believe
hard work will get the job done (internal attribution). Expectancy theories work best in explaining cultures that emphasize internal attribution.

The rewards people want from work also vary greatly across cultures. As discussed in reference to Maslow, security is very important to some people, congenial relationships are paramount to others, and individual status and respect (career advancement) are dominant for others. In a classic study, Sirota and Greenwood investigated the work goals of 19,000 employees in a large multinational electrical equipment manufacturer operating in forty-six countries and reported the results for the twenty-five countries with at least forty employees, including Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, India, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Venezuela. In these countries the five most important goals concerned achievement, especially individual achievement. Next in importance were the immediate environment, general features of the organization, and employment conditions such as pay and work hours. Some of the major differences among the culture groups included

1. English-speaking countries were higher on individual achievement and lower on the desire for security.

2. French countries, although similar to the English-speaking countries, gave greater importance to security and somewhat less to challenging work.

3. Northern European countries expressed less interest in "getting ahead" and work recognition goals and put more emphasis on job accomplishment; in addition, they showed more concern for people and less for the organization as a whole (it was important for them that the job not interfere with their personal lives).

4. Latin countries found individual achievement somewhat less important, especially southern Europeans who placed the highest emphasis on job security. Both groups of Latin countries emphasized fringe benefits.

5. Germany was high on security and fringe benefits and among the highest on "getting ahead".

6. Japan was low on advancement but was also second highest on challenge and lowest on autonomy, with strong emphasis on good working conditions and a friendly working environment.

Expectancy theories are universal to the extent that they do not specify the types of rewards that motivate a given group of workers. Managers themselves must determine the level and type of rewards most sought after by a particular people. While Sirota and Greenwoods' conclusions support the idea that basic human needs are similar, they highlight that culture and environment determine how these needs can best be met.

The international management literature is replete with examples of overgeneralization, due to the dominance of American reward structures. For example, raising the salaries of a particular group of Mexican workers motivated them to work fewer, not more, hours. As the Mexicans explained, "We can now make enough money to live and enjoy life (one of their
primary values) in less time than previously. Now, we do not have to work so many hours."
In another example, an expatriate manager in Japan decided to promote one of his Japanese
sales representatives to manager (a status reward). To the surprise of the expatriate boss, the
promotion diminished the new Japanese manager's performance. Why? Japanese have a high
need for harmony - to fit in with their work colleagues. The promotion, an individualistic
reward, separated the new manager from his colleagues, embarrassed him, and therefore
diminished his motivation to work. When modified for the extent to which managers believe
they control their work environment and for the specific types of rewards desired, expectancy
theories appear to hold outside of the United States even in countries as culturally dissimilar
to the United States as Japan.

Maslow’s Need Hierarchy:

In a paper of remarkable insight on China, by Nevis (1983), we have some crucial cross-
cultural comparisons, which are:

1. The comparison with Maslow need hierarchy theory shows that the concept of
   a hierarchy of needs is only valid in terms of a specific culture. It is a
   culturally relative concept, not a biological imperative.

2. Incentives and structure to further motivation can only succeed to the extent
   that they fit with basic values as reflected in culturally bound theory.

3. In fact, it may be appropriate to give up this terminology “self actualization”
   altogether, and call the higher Chinese order need something like ‘social
   confluence’ : the submersion of individual desires for super ordinate goals or
   working toward a truly collective consciousness.

Maslow says “........“Cultural specificity and generality of needs. --- This classification of
basic needs makes some attempt to take account of the relative unity behind the superficial
differences in specific desires from one culture to another. Certainly in any particular culture
an individual's conscious motivational content will usually be extremely different from the
conscious motivational content of an individual in another society. However, it is the
common experience of anthropologists that people, even in different societies, are much
more alike than we would think from our first contact with them, and that as we know them
better we seem to find more and more of this commonness, We then recognize the most
startling differences to be superficial rather than basic, e. g., differences in style of hair-dress,
clothes, tastes in food, etc.”

Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory

Herzberg’s two factor theory has special significance for our research because we are going
to measure the motivational profile of respondents by using an instrument which relies on
thus monumental motivation theory.

But Herzberg research has not gone unchallenged. Victor H. Vroom was in the vanguard of
the attack. In 1964, he stated that the two-factor conclusion was only one of many that could
be interpreted from Herzberg’s research findings. One could also argue that the relative frequency with which job-content or job-contextual factors will be mentioned as source of satisfaction and dissatisfaction is dependent on the nature of the content-context of the work roles of the respondents. Vroom cited the classic study of the assembly line worker by Walker and Guest, to support his interpretation.

Dayal (1992) in his diagnosis of behavioral patterns in Indian Organizations found that employee participation in a society characterized by high power distance (Hofstede, 1980) does not work, and hence contradicting McGregor’s theory Y.

All most all major theories on work motivation are developed in west are biased towards an context insensitive approach. There have been a distinct emphasis on the job at the cost of excluding cultural variables. But there have been two notable exceptions: the socio-technical systems (STS) approach (Trist et al., 1963) and the social information processing (SIP) approach (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978). The socio-technical systems theory explicitly considers the social aspects of the work context by considering the work unit to be a social-plus-technical systems theory which is open in relation to its environment. The SIP model hold that the person,s immediate social environment provide sources of information which influences the individual’s perception of the salient characteristics of the job.

Kanungo and Jaeger (1990) have characterized developing countries as being relatively high on power distance and uncertainty avoidance, and relatively low on individualism and masculinity. Mendonca and Kanungo (1992) have suggested the possible organizational implications of this particular cultural configuration as follows:

1. High power distance discourages employee initiative and participation, fosters unquestioning acceptance, and hinders joint managers- subordinate activities.
2. High uncertainty avoidance leads to a reluctance to exercise autonomy, impedes the acceptance of performance based pay.
3. Low individualism reduces the motivational; impact of task attributes such as task identity, autonomy, and job feed back, and is not compatible with managerial approaches that emphasize only task roles and rewards based on individual performance.
4. Low masculinity leads to an exclusive focus on personalized relationships rather than effective or efficient performance., and promotes personalized rather than organizational loyalty.

A framework suggested by Kanungo and Jaeger (1990) suggests that the context or environment of the developing countries differs from that of the developed countries at three levels:

a) External, economic, technological, political, and legal contexts
b) External socio-cultural context
c) Internal work culture context
Within each level, they have identified specific dimensions that account for the differences between the behaviour of employees (and management) of developing and developed countries. These differences are summarized below:

Characterization of Environment of Organizations in Developing Countries:

A. External Environment: Economic/Political/Legal
   i. Low predictability of events
   ii. Greater difficulty in obtaining resources

B. External Environment: Socio-Cultural
   i. High uncertainty avoidance
   ii. High Power distance
   iii. Low individualism/high collectivism
   iv. Low masculinity/high femininity
   v. Low abstractive/high associative thinking

C. Internal Environment: Internal Work Culture
   a. Descriptive assumptions about what people are like
      i. External locus of control
      ii. Limited and fixed potential
      iii. Past and present orientation
      iv. Short-term perspective
   b. Prescriptive assumptions about how to behave
      i. Passive/reactive task orientation
      ii. Moralistic orientation in judging success
      iii. Authoritarian/paternalistic
      iv. Context dependent orientation to environment

A master theory that meaningfully integrates the critical indigenous variable associated with work motivation in developing societies does not exist, nor does a magic formula to enhance employee motivation. (Mishra, Kanungo, 1994)

Mishra and Kanungo classify the Cultural factors affecting motivation into two classes: viz. exogenous variables and indigenous variables.

Exogenous variables:

1. Socialization Practices
2. Stable Behavioral Dispositions
3. Instrumental Value Systems

Indigenous Variables (Organizational Practices)

4. Experiences Related to Management Philosophy
5. Task related Experiences
6. Reward Related Experiences
7. Supervision Related Experiences

The exogenous variables operate as predisposing factors for low work motivation of employees. The indigenous variables are inherent in organizational practices that precipitate low worker motivation in employees' day-to-day work life. Employee experiences of organizational practices that contribute to low work motivation can be divided into four broad categories: 1. those related to the management philosophy (experience of how managers view employees), those related to the nature of tasks performed on the job (task related experiences) 3. those related to the nature of rewards or compensation system (reward related experiences), 4. those related to the nature of superior-subordinate relation (supervision related experiences).

Experiences Related to Management Philosophy:

In most organizations in India, managers still hold the ‘economic man’ assumption about employees (McGregor, 1960). The management considers employees as a cost rather than a capital or resource. This commoditization of employees reduces their self esteem and lowers their loyalty towards the organization.

Task related experiences:

Work motivation suffers if there are no clear job expectations regarding what the employees are supposed to do on the job, and whether they can get what they value most through their job behaviour for the satisfaction of their significant needs. In Indian organizations, many employees do not have clear task objectives, neither any proper feedback mechanism. Very often management fails to provide adequate job descriptions and standards which might clarify employees duties and responsibilities.

Reward Related Experiences:

In many Indian Organizations, compensation schemes are drawn up and implemented without any consideration of their value, equity, contingency, visibility and timing. Employees are hired with the understanding of receiving a compensation package that is largely time based, rather than performance or skill based. Employees know that their skills and performance have no relation to the salary and benefits they receive from the organizations. Since job performance does not guarantee the sought after reward, they feel helpless in controlling the reward through their job behavior and consequently develop apathy toward their job.

Supervision Related Experiences:

In many Indian organizations, supervisors and executives emphasize bureaucratic practices with excessive reliance on rules and regulations. Such practices create a cold and impersonal work environment. An impersonal and legalistic environment alienates workers from both their job and the organization. Organizational interests are seen as separate and distinct from
the interests of workers, and workers' behaviour is often directed toward fulfilling their own interests even at the cost of organizational interests.

The intrinsic-extrinsic rewards classification was popularized by Herzberg's two factor theory (1966) which argued that intrinsic rewards alone motivated employees to high work performance. Extrinsic rewards did not motivate employees to high work performance, they only served to lower employee dissatisfaction. This emphasis on intrinsic rewards clearly reflects the cultural bias that employees work primarily to satisfy their personal achievement and autonomy needs. Hence, only those rewards which satisfy the salient growth needs will be effective motivators. Besides being conceptually flawed (Dyer and Parker, 1976; Guzzo, 1979; Kanungo and Hartwick, 1987), the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy is completely at variance with the fact that, in developing societies, economic and social security is considered more important in life than are freedom and control at the workplace (Kanungo, 1979). Consequently, extrinsic rewards can and do serve as motivators for workers in these countries.

According to Manuel Mendonca and Rabindra N. Kanungo (1994) Organizational Culture affects motivation for rewards as follows:

- Low individualism work culture does not favour contingent rewards that are based on individual's performance because individual initiative is socially disapproved and discouraged.
- The relatively high uncertainty avoidance implies an unwillingness to take risks, and thus performance is taken for granted (not rewarded), whereas mistakes are highly punished.
- High uncertainty avoidance inhibits the use of non-economic rewards such as challenging assignment, autonomy, that satisfy high growth needs, because of the reluctance to take personal initiatives outside of the prescribed roles.
- Individuals in cultures that are high on uncertainty avoidance have been found to have a lower ambition for personal advancement, and prefer detailed, written directions (Hofstede, 1980)
- In a work culture characterized by low individualism, employees, even when they perform extremely well, do not get satisfaction from 'work well done' but, rather, from 'work well recognized'.
- In situations of high power distance, the tall organizational structures that rigidly enforce the norm of inequality, the reward system would inevitably emphasize status symbols, along with considerable wage or salary differentials, that do not truly reflect the real value of the job's contribution to organizational objectives.
- In low masculinity cultures, the satisfaction of affiliation needs takes precedence over satisfaction derived from achieving job objectives. Low masculinity does not encourage performance based pay. Low masculinity underscores the importance of non-economic rewards that satisfy affiliation needs.
- The reluctance to be held responsible for specific goals in terms of job behaviours/results and time targets indicates that high associative thinking cultures will have difficulty in accepting performance based pay.
Sanjay T. Menon (1994) underscores the two approaches available for us to study and interpret motivation theories propounded by western scholars: 'Is it nobler in the mind to attempt indigenous solutions to problems, which might mean re-inventing the wheel and sub-optimal use of scarce resources and thereby risk never catching up with the industrialized world, or to open one's arms to everything western in uncritical emulation, and hope for economic miracles even if at the risk of falling prey to economic or even cultural imperialism?'

In the case of management of organizations, many developing countries opted for the latter choice of wholesale adaptation of western management theories and techniques, with scant attention to local realities and constraints. In many instances, this thoughtless transfer actually contributed to organizational inefficiency and ineffectiveness (Kanungo and Jaeger).

3.2.4. Empirical Studies Related to Culture Specificity of Work-motivation

Santanu Sarkar (2003) has made some important observations after making a review of previous studies on effects of organizational culture on motivation:

(1) The majority of work on motives and needs in the last few decades falls into three areas: an examination of the job attributes that motivate individuals, research that examines need for achievement, and research on Protestant work ethic.
(2) Cross-cultural research on motivation has been criticized for focusing almost exclusively on U.S. populations.
(3) The literature on cultural diversity has generally focused on international models, ignoring the effects, which the firm's exposure to multiple cultures within a nation can bring on its performance.
(4) Grouping by cluster analysis and bi-dimensional mapping techniques have been used by many past cross-cultural researcher.
(5) Measurement of different aspects of work behaviour across cultures was made by taking "national culture" as an unit of study. But very few attempts have been made by researchers in past to direct their scientific inquiry towards measuring similar differences within a nation or within a community. Thus most of the previous cross-cultural researches reviewed were found to be 'cross-national' and hence much of the emphasis was on grouping or cluster analysis.
(6) Whether motivation framework and approaches hold across such cultures (not national culture), remains mostly unanswered by all such previous researches.

An interesting application of Herzberg's method was made in the research at Texas Instruments by Myers. In a study of 282 employees of this firm including scientists, engineers, supervisors, technicians and assembly workers, his finding only partially supported Herzberg's theory. He found that those persons who sought opportunities for achievement and responsibility, whom he characterized as growth-seekers, did indeed fit Herzberg's growth model in that they were concerned with satisfiers and relatively concerned with environmental factors. On the other hand other people whom he called "maintenance seekers" were greatly concerned with environmental conditions. In other words what motivate individual was found to be largely a matter of personality. Moreover, Myres found
that if growth seekers were treated like maintenance seekers, they soon developed the characteristics and concern of this latter group. In other words, if opportunities for advancement and achievement were not given to growth seekers, they soon become maintenance seekers. Thus according Myres, the effectiveness of a motivation system depends on the ability of supervisors to:

1. provide conditions of motivation (mainly through careful planning and organizing of work) and
2. satisfy maintenance needs (especially through such actions as being fair and friendly and dispensing adequate information).

The achievement motivation-training programme concluded in India (McClelland and Winter, 1969) to foster entrepreneurship was not suitable and the little effect it may have had was ephemeral. (Kanungo). Machungwa and Schmitt (1983) have reported limited usefulness of western constraints in understanding motivation to work in a developing country like Zambia. Hofstede’s research shows country scores on a Long-term Orientation Index (LTO) for 23 countries. East Asian countries (China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea) scored highest. Western countries were on the low side, and some developing countries (Zimbabwe, Philippines, Nigeria, and Pakistan) scored lowest. So this dimension does not oppose East and West; it divides the world along new lines. Business people in long-term oriented cultures are accustomed to working toward building strong positions in their markets and do not expect immediate results. Managers (often family members) are allowed time and resources to make their own contributions. In short-term oriented cultures the “bottom line” (the results of the past month, quarter, or year) is a major concern; control systems are focused on it and managers are constantly judged by it. This state of affairs is supported by arguments that are assumed to be rational, but the cultural distinction reminds us of the fact that this entire rationality rests on cultural – that is, pre-rational – choices.

Hofstede’s research, which used questionnaires provided to the worldwide employees of IBM, did not include some regions, and countries of Central and Eastern Europe. However, Hofstede hypothesized that Russian managers would be characterized by high power distance, high uncertainty avoidance, medium-range individualism, and low masculinity (low gender roles distinction at work). Bollinger tested Hofstede’s hypothesis in its studies of Russian managers in 1994, and found support for these predictions.

More recent studies utilized Hofstede’s dimensional model as a paradigm for new countries. For instance, Elenkov in his comparative study found that US managers are more individualistic than their Russian counterparts and the managerial culture in the United States is also characterized by lower power distance and uncertainty avoidance than the Russian managerial culture. Regarding paternalism and fatalism, Aycan et al. found Russian managers to have high scores on both of these dimensions.

Frame recognized the cultural aspects of project management in his publications and specifically accommodated the attitudes of Japanese business students attending his lectures.

In a study by Dore, workers in the Japanese factory Hitachi were found to be highly motivated and committed to their jobs and their company in spite of low work satisfaction.
The workers seemed to experience a devotion to their company because of the belief in a future reward for all as a result of their commitment. The belief seemed to be that Hitachi was a family to them and it was logical to support that family for the benefit of all included. "The Hitachi case illustrates further the orientation of Oriental workers. They are motivated not only out of individualistic striving for self-interest but also by a collectivistic consciousness of the 'commonwealth' that the work enterprise epitomizes. There is an altruistic belief in a durable job tenure, a degree of mutuality of trust and a felt obligation shared by the individuals to contribute to company solidarity and survival..." (Schumaker & Carr, 1997)

The Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) developed by O'Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell (1991) and since revised by Cable and Judge (1997) and is one of the top ten culture instruments in used today to measure culture at organizational level. (Judge and Cable, 1997). James C. Sarros, Judy H. Gray, Joseph C. Santora, Iain L. Densten (2002) in a study used, an abbreviated version of the OCP (Cable and Judge, 1997). This abbreviated version (40 items reduced from original 54). Numerous samples consisting of graduate students and practising executives attending graduate management classes in two universities and four campuses throughout Australia were selected for the study. In order to examine differences among dimensions of organizational culture when classified by demographic variables, analyses of variance and t-tests were conducted. The results of these analyses are reported as follows.

**Organizational Culture by State.** Executives in Victoria recorded significantly higher levels of supportiveness, social responsibility, and emphasis on rewards compared with their counterparts in New South Wales. Although not statistically significant, executives in the Northern Territory registered the highest mean scores on most OCP factors, apart from stability and performance orientation.

**Organizational Culture by Gender.** Male respondents recorded significantly higher scores on all organizational culture items than did women, apart from social responsibility and competitiveness.

**Organizational Culture by Age.** Executives 50 years of age and older reported their organizational cultures as significantly higher in all facets (supportiveness, social responsibility, etc) compared with their younger counterparts. The lowest scores were recorded by executives 39 years of age and younger. Similar to the findings recorded for the MLQ, younger executives in Australia saw themselves as both being less effective leaders and less likely to grow and sustain competitive and caring organizational cultures compared with their older and arguably more experienced colleagues.

**Organizational Culture by Level of Seniority.** Respondents from the top level of seniority (CEO, COO) recorded significantly higher scores on all organizational culture profiles compared with all other respondents. Similarly, respondents from the executive level (VP, Director) recorded higher scores on these factors than did respondents from the upper middle level (Department Executive, Superintendent, Plant Manager).
Organizational Culture by Years as an Executive. Executives with fewer than six years experience recorded significantly lower scores on social responsibility, competitiveness, stability and innovation compared with executives with 11 or more years experience.

Organizational Culture by Years in Current Position. Executives who had been in their current positions for three or more years recorded significantly higher levels on all organizational culture profiles compared with executives with three or fewer years experience.

Organizational Culture by Salary. Generally, the higher the salary, the more respondents described their organizational cultures as being supportive, socially responsible, and competitive. The findings show that as age, seniority, tenure, and level of remuneration increased, favorable assessments of organizational culture also increased.

Organizational Culture by Formal Education. Respondents who finished high school recorded significantly higher scores on all OCP factors compared to respondents with Bachelors degrees. Executives with Bachelors degrees scored significantly higher on social responsibility, competitiveness, and stability compared with Masters degree holders. Generally, the higher the formal qualification, the less likely it was to identify the company as scoring high on the organizational culture profiles.

Organizational Culture by Size of Organization. Executives in smaller-sized companies (fewer than 100 employees and between 100 and 499 employees) recorded significantly higher levels on all cultural profiles compared with larger-sized organizations. The highest scores were recorded for performance orientation, social responsibility, and emphasis on rewards.

A key finding of this study was that executives in smaller sized companies recorded significantly higher levels on all cultural profiles compared with larger-sized organizations. The highest scores were recorded for performance orientation, social responsibility, and emphasis on rewards. The study suggests that larger organizations might benefit by creating strategic business units empowered to focus on their areas of expertise and begin to build cultures necessary for achieving their objectives.

Chatman’s (1991) study of 171 entry-level auditors working in eight US public accounting found that recruits whose values upon entry matched those of the firm adjusted to the organizational culture more quickly, and recruits whose values most closely match the firms feel most satisfied and remain longer with the firm. According to Cable and Parsons (2001), job applicants self-select into organizations based on subjective person-organization fit and interviewers use an estimation of person-organization fit when evaluating and hiring job applicants.

Sheena Iyengar, Mark R. Lepper and Sanford E. Devoe, through their study sought to examine the relationship between manager perceptions of employee motivation and the appraisal of employee performance by surveying managers and employees in three distinct cultural regions (North America, Latin America, and Asia) within the same global organization (Citigroup). Results reveal that the extrinsic incentives bias - the tendency for
observers to hold lay theories of motivation that emphasize the role of extrinsic incentives over intrinsic ones—failed to replicate in cultural regions outside of North America. Distinctive patterns emerged for Latin American managers (perceived intrinsic as primary) and Asian managers (perceived intrinsic and extrinsic holistically). Moreover, manager perceptions of intrinsic motivation predicted appraisal of employee performance within each cultural region surveyed, but the degree to which perceptions of extrinsic motivation were predictive varied.

Research by Heath (1999) has demonstrated that, within the vocational context, observers exhibit a proclivity towards emphasizing the role of external over internal rewards when perceiving others' motivations—a finding which is the opposite of predictions made by the fundamental attribution error. Heath's (1999) research revealed an important counterexample to the fundamental attribution error when he examined lay theories in the vocational setting (also, Krull, 1993, and Quattrone, 1982). Instead of a bias towards perceiving the primacy of internal factors over external ones, the participants exhibited a pronounced tendency to overemphasize the role of extrinsic incentives in explaining the motivations of others as compared to self-reports. In a series of studies, Heath (1999) asked participants to predict the motivations of others (ranging from abstract managers and employees to specific individuals who were well known to the participant in a real world setting). The results revealed that when participants assessed their own motivation within a vocational context, they drew primarily on internal explanations; however, when assessing the motivation of others, they drew primarily on external explanations. Across the board, and even when a self-serving bias was controlled for, people understood others' motivations to be more extrinsically than intrinsically determined.

In Heath's analysis of North American participants, however, the ways in which this salience of extrinsic factors may be induced by norms unique to Anglo-American culture were not addressed. While most cultural psychologists have focused on the reverse Anglo-American tendency to ascribe causality primarily to internal factors (e.g., Hernandez & Iyengar, 2001; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Morris & Peng, 1994; Triandis, 1989, 1995), the pervasiveness of capitalism within the United States establishes economic self-interest as the primary motivation for human behavior. Vocational behavior within Anglo-American society, then, is enacted within a culturally pervasive system of capitalism where economic self-interest is a chronic heuristic for understanding human behavior (Miller, 1999; Schwartz, 1986).

Evidence that the norms of Anglo-American society tend to exclude a consideration of socio-emotional dimensions of the workplace comes from a cross-national analysis of a global organization conducted by Morris, Podolny, and Ariel (2000; 2001). The results of their analysis suggest that Anglo-Americans bring a "market orientation" to their interpersonal relations within the workplace. Within this orientation, relationships are viewed in terms of their instrumental value and are entered and exited regardless of their socio-emotional components. This instrumental orientation towards their relationships with co-workers would appear to emphasize their external value and remove the perceived relevancy of intrinsic factors to motivation.

Miller (1999) has argued that the individualism of Western culture has cultivated a pervasive belief in the powerful role self-interest has on human motivation. Miller demonstrates that this "norm of self-interest" leads observers to assume that people are more motivated by
extrinsic incentives than their actual behavior suggests. For example, people assumed that their peers were more likely to give blood for financial compensation, even though the introduction of such extrinsic incentives was not predictive of their own behavior or that of their peers. The results of this analysis suggest that when the possibility of economic self-interest is present, the norm of self-interest will lead observers to emphasize extrinsic incentives when perceiving the motivations of others.

In their multinational surveys, both Hofstede (1980) and Triandis (1995) demonstrated that North Americans are more oriented towards individualism than almost any other country, and argued that members of Asian and Latin American cultures are more oriented towards the collective. However, a recent meta-analysis of this literature has challenged the very validity of the construct (Osyerman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). Indeed, many cultural psychologists have called for a more fine-grained understanding of the qualitatively different forms of collectivism. For instance, in Morris et al.'s (2000; 2001) analysis of workplace norms in which employees from the United States were found to have a market orientation, it was also revealed that employees from Spain were characterized by an affiliative orientation (high emotional involvement with coworkers), whereas employees from China held work norms that were better characterized as a familial orientation (sacrifice for the group).

While Latin Americans appear to resemble Asians in their collectivist values (Triandis, 1995), they differ substantially by emphasizing expressive displays of personal charm, graciousness, and hospitality (Diaz-Guerrero, 1976; Lindsley & Braithwaite, 1996; Sanchez-Burks, Nisbett, & Ybarra, 2000). Indeed, Morris et al. (2000; 2001) have argued that while Asian and Latin societies place greater emphasis on social relations and collectives, these cultural groups do not all emphasize these factors in the same way. The norm of Latin American culture that most distinguishes it from both Asian and North American cultures is the manner in which work relations are guided by the cultural tradition of simpatía (Triandis, Marin, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984; Sanchez-Burks et al., 2000), in which there is a pronounced tendency to exhibit more expressions of internal emotive states. The tendency for Latin American observers in the workplace to attend to the internal socio-emotional expressions of others and the prevalent norm of actively displaying internal states, leads to the prediction that managers will be sensitized to the internal motivations of their employees. Hence, the researchers hypothesize, that Latin American managers will perceive their employees as more internally motivated than externally motivated, a pattern in the reverse of their North American counterparts. Moreover, it was hypothesized that, unlike North Americans, Latin American employees and managers will correspond in their perceptions of motivations—i.e., both manager lay theories and employee self-reports will emphasize intrinsic over extrinsic factors.

Recent work by Nisbett and colleagues (Miller, 1984; Choi & Nisbett, 1998; Nisbett, Peng, Choi, & Norenzayan, 2001; Masuda & Nisbett, 2001) has argued that, unlike their Western counterparts, Asians are more likely to perceive the world holistically. According to this cultural analysis, the Western philosophies—with their origins in Greek Aristotelian thought—are highly influenced by the analytic tradition; whereas, contemporary East Asian mentalities and thought processes—with their origins in Chinese cultural traditions such as Taoism, Chinese Buddhism, and Confucianism—are cognitively integral and holistic. A compelling series of studies by Masuda and Nisbett (2001) demonstrated through recognition
and reaction time data that, while North Americans attempt to shift out individual focal figures from their surrounding context, Japanese are more likely to perceptually encode them together, suggesting that North Americans may give more attention to traits focal to the individual, while Asians may attend more to the relationship between the individual and its environment.

A growing number of studies have empirically demonstrated that Asians are more likely to draw on both internal and external causes when explaining the behaviors of others. Studies by Norenzayan, Choi, and Nisbett (2001) showed that, like North Americans, Koreans are likely to endorse a dispositionist theory of behavior; yet, at the same time, unlike North Americans, Koreans were equally likely to endorse a situationist theory of behavior. These results comport well with a large body of cultural research that has shown that Asians—as compared to their North American counterparts—are more likely to make attributions towards the external situational context, and are thus, are less prone to commit the fundamental attribution error (e.g., Miller, 1984, Morris & Peng, 1994).

Kalburgi M. Srinivas in his article “Organization Development: Maya or Moksha” reports of OD's lack of fit with societal culture. He anticipates that the change agents might have intervened at a depth that was inappropriate. OD intervention techniques range from MBO and job enrichment to role analysis, quality circles, process consultation, team building, sensitivity training groups and so on. That is, from the formal and overt levels of analysis to the informal and covert (deeper) levels. At the formal levels the emphasis is on task facilitation while at the covert or deeper levels the emphasis is on understanding of inter- and intra- personal processes and new skill building. This may involve a confrontation between organization members across hierarchic levels. Consequently, evoked emotionality tends to be higher at the deeper levels of intervention. Although the change agent seeks to ensure that confrontations take place in a spirit of mutual feedback and support aimed at increasing collaboration and cooperation in the group, they do stir emotions, values, and hidden matters. There is a potential of harm (or belief of harm) while at the same time there is a high potential for positive outcomes by clearing the air. But many developing country norms and even some developed country norms are averse to these risks. Expressing or sharing feelings openly is considered un-masculine, and inappropriate workplace behavior. Organizational interventions at the deeper end need to heed the cultural sensitivities.

Srinivas maintains that where techno-structural issues or public aspects of individual role behaviors are concerned we could expect the culture of developing countries to be more receptive to the formal types of OD interventions. He cites the ILO initiatives in Asia and Africa which confirm this. However, he also noted problems with respect to even the techno-structural interventions. Thus, he concludes, the transfer of 'organizational change technology' to the developing countries is perhaps more difficult than has been suggested in the literature. Deeper level changes are held to be significant and enduring, while changes in the external and superficial levels are considered not so enduring. And this belief may induce some change agents to push in the direction of deeper kinds of intervention. An additional factor to recognize is that OD consultants are typically growth oriented. Their desires for achievement and wish for significant contribution to increasing the quality of work life for others may also tilt them in favor of greater than needed or wanted depth.
Sarkar (2003), in his paper “Cultural Correlates And Determinants Of Executives’ Work Motivation: An Analysis Of 14 Indian Industrial Organizations”, apart from investigating the effect of culture on motivation, made an effort to look into the distribution of executives’ cultural dimensions “diagonally” their age, place of birth, background, and designation. The universe of the study comprised of all executives from low, middle and top-level functions, based on their designation, working in fourteen industrial organizations (Bridgestone ACC India Ltd, Eicher Motor Limited, Gabriel India Limited, Gajra Gears Bevel Ltd., Gajra Gears Ltd., Garha Gears Limited, Hindustan Motors Limited, Kirloskar Brothers Limited, Larsen and Turbo, Novino National Limited, S & H Gears Limited, Steel Tubes India Limited, Tata International Ltd., Tata Precision Ltd.) from the two industrial areas of Pithampur and Dewas (from Indore and Ujjain divisions in Madhya Pradesh) located at the Central province of India.

The major findings of Sarkar’s research were:

1. In age wise distribution of the executives’ cultural dimensions his study reveals that executives after crossing their mid 40s in work life suddenly changed their orientation from particularism to universalism; and with growing age further, they exhibited greater point of reference towards universalism.

2. It was also quite evident that after every five years of their life, executives have shown a difference in their orientation to specific – diffuse culture at work.

3. The degree of affectiveness decreased with growing age of the executives.

4. The study found that more aged executives were achievement oriented than their young counterparts.

5. The young executives below the age of 30 years preferred large power distance at work, but with growing age especially upto their 40s, these executives shifted to small power distance. But once again, much elderly executives were found to be of large power distance.

6. The executives with their growing age reduced uncertainty avoidance in work and once they reached their mid-career sub-stage (35 – 40 years) they once again exhibited high uncertainty avoidance.

7. Distribution of executives’ cultural dimensions by their mother tongue reflected that executives speaking local dialect as their mother tongue were found to be particularist, specific, highly affective, with an approach towards ascription in job, large power distance, and polychronic time dimension. Whereas, those speaking dialect other than the local language were found to be universalist, diffuse, neutral, with an approach towards achievement in job, and small power distance with monochronic time dimension.

8. Distribution of executives’ cultural dimensions across their background in the study reflected that executives with rural background were more particularist, diffuse, highly affective, with an approach towards ascription in job, large power distance, high uncertainty avoidance and monochronic time dimension, whereas, those with urban background were relatively less particularist, specific, less affective, with an
approach towards achievement in job, lesser degree of large power distance, low uncertainty avoidance and polychronic time dimension.

9. The study revealed that executives born in the same province where they were working were more particularist, specific, more affective, with an approach towards ascription in job, having large power distance, low uncertainty avoidance and polychronic time dimension. Whereas, executives hailing from a different province were relatively less particularists, diffuse, less affective, with an approach towards achievement in job, small power distance and high uncertainty avoidance, with monochronic time dimension.

10. While measuring the extent of inclination towards particularism index among the three categories of executives (based on position in the organizational hierarchy) it was found that degree of inclination to particularism was highest among higher-level executives and lowest among middle-level executives. Low-level executives were found to be high on “specific pole” and high-level executives were high on “diffuse pole”.

11. Executive’s level of expression of emotion changed from affective to neutral with rise in hierarchy. The bipolar cultural dimension of ascribed and achieved status orientation explicitly depended on the position in the hierarchy followed by experience in organization.

12. Higher-level executives have higher orientation to achievement than their counterparts down the line. Higher-level executives were also found mostly with small power distance. The degree of uncertainty avoidance increased down the line in organizational hierarchy among the executives.

13. Sarker asserts that cultural dimensions do not necessarily alone determine the motives of the executives at work place and there might be certain other factors like the experience of the executives shared with organizational culture at work place, which determine the work motivation. i.e culture was not enough to determine executives’ motivation even though the motivation differs across culture.

14. Discussing about the individual correlation between cultural dimensions and each of the motives of executives, it has been found that achievement-ascription, small-large power distance, and monochronic-polychronic time dimension of culture are positively and significantly correlated with all the six motives of executives. But the relationship is low.

15. The study revealed that seven cultural dimensions can significantly predict the achievement motive, influence motive, control motive, affiliation motive, dependence motive, extension motive in work of executive.

Dong Kyoon Yoo and Subba S. Rao of The University of Toledo in their study presents a model that explains the relationships between national cultures and human resource practices at the international level and empirically tests how national cultural differences affect empowerment and training using data gathered from six different countries – Korea, USA, China, India, Mexico and Taiwan. Their data suggests that collectivism indicates a significant difference in empowerment and training. This study also shows that for each country particular aspects of employee empowerment and training are required to bring out
Drawing upon Hofstede's (1980, 1991) five dimensions of culture, a study on “Cultural Issues in Airline Crisis Communication: A U.S.-Japan Comparative Study” by Amon Haruta and Kirk Hallahan contrasts the organizational responses to two major airline crashes that occurred in 1985 in Japan and the United States. Using a qualitative approach, this study reveals significant cultural differences that affected communications practices by the two airlines. Findings are based upon analysis of 198 U.S. newspaper stories and 196 Japanese newspaper and magazine stories published during the 10 days that followed each disaster. The study revealed significant differences in the use of apology, media strategies, and litigation concerns. This study examines differences in the crisis response strategies followed by two airlines—one in Japan and one in the United States—following two of the worst airline crashes in history. Both occurred in 1985, the worst single year in history for aviation disasters. When a Japan Air Lines' Boeing 747 aircraft crashed into steep mountains in Ueno-mura, a small village about 100 miles west of Tokyo, on August 12, 1985, the accident involving Flight 123 took the lives of 520 people on board. The two incidents, which occurred only 10 days apart but in opposite sides of the world, provide an insightful contrast in how the companies responded in different ways to quite similar incidents, based on the cultural differences between the nations in which they occurred. Although both airlines were obviously striving for the same goal of obtaining control over and alleviation of the crisis situation, each company followed a different set of protocols that had been thought through to meet the expectations of its corporate and national culture. From these two accidents, the paper concludes, it is clear that national culture played a major role in each airline's response to the crisis situation.

The study entitled "Developing a New Organizational Culture: Framework, Process and Outcomes" by Bindu Khosla (2000) is a longitudinal study spread over two and a half years, undertaken with the specific purpose of finding answers to certain questions such as: 'can culture be managed?', 'does culture impact corporate performance?', 'will culture become dysfunctional if no conscious effort is made to develop it?' etc. It is an ethnographic account, which is interspersed with field experimentation in order to do justice to the research questions. The study proposes a comprehensive conceptual framework including various factors determining organizational culture, and establishes a linkage between culture and performance. In addition, the study proposes a process model outlining various stages that an organization would need to go through in order to succeed in its attempt to develop a desired culture. The study was conducted in the live setting of two units of a start-up venture of an umbrella organization in the information technology industry. In one unit (experimental group), a conscious effort was made to develop the desired culture, whereas no such effort was made in the other unit (control group). A number of interventions were designed and implemented in order to develop a strategically appropriate culture. The interventions were planned for different stages of the culture development process viz. conceptualization, concretization, articulation, indoctrination, internalization and institutionalization. Findings revealed significant differences in responses on employees of experimental and control group on various dimensions of organizational norms Opinionnaire (Alexander 1978) as well as on various dimensions of employee satisfaction questionnaire. Before-after comparisons clearly established the change in organizational culture over the period of study. Performance
measures also showed differences in before-after comparison, as well as experimental-control group comparison. Findings clearly support the view that organizational culture acts as an independent variable and can be managed by planned interventions. Findings also establish a positive relationship between culture, and performance measures like revenue, retention rate, cost control and employee satisfaction. The last question, viz. 'will culture become dysfunctional if left on its own', could not be conclusively answered for want of sufficient data. The non-interventionistic approach however, showed no or non-significant improvement on the desired cultural attributes and performance measures in the control group.

A study was undertaken among 165 employees at Hotels chain International and National (USA, Hong Kong, Indonesia) by Juanna Judith Huliselan, University Pelita Harapan, Indonesia and Juhary Hj Ali, University Utara Malaysia, Malaysia for the purpose of determining

(1) effect of dimensions of National and Corporate cultures as defined by Hofstede, have a greater synergy to improve the performance of hotel managers and

(2) whether the presumed negative effect from culture distance on performance originate more from differences in organizational culture than from differences in National culture.

The finding also shows that to a large extent there was a positive relationship between National and Corporate Culture. Therefore it was possible to conclude that as hypothesized by Hofstede and others, the cultural differences influence the way International management should be conducted.

To ascertain how far males and females keep up their traditional orientations towards the different facets of individualism and collectivism G. Suryanarayana Reddy and P. Govinda Reddy conducted a survey of 100 MBA students. To measure individualism and collectivism, a 15 item questionnaire was prepared on the basis of Oyeserman et al. (2002) and data were collected in March 2003 from 100 M.B.A. students of Madras University. The results indicate that males and females are converging on their importance scores for achievement orientation, distinctiveness of private and public spaces, autonomy, collectivist conscientiousness, and in-group harmony. Males scored significantly more on the importance ratings of group orientation in comparison to females. However, both sexes rated group orientation as least important of all facets. Results point out that males and females have scored alike on five of the facets of individualism and collectivism.

In the paper “Organizational and National Cultures: Some Observations on the Basis of a French-Italian-German Study of Computerization Processes”, Martin Heideneich (with the assistance of E. Gorman) observes that the French companies typically followed a strongly centralized, top-down approach involving highly generalized and uniform rules and routines.

In his paper, “The Effect Of Caste And Education On Achievement Motivation And Authoritarianism”, J. J. Ray examines the role of caste on some psychological variables like achievement motive, authoritarianism. In the study of 305 randomly selected respondents in
Bombay, contrary to expectation, Ray observes, there was found to be no association between caste and authoritarianism or between education and achievement motivation. In his paper, Ray presents a re-analysis of some data gathered for some other study in a random cluster sample of the city and suburbs of Bombay. The results of the analysis was that, in Bombay there was no detectable influence of caste on either authoritarianism or achievement motivation.

Hofstede (2001) reported a study, which found that students and teachers in China (high power distance) were more likely to explain teacher-student relationships in a similar way to a father-son relationship than students and teachers in Great Britain (low power distance). Because of the respected position of teachers in societies with high power distance, they are expected to initiate all communication in class. However, students in individualistic societies tend to be encouraged to initiate some communication (Hofstede, 2001). Power distance may also be observed in relationships between school staff members.

In their evaluation of the applicability of North American management theories to developing countries, Kiggundu et al. (1983) found that differences in culture or economic and political systems made conventional theories inapplicable.

Bourantas and Papalexandris (1992) empirical study of 588 Greek managers found that 74 per cent of respondents perceived that their organizations reflected either the characteristics of an Eiffel Tower culture (38 per cent) or a Family culture (36 per cent), providing support for the classification of Greek organizations as either of these two organizational culture types. Data were gathered by questionnaires completed by Greek middle managers working in manufacturing organizations in Athens, Greece. The results of this research show that the alignment of high-power distance/strong uncertainty avoidance Greek managers’ societal values with the Eiffel Tower organizational culture, characterized by a focus on hierarchy (high centralization) and a focus on the task (high formalization), reduces feelings of job-related stress. Further analysis of the job stress variable reveals that an increase in decentralization (or a reduction in centralization) is more specifically associated with role ambiguity stress and work overload stress. It appears that the devolvement of decision-making authority to high-power distance/strong uncertainty avoidance Greek middle managers create confusion and anxiety over their work roles.

Kanji and Yui (1997) reinforce the view that, what constitutes a TQM-type culture environment often follows the Japanese model proposed by Ishikawa (1986), and therefore it can be difficult to apply in other cultures, in a study that compares corporate cultures of Japanese companies and UK subsidiaries of Japanese companies that have implemented TQM. One of their most important findings is the range in the characteristics of companies that have effectively implemented TQM in the two countries. In Japan, there is very little difference in cultural profiles between companies that have established TQM programs and those that have not. This suggests that the underlying corporate culture of most Japanese companies is very suitable for TQM implementation. However, in the UK the cultural characteristics of companies applying TQM were markedly different than those that were not. This suggests that in the UK, only a subset of the local companies have the characteristics required for implementation and that the corporate culture of many UK
companies is not naturally suited to the TQM implementation. This study was designed to assess if different corporate cultures have an effect on the ease of implementation of TQM in different countries. To do this cross-cultural study, quality management implementation levels and corporate culture conditions were measured for manufacturing companies in three different regions of the world: USA, Switzerland and South Africa. The results of this study support the hypothesis that specific corporate cultures in different regions or countries have a different impact on the characteristics of the TQM implementation. In each of the countries, the relationships between the dimensions of corporate cultures and the dimensions of TQM implementation are different. That is, a uniform implementation plan would probably have different results in each of the three countries. This implies that the implementation plan should be adapted to the ethnological culture specific to the region in which TQM is being implemented.

The intention of this study by Peter Lok and John Crawford was to examine the differences between east and west in the determinants of manager’s perception of their level of job satisfaction and commitment. The organisational variables of leadership and organisational culture were selected as determinant for the present study. Managers from Hong Kong and Australia were used in this study to represent this east-west dichotomy. This study is based on the assumption that the differences in national characteristics (Hofstede, 1981, 1991; Phatak, 1997; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998) such as power distance, collectivism and risk orientation (to name a few) are well established between east and west. Also, the influence of certain demographic variables such as age, education level, gender and tenure was also investigated, because it is plausible that the influence of Confucian values (Chen, 1998) in the east might produce different patterns of relations than in the west. The results of this study revealed that the Australian managers scored more highly the innovative and supportive culture measures, and on job satisfaction and organisational commitment. This is consistent with studies that have shown that there is strong positive link between empowerment, job satisfaction and commitment. No significant difference between these two samples was found in bureaucratic organisational culture or on consideration and initiating structure leadership styles.

Chen and Francesco (2000) sampled 333 employees in the People’s Republic of China and concluded that position is positively correlated with employee commitment while all other demographic variables, including age and tenure, are not. With reference to the practice of Confucian philosophy, issues such as authority, respect for the elder, loyalty (Cheng, 1995), the value of education (Knight and Shi, 1996), conformity and guanxi (obligation based relationships with the boss, colleagues and friends) are different between the east and west (Chen, 2002; El Kahal, 2001).

Kotter and Heskett (1992) found that culture can enhance business performance if an organization has a strong culture, a business strategy that fits its industry and environment, and cultural norms and values that help the firm adapt to environmental changes. They found that low performance (unhealthy) cultures tended to have arrogant managers, to not value customers, employees, and stockholders, and to be hostile toward leadership and change values. High performance (healthy) cultures were adaptive and tended to have managers who (1) cared deeply about customers, employees, and stockholders and (2) strongly valued people and processes that created useful change. Adaptive cultures energize and align...
employees to strategies and practices that fit environmental conditions and have a built-in
capacity to alter those strategies and practices when relevant conditions change. Companies
with high performance cultures had triple the average annual income growth of low
performance firms (47.26% vs. 14.15%), and industry analysts were nine times likelier to
identify culture as helping performance in the high performing cultures (Kotter and Heskett,
1992). Kotter and Heskett (1992) found that the critical difference in cultural development
for the unhealthy cultures seems to stem from a lack of competition. This allowed them to
establish a dominant market position and to succeed in their business without ongoing
guidance from their philosophy and business strategy. They developed unadaptive, change-
resistant cultures characterized by arrogance, insularity, bureaucracy, and self-interest. These
firms hired, promoted, and eventually were led by a managerial orientation; they valued
stability and order and stifled leaders.

Kotter and Heskett (1992) investigated the relationship of culture to corporate performance.
They summarized their research by means of four conclusions:

1. Corporate culture can have a significant impact on a firm’s long-term economic
   performance.
2. Corporate culture will be an even more important factor in determining the success or
   failure of firms in the next decade.
3. Cultures that inhibit strong long-term financial performance are common, and they develop
easily, even when employees are reasonable and intelligent people.
4. Although tough to change, corporate cultures can be made more performance enhancing.

Deshpande et al., using a synthesis of over 100 previous studies in organisational behaviour,
sociology and anthropology suggest that a certain variety of cultures are more able to
enhance innovativeness than other types. Market and adhocracy cultures score highly for
high performance companies, exhibiting a statistically significant relationship. A study by
Goran Ekvall (1993) in Sweden further supports the link between culture and innovativeness.

In a study by Chen and Lu (1998), the importance of looking into traditional Chinese cultural
values, namely Confucian values, in TQM has been highlighted. The authors have argued
that there is no universal model of quality transformation and the implementation of TQM
has to be culture specific. Through an in-depth analysis of a Taiwanese company, the authors
have demonstrated how TQM could be effectively implemented by following “The Great
Learning”, an important ancient Confucian philosophy. Although the study has illustrated
that Chinese philosophy may play an important role in guiding the Chinese firm along the
path of quality transformation, the coverage of the various important Chinese values is
clearly insufficient. A study that has systematically designed a Chinese culture-specific
research instrument to investigate the appropriateness of using Confucian principles in TQM
was conducted by Lo (1998, 1999). The author reported that Chinese managers do find
Confucian principles relevant to quality management and they do practice them in reality.
Following the Fishbein behavioral intention model (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975), he designed
an instrument composed of 19 Confucian statements and administered it to Chinese managers
in Hong Kong. In particular, he identified two areas in which Chinese staff and managers feel
positive towards the successful implementation of TQM. The first is the importance of a
strong leadership through the Confucian trait of *de*, which means virtue, goodness, kindness, morality, favor, or ethics.

This study by Ikushi Yamaguchi explores whether a nation-culture factor (national culture) or a worker-type factor (organizational types of workers) has more powerful effects on various job-related orientations of Japanese, US and Australian employees. Job-related orientations were categorized into the following three: job-performance orientation, human-relation orientation, and safety-maintenance orientation. A total of 212 Japanese, 187 American and 147 Australian workers participated in this research. The subjects were grouped into five different organizational types of workers. The cultures-by-types interaction failed to achieve significance on the combined dependent variables. The cultures (nation-culture) variable indicated significant relationships with human-relation orientation and safety-maintenance orientation, and the types (worker-type) variable showed an indication of significant relationships with job-performance orientation.

Several studies conducted by Yamauchi and his colleagues focus on cross-cultural differences on a variety of work motivation and attitude dimensions. For example, Yamauchi, Beech, Hampson, and Lynn (1991) found British university students scored higher on work effort and ambition, whereas Japanese students scored higher on work tension and confidence in success. Yamauchi and Li (1993) compared university students in Japan and China on the same set of work motivation and attitude measures. They found the Chinese students reported stronger motives and attitudes toward achievement than the Japanese students, whereas Japanese students reported a stronger work ethic. Borg and Braum (1996) compared the existence, relatedness, and growth work values of East and West Germans and found that the underlying structure of these values was the same for both groups, but West Germans put less weight on the existence of relatedness values than East Germans. Silverthorne (1992) compared supervisors’ and subordinates’ rankings of ten motivational job factors in the U.S., Russia, and Taiwan and concluded based on the correlations between employee rankings and manager rankings that there is not a universal set of motivators.

Welch, Luthans, and Sommer (1993) in their study found that U.S. based extrinsic rewards and behavioural management approaches significantly improved the productivity of workers in a Russian factory, but a participative did not. This study confirmed that with the differences in geographical environment leading to cultural variations the philosophy made for one group of workers had a counterproductive effect on culturally different other group of workers. On the other hand Kim, Park, and Suzuki (1990) in their study found that motivational process such as equity may be found more in U.S., Japan and Korea. Silverthorne (1996) presented another comparison between U.S. and Taiwanese subjects with regard to how comfortable they are with assumptions about human nature derived from Theory X, Theory Y, and Theory Z and found that the Taiwanese subjects score higher on all three scales compared to normative data for the U.S. and suggested that the Taiwanese may be more committed to motivational issues than their U.S. counterparts. After reviewing the cross-cultural motivation literature, Adler (1997) concluded, “American motivating theories although too often assumed to reflect universal values, have failed to provide consistently useful explanations for behaviour outside the U.S.” Moreover, most of the cross-cultural researches on motivational theories and approaches have been limited to date, to the content
theories, such as Maslow's, Herzberg's, McGregor's and McClelland's. The result of this is that there are definitely variations of these content motivation theories across cultures.

Yamauchi, Lynn, and Rendell (1994) examined gender differences in both Japanese sample and an Irish sample of adults on seven work motivations and attitudes (work ethic, mastery, competitiveness, savings, achievements, motivation, valuation for money, and achievement through conformity) and found that men scored significantly on achievement motivation than women among Japanese sample, whereas for the Irish sample, men and women differed significantly only on competitiveness. Baum, Olian, Erez, Schnell, Smith, Sims, Scully, and Smith (1993) examined the relationship between entrepreneurs' and managers' motivational needs (need for achievement, need for affiliation, need for autonomy, and need for dominance) and their results generally supported that there was a main effect for nationality for all four needs. A main effect for role was found for need for autonomy (with entrepreneurs having higher need for autonomy than managers).

Frese, Kring, Soose, and Zempel (1996) examined differences in personal initiative at work for East and West German subjects. They found lower personal initiative in the East German sample than the West German sample. Additionally, analyses on the East German sample revealed that control at work (autonomy) and complexity (how difficult an individual’s job decisions are) affected changes in initiative. Rather than relying on mean differences in scale ratings, Shome, Sen, and Bharadwaj (1995) used factor analysis to explore the similarities and differences between Bangladeshi and Indian Bank managers on achievement motive, belief about work, and organizational climate and their analyses revealed that three factors emerged for each group. However, the factor structures differed for the Bangladeshi and Indian managers, suggesting the cultures differ in their conceptualization of these constructs.

Couger and O'Callaghan (1994) compared the motivation of Spanish and Finnish computer personnel to U.S. personnel and found that people attracted to the computer field have a high need for growth and a low need for social interaction. However, in Finland, the technical specialist job had a mismatch between the job's motivation potential and the employees' need for growth. Griffeth, Hom, DeNisi, and Krichner (1980) found that 52% of the variance in managers' attitudes could be accounted for by their nationality. Alpander and Carter (1991) compared employee need patterns in eight foreign subsidiaries of a major multinational company. They found that need to control one's environment was the most dominant need in all countries.

Notes:
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