MOTIVES, NEED SATISFACTION AND EFFECTIVENESS

- Need for Achievement and Effectiveness
- Need for Affiliation and Effectiveness
- Need for Approval and Effectiveness
- Need for Power and Effectiveness
- Need Satisfaction/Importance and Effectiveness
The study of motivation has received constant importance in research and practice. While researchers have been trying to formulate various concepts so as to understand human behaviour in a better fashion, people in the work situation have been trying to apply this theorization to practical situations at work in order to optimise their performance and achieve effectiveness.

Luthans (1995) calls motivation as a basic psychological process. According to him, "few would deny that it is the most important focus in the micro approach to organizational behaviour." Motivation is a set of energetic forces, originating both within and outside the individual, that initiate behaviour and determine its form, direction, intensity and duration (Pinder, 1984). According to Rao and Narayana (1991), "one of the key elements in human resource management is motivation. It is concerned with 'why' of human behaviour. At any given point of time, people vary in extent to which they are willing to direct their energies to the attainment of goals due to difference in motivation." Defining motivation in the organizational context, Dubin (1991) described motivation as a complex of forces starting and keeping a person at work (salary, perks and treatment) in an organization.

Rajagopalan (1986) reported that motivation comes from the Latin word 'movere', which means 'to move' and has been defined as all those inner striving conditions described as wishes, desires, drives etc. Explaining the concept of motivation in relation to work, Shapiro (1975) called motivation as a force that energizes the employee's willingness to perform; it is a summary of his perceptions about the job.

Theories of Motivation

Research in the area of motivation churned out various theories conceptualizing the basics of human motivation. According to Steers and Porter (1979), motivated behaviour is not only influenced by an individual's characteristics (needs, interests, attitudes and goals), but also by organizational conditions (task, managerial practices and organizational climate). To deal with this complexity a conceptual scheme concerning the effects of these individual and organizational variables on work motivation is needed.
Steers and Porter (1979) reviewed the research on motivation and classified some of the major motivation theories as: Scientific Management Theory (Taylor, 1911); Human Relations Approach (Mayo, 1933); Murray's Manifest Needs Theory (Murray, 1938); Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory (Maslow, 1943, 1954, 1970); Herzberg's Motivation versus Hygiene Theory (Herzberg et al., 1959); Human Resources Approach (McGregor, 1960); Atkinson's Model (Atkinson, 1964); Vroom's Model of Motivation (Vroom, 1964).

The relatively contemporary theories of Motivation can be categorized as follows: McClelland's theory of Need (McClelland 1961); ERG Theory (Alderfer, 1972); Theory of Intrinsic Motivation (Deci, 1975); Consistency Theory (Korman, 1976).

In the present study of motives, the four motives - need for Achievement, need for Approval, need for Affiliation and need for Power - as identified by Atkinson (1958) to be most significant among several motives identified in the work settings, have been included. These motives are being studied as correlates of Self-Rated Effectiveness among Judicial Officers.

Along with these motives, deficiency in need satisfaction in the five need areas of Self-Esteem, Self-Actualization, Autonomy, Social and Security are also being studied.

**need for Achievement**

Although this motive of need for achievement does not have a long history as other motives, more is known about achievement than any other motive because of the tremendous amount of research that has been devoted to it (Feather, 1993; Turban and Keon, 1993).

The need for achievement has been defined as a desire to excel in relation to competitive or an internalized standard of excellence (Atkinson, 1958). Achievement motivation is a drive some people have to overcome challenges and obstacles in the pursuit of goals. An individual with this drive wishes to develop, grow and advance up the ladder of success. Accomplishment is important for its own sake, not for the rewards that accompany it (Davis and Newstrom, 1985).
Costley and Todd (1983), Luthans (1995) reported that over twenty years, McClelland and his associates (1962, 1984) have studied achievement motivation in laboratory settings and organizational environment. Their studies led to the identification of achievement motivation as a distinct human need that varies in intensity among people. It has now become clear that the need to achieve was the key to economic growth and entrepreneur success.

Steers and Porter (1979), Costley and Todd (1983), McClelland, (1984) and Luthans (1995) listed the following characteristics of individuals high on achievement motivation:

(i) They are more concerned with achievement itself than with any rewards that result from their success;

(ii) Since those with high achievement motivation are primarily concerned with individual accomplishment, they tend to have a desire for specific feedback on how successful they are in reaching objectives; and

(iii) Individuals with high achievement motivation spend more time thinking about performing high level accomplishments than do individuals with low levels of achievement motivation.

Elaborating on the work of McClelland (1952) and Atkinson (1964) the two prominent investigators in the field of achievement motivation, other researchers have described Achievement-oriented employees to be endowed with certain typical characteristics: They work harder when they perceive that they will receive personal credit for their efforts, when there is only moderate risk of failure and when they receive specific feedback about their past performance. As managers, they tend to trust their subordinates, share and receive ideas openly, set higher goals and expect that their employees will also be oriented towards achievement (Glasgow, 1980; Matsui et al., 1982 and Mam pilly, 1990).

need for Power

The need for Power has been formally studied for quite some time. The leading advocate of the power motive was pioneer behavioural scientist Adler (1918, 1974), with McClelland (1962) and Winter (1973) being later contributors to it. Luthans (1995) explained the power need as the need to manipulate others or drive for superiority
over others.

The need for Power is defined as the need to make others behave in a way that they would not have behaved otherwise (McClelland, 1961). According to Steers and Porter (1979), if a man spends his time thinking about the influence and control he has over others, and how he can use this influence to win an argument, to change other people's behaviour or to gain a position of authority and status—then he has a high need for power. Veroff (1957), who developed the first measure of power motive, defined it as a motive which directs behaviours towards satisfaction contingent upon the control of the means of influencing another person.

According to Aldag and Stearns (1987) need for power is the desire to control other persons, to influence their behaviour and to be responsible for other people. While McClelland (1984) felt that need Achievement was most important for entrepreneurs, he saw need Power as quite important in large organisations. Power orientation is the personal inclination to control and influence other persons. In simple terms, it is the persistent desire for domination over others (Mampilly, 1990).

**Characteristics of People high on need for Power**

High-power motivated individuals became more highly activated when supervising others than low power individuals. Males high on need for power reported that they had more arguments, played competitive sports more, had less stable interpersonal relations, favoured more assertive foreign policies, experienced more emotional problems and were more impulsively aggressive than males low on need for power (McClelland, 1985).

Singh's (1986) results indicated that subjects scoring higher on need for power tended to be reserved, forthright, trusting, conservative, group adherents, interested in people, and less interested in economic values. Thus executives high on need for power would behave differently than those low on need for power.

DuBrin (1985) made a distinction between socialized power, i.e. people who crave power so that they can perform a social good and self-serving power, i.e. those who crave power to serve their own ends. Power-motivated people make excellent managers if their drives are for institutional power instead of personal power. Such people seek power through legitimate means, rise to leadership positions through successful performance and thereafter are accepted by others (McClelland 1975).
The Institutional power manager is concerned with organizational problems and actions that will result in attaining organizational objectives. Managers with this style concentrate their efforts on influencing others to make commitments to effective task performance. They do not try to obtain personal submission or to dominate individuals. The manager with institutional power style wants loyalty to the organization and is concerned with group goals. Helping people to identify and achieve group and providing support for individual efforts, are characteristics of the institutional power style. According to McClelland (1975) individuals with a high institutional power orientation have the following characteristics.

They feel responsible for developing an effective organization; they like work and doing things in an orderly way; they are willing to sacrifice some of their self-interest for the welfare of the organization; they believe people should receive just rewards for their efforts; and they are more mature and willing to get advice from others.

According to McClelland (1984), effective leaders are educators; they lead people out by helping set goals for a group, communicating with them widely throughout the group, taking initiative in formulating means of achieving the goals and finally inspiring the members of the group to feel strong enough to work hard for those goals. Such an image of the exercise of power and influence in a leadership role should not frighten anybody and should convince more people that power exercised this way is not only not dangerous but also of the greatest possible use to society.

**need for Affiliation**

Going as far back as the Hawthorne studies, the importance of affiliation motive in behaviour of organizational participants has been very clear.

McClelland (1961) defined need for affiliation as a desire for friendly and close interpersonal relationships. Houston (1985) describes 'the tendency of people to be with other people' as the affiliation motive. According to him, most people need the protection afforded by group membership. According to Aldag and Stearns (1987), need for affiliation is the desire to establish and maintain friendly and warm relations with other persons. It is much like Maslow's social needs. Persons high on need for affiliation welcome tasks requiring considerable interaction, while those low on the
need may prefer to work alone.

Human beings differ on the need for the company of others. According to Meichenbaum et al. (1989), people who tend to seek out others, value being with them, and care about them are said to be exhibiting a need for affiliation. Such people have learnt that others can offer comfort or aid. Others can provide information important to attaining goals and can act as models or spur one on to greater efforts.

**Characteristics of people high on need for Affiliation**

Misra and Tripathi (1980) gave the characteristics of individuals high on need for affiliation. According to them, those high on need for affiliation tend to describe themselves as friendly, warm, trusting, talkative, cheerful, kind, loyal, helpful, praiseworthy, accepting and generous.

Individuals with strong affiliation motivation tend to take jobs characterized by a high level of interpersonal interactions, such as public relations, personnel, sales and teaching. For individuals with high affiliation motivation, social relationships will usually take precedence over task accomplishment. Trying hard to get along with others and enjoying the company of others are indications of high affiliation motivation (Costely and Todd, 1983).

Harlow and Hanke (1975) described the need for affiliation as a love need which leads to a hope for affiliation rather than a fear of rejection. A person with a strong need for affiliation disposition is interested in establishing or repairing affiliative relations and in seeking warm personal relations with others.

McClelland (1982) said that affiliation is an important motive as it can reduce the negative effects of stress. Caring for others and being cared for by others can counteract some of the potential harm stemming from a high powered life styles.

**need for Approval**

Research on need for approval has stemmed from the work of Edwards (1953) on social desirability. Crowne and Marlowe (1964) who conceptualized need for approval as a distinct motive reported that social desirability indicated a need for social approval which was conceptualised as a reliance on the evaluative judgement of others.
Most human beings have a need for positive reactions from other people. Murray (1964) proposed a need for affiliation; Maslow discussed the need for belongingness. Similar to these needs is a desire simply to gain approval, or some kind of sign that others like us and think we are good. One interesting aspect of the need for approval is that there are marked individual differences in the degree to which people need approval. Some people are relatively indifferent to what others think of them. Others act as if they would do almost anything to gain approval or, perhaps more importantly, avoid disapproval.

Characteristics of Individuals high on need for Approval:

Crown and Marlow (1964) described approval-dependent individuals to be sensitive to social rejection. They also found people with high need for approval to conform more. The goals and needs of the approval-dependent person would appear to include social recognition and status, protection and dependency, love and affection. People with a high need for Approval often change the way they behave if others can observe them. People with a low need for social approval are more likely to act the same whether they are observed or not (Satow, 1975).

Lobel (1982) in his review said that some researchers have also investigated another aspect of need for approval that includes the two components of this construct. Crowne and Marlowe (1964) regarded need for approval as a single personality characteristic and included in need for approval both "dependence on evaluation of others" and "avoidance of self-criticism".

Other investigators (Jacobson and Ford, 1966; Millham, 1974 and Ramanaiah et al., 1977), however, stated that the construct is composed of two components - (1) "the approach or the attribution component," which is the tendency to attribute desirable characteristics to oneself and (2) the "avoidance or the denial component," which is the tendency to deny undesirable characteristics in oneself. These investigators argued that it is possible that some people try to defend themselves against negative evaluation but do not try to gain a positive evaluation from others.

Several researchers found moderately significant correlations between the two components (Ford, 1964; Greenwald and Clausen, 1970; Millham, 1974 and Ramanaiah et al., 1977). Some researchers (Millham, 1974) found different relationships between the two components and certain behaviours. These results suggest
that the two components are partially independent of each other. Thus, it is possible that child-rearing variables are differentially related to these two components.

On the basis of the studies cited above, Lobel (1982) opined that it was reasonable to assume that parental practices which emphasize the importance of approval by others and conformity to societal norms and conventions would tend to increase need for approval in their children. It is also logical to assume that child-rearing variables that would foster fear of rejection and low self-esteem would be related to need for approval.

Thus, one may conclude that effective performance is a positive function of the degree of motivation.

NEED SATISFACTION

The behaviour at work is oriented towards satisfaction of needs of the individuals. Work is a potent source of gratifying the various physical, social and ego needs. Thus, the study of need satisfaction is in fact a study of motivation.

According to Luthans (1995), motivation is a process that "starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates behaviour or a drive that is aimed at a goal or incentive." Thus a key to understanding the process of motivation lies in the meaning of, and relationship between needs, drives and incentives. Kumar (1976), highlighting the role of needs opined: "Among the diverse factors that influence the behaviour, the needs of an individual are the most important".

Thus, a detailed study of the need of an individual can facilitate in better understanding and prediction of one's behaviour.

Reviewing various theories of motivation, Steers and Porter (1979) called the various theoretical constructs as vehicles for not only explaining motivational behaviour, but also for providing managers with a tool to promote productive behaviour in organisations.

Maslow's (1943, 1954) theory of human motivation is one of the landmark research outcomes, emerging in early sixties as an appealing model of human behaviour in organizations (Schneider and Alderfer, 1973).

Maslow's need hierarchy theory describes how behaviour is affected by the presence and satisfaction of various needs.
Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory (1943, 1954)

The fundamental premise of Maslow's model comprises the fact that human behaviour is directed towards the goal of satisfaction of needs, which are universal in nature and are arranged sequentially in hierarchical form. These are:

(i) Physiological Needs: which include hunger, thirst, shelter, sex, and other bodily needs.

(ii) Safety Needs: which include security and protection from physical and emotional harm.

(iii) Social Needs: which include affection, belongingness, acceptance and friendship.

(iv) Esteem Needs: which include internal esteem factors such as self-respect, autonomy and achievement; and external esteem factors such as status, recognition and attention.

(v) Self-Actualization Needs: The drive to become what one is capable of becoming includes growth, achieving one's potential and self-fulfilment. See figure D.

Stating these needs, Maslow reiterated that these needs are arranged in a hierarchy of 'pre-potency' or dominance, the order being from most to least prepotent. As each of these needs becomes substantially satisfied, the next need becomes dominated. This hypothesis of 'pre-potency' of needs was supported by various subsequent studies (Porter 1961, 1962, 1963; Porter and Lawler, 1968 and Wofford, 1971).

The five basic needs proposed by Maslow were further separated into higher and lower needs. Physiological and safety needs were described as lower order needs, while social, self-esteem and self-actualization as higher order needs. The distinction between the two orders was made on the premise that higher order needs are satisfied internally (within the person) whereas lower order needs are predominantly satisfied externally (by such things as wages, union contracts and tenure).

Maslow's need hierarchy theory has thus emerged as one of the most popular theories of motivation. Researchers like McGregor (1960), Porter (1961), Porter and Lawler (1968), Daftuar (1982) elaborated the basic constructs by Maslow and popularized his theory in management literature. In a very rough manner, Maslow's need hierarchy theory can also be converted into the content model of work motivation as shown in fig. E. If Maslow's estimates are applied to an organizational sample, the
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lower level needs of personnel would be generally satisfied (85 percent of the basic needs and 70 percent of the security needs), but only 50 percent of the social needs, 40 percent of the esteem needs, and a mere 10 percent of self-actualization needs would be met (Luthans, 1995).

Generally, the content model and the estimated percentage given by Maslow seem logical and applicable to the motivation of employees in today's organizations. It has been uncritically accepted by various management writers and practitioners.

Maslow has furthered this basic concept of need satisfaction at work by adding that gratifying the self-actualization need of growth-motivated individuals can actually increase rather than decrease this need. He also hedged on some of his other original ideas. For example, that higher needs may emerge after lower needs that have been lying unfulfilled or suppressed for a long period, are satisfied. He stressed that human behaviour is multi-determined and multi-motivated.

Porter's (1961) Need Satisfaction Questionnaire is based on a modified version of Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory (Mitchell and Moudgill, 1976) (Fig. F). According to Porter (1963) the physiological needs of the managers were assumed to have been adequately satisfied and therefore were not included in his questionnaire. An additional category, 'autonomy' was inserted between the esteem and self-actualization categories. The security (safety), social (love), esteem, autonomy and self-actualization needs were elicited by the different items of this questionnaire.

Later, Daftuar (1982) recognizing the practical importance of this theory for practising managers, converted it into the content model of work motivation. In his study on job attitudes in managers in India, Daftuar (1982) chose Maslow's hierarchical classification scheme based on 'Prepotency' of various types of needs as a model (Maslow, 1954). Like Porter (1961), Daftuar (1982) also substituted the basic physiological needs with need for security. Just like Porter (1961) he also inserted 'autonomy' between esteem and self-actualization needs. The categories thus, as given by Daftuar (1982) arranged from lowest order (most prepotent) to highest order and applicable to managers/executives were:

(i) Security needs: The feeling of security of service in management positions held.
(ii) Social needs: The opportunity in the management position, to give help to other people and the opportunity to develop close association and friendship in the
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management positions held.

(iii) **Esteem needs**: The feeling of self-esteem a person gets from being in the particular management position held, the prestige of the management position inside the company and the prestige of the management position outside the company.

(iv) **Autonomy needs**: The opportunity for independent thought and action in the management position held, the opportunity for participation in the setting of goals of the organization in the management position, the opportunity for determination of methods and procedures within the organization in the management position.

(v) **Self-actualization needs**: The opportunity for personal growth and accomplishment in the management position held and the feeling of self-fulfilment a person gets from being in the management position.

Daftuar (1982) opined that the need structure of people is rooted in the social system. In the Indian context few researches have been reported which used Maslow’s model. He investigated the hypothesis that the Maslow-type need hierarchy will hold good in the Indian setting also i.e. in case of all management levels the need deficiencies will be stronger as one goes from lower to higher order needs. For this purpose he conducted a study where he investigated the difference in perceived deficiencies in need-fulfilment at different levels of management i.e. from the first level of supervision to the fourth level (upward).

He reached the following conclusions after his study on job attitudes in Indian management:

(a) Need deficiencies for each item tended to increase at each successive, lower-level of management hierarchy.

(b) Items of the two highest order need categories showed largest deficiencies in all management cadres except the lowest.

(c) In the two lowest order need areas the managers of different levels perceived themselves about as equally satisfied, but the managers of the lowest level probably craved for more satisfaction of security need.

(d) For the three high order need areas the lower-level managers perceived their position as providing significantly less satisfaction compared with higher-level managers.
The youngest personnel of upper and upper-middle level management appeared to be consistently more dissatisfied in lower and middle order need categories.

The two highest order need areas were consistently ranked first and second respectively, in terms of the size of mean deficiencies in all sub-groups except the lowest cadre --- who ranked security and social needs as first and second respectively.

Security needs tended to be ranked higher for older individuals and lower cadre personnel, while the social needs tended to receive somewhat higher ranks in younger as compared to older personnel at most levels.

Across all the upper three levels of management the two highest order need areas elicited the greatest expression of importance. There was no essential difference among these upper management levels in terms of how they ranked the relative importance of the five need categories.

The lowest management personnel however made different ranking as security, social, self-actualization, autonomy and esteem needs (in that order). Similar results in Indian setting were reported by Sehgal and Rana (1992).

**MOTIVES, NEED SATISFACTION AND EFFECTIVENESS**

'Motivated behaviour' is one that ensures peaked performance and it may be subsumed that managerial motivation is the key factor in determining executive effectiveness. According to Ramanamma (1991), motivation is the process of creating organizational conditions which will impel employees to strive hard to attain company goals.

Executive motivation has long been established as an important predictor of executive effectiveness and success. Review suggests that those who possess stronger executive motives were rated as effective and rose faster and higher in the executive hierarchy in large bureaucratic organisations (Chen et al., 1997). Research in the United States had found substantial and consistent validity for the construct of executive motivation and its relationship with executive success (Miner 1965, 1985, 1993).

Executive motivation is an important determinant of organizational effectiveness. Venkataraman and Valecha (1981) are of the opinion that motivation is very closely linked with job performance, productivity and organizational effectiveness.
Individual performance is directly related to how motivated a person is. Motivation refers to those forces operating within an individual which impel him to act or not to act in a certain way (Rao and Narayana, 1991). Schippmann and Prien (1989) investigated the extent to which general mental ability and personality characteristics such as dominance, independence and risk-taking could be used to distinguish more successful from less successful executives. On the basis of subject’s responses (n=296) they found that subjects who succeeded in management tended to be more intelligent and achievement-oriented besides taking an active and independent role in group situations.

Several studies in the field of motivation have attempted to find out the relationship between need for Achievement and Effectiveness (McClelland, 1961; Atkinson and Feather, 1966; Wainer and Rubin, 1969; Hundal, 1971; Steers and Spencer, 1977). In a study of eleven successful and twelve less successful executives, Kumar (1970) found highly successful executives to be achievement-oriented, challenging, stimulating, task-oriented and creative. Steers and Porter’s (1979) review of studies of motivation of executives has revealed that strong achievement-motivation distinguished the successful executive or entrepreneur from other people.

According to Pareek et al. (1981) to be effective as an executive some need for Achievement, a high need for Influence, high need for Extension and low need for Dependency, Control and Affiliation are likely to be helpful. McClelland (1984) said that successful businessmen and executives are not motivated by greed and self-interest; their success, prestige and income are due to their high need Achievement. Chusmir and Hood (1986) found that several of Miner’s (1978) managerial motivational patterns appeared to be related to need for Achievement or need for Power. The presence of both high need for Power and high need for Achievement was indicative of managerial motivation (Stahl, 1983).

Mohan and Rattan (1987b) opined that need for Achievement is a striving to increase or keep as high as possible, one’s own capabilities in all activities in which a standard of excellence is thought to apply. Chatterji et al. (1988) reported that managerial motivation was definitely related with managerial effectiveness.

Dalal and Sethi (1988) found that high need for achievement sub-scale showed a tendency to attribute success to their own efforts and while attributing failure
to both lack of effort and task difficulty. According to Meichenbaum et al. (1989) “the need for Achievement is a learned, internalized desire to perform well and to strive for excellence in a variety of activities.”

Singh (1989) indentified variables affecting managerial success in managers (n=324). Correlational analysis indicated that successful subjects tended to be intelligent, reserved, placid, radical, relaxed and power-oriented. In Wisconsin study of measurement and prediction of effectiveness in teachers, Barr (1961) reported that performance, as in teaching, is seen to be a function of several variables:

a) One's Potential : One's knowledge, intelligence, developmental level etc.
b) One's Cognition of the situation : One's perception, based upon knowledge, expectancy, the situation itself.
c) One's motivation : One's drives, goals, emotional status.

However, a different aspect of achievement motive is observed when researchers like Hersey and Blanchard (1978) opined that though Achievement-motivated people are needed in organizations, they do not always make the best managers. According to them, Achievement-oriented people can be the backbone of most organisations. As we know people with high need for Achievement are more effective and get ahead because as individuals they are producers, they are likely to get things done. However, when they are prompted to, where their success depends not only on their own work but on the activities of others, they may be less effective. Since they are highly task-oriented and work to their capacity, they tend to expect others to do the same. As a result, they sometimes lack the human skills and patience necessary for being effective managers of people who are competent but have a higher need for Affiliation than they do. In this situation, their high-task/low-relationship behaviour frustrates and prohibits these people from maximizing their own potentials.

Tayal (1992) found no significant relation between executive success and need for achievement in a total sample of 200 middle level executives.

need for Power has been found to be related to effectiveness by various researchers. Miner (1965) observed that possession of high power motive is a requirement for managerial effectiveness. Kipnis (1974) suggested that high power need may occur simply as a function of one's level in a hierarchical organisation. McClelland (1976) argued that needs for Affiliation and Power tend to be closely related
to managerial success. House and Singh (1987) reviewing concept of Power motive said that several studies of the relationship between the power motive and leadership performance for executive success have recently been reported in the psychological literature. Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) also reported that need for Power, as defined by McClelland (1975), has been found to be closely related to managerial success.

Cornelius and Frank (1989) in their study examined the validity of McClelland's Leadership Motive pattern (i.e. a successful leader should be moderate to high on need for Power, low on need for Affiliation and high on activity inhibition) for two levels of management personnel in a professionally-oriented service-industry organization. Three types of outcome measures were used - attitudinal variables taken from survey responses of subordinates' objective measures of administrative performance taken from company records and a variable representing the importance of "status" of the location in which the manager worked. Results indicated that the leadership Motive pattern was not related to administrative job performance or subordinates' morale. In fact, for the sub-sample of first line supervisor, it was need for Affiliation that was related to job performance and favourable subordinates' attitudes, and not need for Power or the Leadership Motive Pattern. The results of this study were interpreted in the light of technical/professional nature of the employees' sample. These results thus contribute to a growing literature that suggests that the motivation to influence others may not be critical for managerial success in technical/professional settings.

need for Affiliation has been studied as an important aspect of Effectiveness research. Managers with high need for affiliation are likely to be biased and may go in for less effective options (French, 1956). Byrne (1961) if the manager and his subordinates were to disagree, the manager would change his attitude to one which was more acceptable to the subordinates, especially if the manager likes them. Thus, the manager is likely to do 'what others want' and not 'what is required to be done'. This would make him ineffective and would decrease an overall efficiency in performance.

Persons high on need for Affiliation according to McClelland (1961) might be reluctant to take necessary action which would offend the group. According to Steers and Porter (1979) men with strong need for Affiliation seek out jobs which offer
opportunities for friendly interaction. In business these men often take supervisory jobs where maintaining good relationships is more important than decision-making. People who have institutionalized helping roles - such as teachers, nurses and counsellors- also demonstrate strong need for Affiliation. They further added that while strong need for Affiliation does not seem to be important for effective managerial performance, and might rather be detrimental, recent research has suggested that some minimal concern with the feeling of others and with the companionate quality of relationships is necessary for superior managerial and executive capability.

Costly and Todd (1983) further stated that the satisfaction of employees' affiliation needs can be beneficial to an organization. Research findings indicate that when employees' affiliation needs are satisfied by association with others on the job, there is a decrease in absenteeism and turnover. When there are co-operative work group affiliations, productivity tends to be high and costs low. Most individuals dislike being isolated and desire to have contact with other people.

Boyatzis (1984) observed that a manager with a high need for Affiliation would strive for approval from his subordinates and superiors. According to Dhir (1991), the executive with high need for affiliation is so concerned about his relationships that performance objectives of his job become confused. The goal as building and maintaining friendly relations supersedes a concern over the effectiveness of his organizational unit's performance towards corporate objectives. He sincerely believes that friendly relations are necessary for healthy corporate performance.

In contrast to above findings, several studies have shown that a person with high-affiliation motivation demonstrates behaviour which contributes to the effectiveness of corporate performance. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) reported that effective "integrators" (managers whose function is to integrate the work of various people or units) rank higher in the need for Affiliation than their less effective peers. Among the six motives identified by Pareek et al. (1981), found to play an important role in determining managerial effectiveness, was the motivation to establish and maintain effective relationship with others called "affiliation motivation".

In various studies of Effectiveness amongst teachers, need for affiliation has been found to be a contributor to effectiveness. According to White (1969) in elementary schools, need for Affiliation, or need for love and affection, is almost
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entirely centred in family matters and family interactions. Teachers should be advertent to those signs of need for love and affection. Effective teachers are able to establish a rapport with their students from the beginning. They interact freely and easily with class members and students perceive them as warm and authentic (Rogers, 1983). They emphasize co-operation rather than competition in their class rooms, which results in more positive learning experiences for their students. The learning process, rather than its products, is emphasized (Johnson, 1988). Their important over-all goals are to improve relationships among students and to continually nurture the growth of students' self-esteem. Effective teachers understand the development of self-concept in their students and structure class-room activities in ways that foster the formation of positive self-concepts. To sum up, effective teachers are high on need for Affiliation.

The relationship between need for Approval and effectiveness has undergone close scrutiny by several researchers. Crowne and Marlow (1964) put forward the proposition that the approval-motivated individual responds to his need to gain acceptance, to obtain dependency-gratification, and achieve recognition and/or status by engaging in approval seeking behaviours in particular situations through positive self-presentations and denial of inadequacies.

On close scrutiny, those identified as approval-dependent seem to resolve some social and personal conflicts in ways that result detrimental to themselves. Obviously, such individuals cannot be categorized as being effective. Dayal (1976) and Sinha (1983) reported that in India executives value strong personalized relations. Social relationships and organizational performance are not separated in India. Loyalty often gets priority over efficiency (Dayal, 1976).

Thus, need satisfaction and motivational patterns are important determiners of behaviour at work. What is the role of need satisfaction and various motivational patterns in Self-Rated Effectiveness, is the focus of the present study.