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1.1 Introduction:

Although human relationships have existed since the beginning of time, the art and science of dealing with human beings in complex organizations is relatively new. In the early days people worked alone or in such small groups that their work relationships were easily handled. But during recent time with the industrialization & globalization the working pattern and needs of the industrial employees have been changed. Employee brings their psychological, social & economical needs with them to an organization which they express individually & collectively. All these different interests come together and are combined into a working social system. So employees are working in particular social system of an organization. The employer has to take care of all these socio-psychological needs of the employees. For that effective interactive styles are needed. In a way this requires paradigm shift from traditional way of managing men to a modern way of managing men in industry.

Most recently, there has been a search of interest in self managed teams as companies try to use team-based approaches to meet their competitive problems. It also emphasizes the need for re engineering of the organization to meet the new paradigm challenges. The two factors namely industrial relations and interpersonal relations in general are very crucial factors in an industrial set up. These two factors have got tremendous impact on performance of employees. To establish good industrial relations, positive attitude & positive thinking are needed. The managers must have well developed interactive style to create harmonious and cor'dial relationship and cong'ruous environment in the organization.
It is a human tendency that we tend to like those who like us. Not only that similarity in work values, beliefs etc. associated with liking & in turn increase interactional processes. One who knows how to interact with peers, subordinates and super ordinates become more acceptable and more assertive. Managers have to develop specific habit to be effective leader in the organization. The manager should be assertive in his dealings.

A manager should be able to develop win/win situation in the organization. As we know win/win is a frame of mind and heart that constantly seeks mutual benefits in all human interactions.

1.2 Objectives of the Research :-

Following are the objectives of the present research.

(1) To study the extent to which various style profile of interaction vary among managers differing in terms of their seniority, work assignment and experience on the present job.

(2) To study whether the style profile of interaction are related to locus of control of managers.

(3) To study the possible relationship of motivational profile with style profile of interaction.

1.3 Explanation of main Concepts in the Research

As we know interaction is an important component of our day-today life and also for our business transaction. Very few persons would choose to live in total isolation. Human being is a social animal, so he/she would like to be in a group. Two types of needs that are fulfilled by the presence of others viz., the need for affiliation and the need for acceptance.
In production organizations or in service organizations, there is always a constant flow of interaction either in written form or in oral form. For running the business effectively, effective inter-personal relations are required. For maintaining inter personal relations there is always either upward communication or downward communication. Not only that but the lateral communication equally important among the peer group. It has got its own importance.

1.3.1 What is Interaction?

It is an enduring process of give and take of ideas, thoughts, instructions, reports and feedback. The effectiveness of interaction depends on reciprocity of liking, positive qualities, similarly in values, social behaviour, and social skills and so on. Those managers/supervisors who are well equipped with the social skills they become more effective and influencing in the organization. One who knows how to keep the healthy inter-personal relations, gets more & more acceptance in the organization and as a result of the same he becomes highly effective and successful in the organization.

1.3.2 Interaction styles:

Interaction Styles is based on observable behavior patterns that are quite similar to the popular social styles models. Interaction Styles tells us the “how” of our behavior. It refers to patterns of interaction that are both highly contextual and yet innate. Knowing our interaction it helps us to locate interpersonal conflicts and situational energy drains. It gives us a map for greater flexibility in our interactions with others.

Berens' Interaction Styles

Adapted from Linda J. V Berens, Understanding Yourself and Others: An Introduction to Interaction Styles (Telos Publications, 2001)
History of the Four Temperaments

Throughout the ages, observers of human behavior have repeatedly identified patterns or configurations of behavior. Such holistic sorting of behavior patterns has been recorded for at least twenty five centuries. Ancient philosophers described four dispositions called temperaments a choleric, a phlegmatic, a melancholic, and a sanguine. Interpretations of these patterns have varied over the years, with two distinct interpretations, one is David Keirsey’s temperament theory and the other relates to the Interaction Style Model.

Most twentieth century psychologists abandoned holistic observation of human behavior for a microscopic examination of parts, fragments, traits, and so on. To them, all human beings were basically alike and individual differences were due to chance or conditioning yet many of them ultimately described patterns that resemble our holistic view.

The seeds were sown for the interaction style model in the 1920s. In 1928, William Marston wrote about the emotional basis for our behavior. Geier looked at traits and clusters of traits that would help us to understand how we behave in the “social field”. Then came a long string of framework and instruments that described the social styles of people. These frameworks yielded descriptions similar to Geier’s interpretation of Marston’s work.

Many of these authors referenced the work of Carl Jung, Isabel Myers, and Katharine Briggs. Their primary focus, in contrast to Jung, was on outer behavior, not inner states, Some even reference Keirsey’s temperament theory. They seemed to not realize they were referring separate models.

All of these models suggest that these styles or types are inborn. In the meantime, studies continue to be conducted on the various “temperamental” traits that can be identified and tracked over time with physiological measures. Many of these traits seem to relate to the interaction Styles patterns.
The Four Interaction Style Patterns

Adapted from Linda V. Berens, Understanding Yourself and Other/E: An Introduction to interaction Styles (Telos Publications, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart-the-Course</th>
<th>Behind-the-Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The theme is having a course of action to follow. People of this style focus on knowing what to do and keeping themselves, the group, or the project on tract. They prefer to enter a situation having an idea of what is to happen. They identify a process to accomplish a goal and have a somewhat contained tension as they work to create and monitor a plan. The aim is not the plan itself, but to use it as a guide to move things along toward the goal. Their informed and deliberate decisions are based on analyzing, outlining, conceptualizing or foreseeing what needs to be satisfied.</td>
<td>The theme is getting the best result possible. People of this style focus on understanding and working with the process to create a positive outcome. They see value in many contributions and consult outside inputs to make an informed decision. They aim to integrate various information sources and accommodate differing points of view. They approach others with a quiet, calm style that may not show their strong convections. Producing, sustaining, defining, and clarifying are all ways they support a group’s process. They typically have more patience than most with the time it takes to gain support through consensus for a project or to refine the result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Charge</th>
<th>Get-Things-Going</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The theme is getting things accomplished through people. People of this style are focused on results, often taking action quickly. They often have a driving energy with an intention to lead a group to the goal. They make decisions quickly to keep themselves and others on takes, on target,</td>
<td>The theme is persuading and involving others. They thrive in facilitator or catalyst roles and aim to inspire others to move to action, facilitating the process. Their focus is on interaction, often with an expressive style. They Get Things-Going with upbeat energy, enthusiasm, or excitement, which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and on time. They hate wasting time and having to back track. Mentoring, executing actions, supervising, and mobilizing resources are all ways they get things accomplished. They notice right away what is not working in a situation and become painfully aware of what needs to be fixed, healed, or corrected.

can be contagious. Exploring options and possibilities, making preparations, discovering new ideas, and sharing insights are all ways they get people moving along. They want decisions to be participative and enthusiastic, with everyone involved and engaged.

**Things-in-Common**

Directing versus informing communications – ways we influence others

Initiating v/s Responding roles – ways to define relationships

Control versus Movement focus – where we focus our attention when interacting

These dynamics are always operating in a situation, and if we become polarized along these dimensions as we interact with others, miscommunication and misunderstanding are probable and likely to result in destructive conflict. However, we need to remember that we always have at least one aspect in common with someone of a different interaction style.

**Chart-the-Course & In-Charge have in common**

Directive Communications - Give structure,

**In-Charge & Get-Things-Going**

Have in common

Imitating Roles-External World, reach out, interact,

**In-Charge & Behind-the Scenes have in common**

Control-Focus on control over the outcome

**Behind-the-Scenes & Get Things-Going have in common.**

Informing Communications Evoke, draw forth, seek input.

Chart-the-Course & Behind the -Senses have in common Responding Roles- Internal world, reflect, slow pace
Chart-the-Course & Get Things-Going have in common
Movement-Focus on movement toward the goal

1.3.3 Determinants of Inter-Personal Interactions & Interactive styles:-

Following are the main determinants of inter-personal interactions.

(i) Reciprocity of liking
We tend to like those who like us. Given information that another individual like us, we tend to interact with that person. So the supervisor or manager who has got pleasant personality will attract the attention of many employees and will get more & more acceptance.

(ii) Similarity in values and beliefs
Similarity in work values, beliefs etc. associated with liking & in turn increase interaction processes.

(iii) Social skills
One who knows how to interact with peers, subordinates & super ordinates becomes more acceptable & more assertive one. Social skills include exposure to environment, knowing others, sociability & communication skills.
(iv) **Positive Qualities**:-
This indicates, liking the good and disliking the bad. One has to develop a clear-cut sense as to what is good & what is bad? It is hardly surprising that people with meritorious qualities should be liked more than those with disagreeable qualities. For example, we like intelligent, warm, sincere, and competent people more than people who do not have those attributes (Kaplan & Anderson, 1973). It is a fact that we tend to prefer competent people compared to incompetent or dull people.

(v) **Equitable Rewards**:-
Equity theory of relations & interaction explains move a step beyond comparison level model by taking into account not only an individual’s own outcomes, but also the outcomes that are perceived to be attained by a partner in a relationship (Walster, Walster and Berscheid, 1978). The theory suggests that we try to maintain a balance between the rewards and costs we experience and those our partner experiences. We always try to restore equity – potentially by modifying our perception of what we are getting out of the interaction, or by modifying our feelings for the partner. So the supervisors, managers should be able to maintain equitable justice in dealings with the subordinates.

(vi) **The need for Social Interaction** :-
As we know, for most of us, social interaction is an important component of our day-to-day existence, for business dealing & for other transactions. Sociability is the must to interact with others with free flow.

(vii) **Personality Types** :-
In any organization, the interaction pattern is shaped by the types of personality of managers. Broadly speaking there are two types of leaders – one is having personality ‘types-A’ and second one having personality ‘type-B’. Type-A personality determines type-A” behaviour pattern” and type-B determines type “B behaviour pattern.” As we know personality characteristics will also determine inter-personal relations and accordingly the production or the outcomes will be affected.
Type_A behaviour Pattern: This type of behaviour syndrome associated with a high risk of coronary heart disease; characterized primarily by intense ambition, competitive drive, preoccupation with occupational dealings and time urgency.

Type-B behaviour pattern: This type of behaviour syndrome associated with a lower risk of coronary heart disease, characterized by easy-going attitudes and relaxed, uncompetitive, patient and rarely hostile behaviours, in contrast to Type-A behaviours.

Different scholars have classified the interaction styles in a different ways. But in this present study following six types of interaction styles will be taken in consideration.

(1) Supportive
(2) Normative
(3) Problem Solving
(4) Innovative
(5) Confronting
(6) Resilient

another's dimension of present study is the “Locus of control,” which is also an equally important determinant of our behaviour.

(viii) Dealing with subordinates:
The manager must be easily available to the subordinates. He must be able to deal with the subordinates as a family member. The manager must have participative leadership style while dealing with subordinates. He should act as the man of their own interest. This will create very positive psychological environment in the organization.

(ix) Managerial habits: -
As pointed out by Stephen Covey a Manger should possess few good habits to be a successful & effective manager in the organization. Stephen Covey has suggested seven habits which are very essential to be a effective manager. The seven habits are:

(1) Be proactive,
(1) **BE PROACTIVE**

**PROACTIVITY DEFINED**

In discovering the basic principle of the nature of man, Frank described an accurate self map from which he began to develop the first and most basic habit of a highly effective person in any environment, the habit of proactively.

![PROACTIVE MODEL Diagram]

**PROACTIVE MODEL**

The word proactively is now fairly common in Management Literature, it is a word you will not find in most dictionaries. It means more than merely taking initiative. It means that as human beings, we are responsible for our own lives. Our behavior is a function of our decisions, not our conditions. We can subordinate feelings to values. We have the initiative and the responsibility to make things happen.

Look at the word responsibility "response ability" the ability to choose your response. Highly proactive people recognize that responsibility. They do not blame circumstances,
conditions, or conditioning for their behavior. Their behavior is a product of their own conscious choice, based on values, rather than a product of their conditions, based on feeling.

Because we are, by nature, proactive, if our lives are a function of conditioning and conditions, it is because we have, by conscious decision or by default, chosen to empower those things to control us. (External locus of control)

In making such a choice, we become reactive. Reactive people are often affected by their physical environment. If the weather is good, they feel good. If it isn't, it affects their attitude and their performance. Proactive people can carry their own weather with them. Whether it rains or shines makes no difference to them. They are value driven; and if their value is to produce good quality work, it isn't a function of whether the weather is conducive to it or not.

Reactive people are also affected by their social environment, by the "social weather." When people treat them well, they feel well, when people don't, they become defensive or protective. Reactive people build their emotional lives around the behavior of others, empowering the weaknesses of other people to control them.

The ability to subordinate an impulse to a value is the essence of the proactive person. Reactive people are driven by feelings, by circumstances, by conditions, by their environment. Proactive people are driven by values carefully thought about, selected and internalized values.

Proactive people are still influenced by external stimuli, whether physical, social or psychological. But their response to the stimuli, conscious or unconscious, is a value based choice or response.

As Eleanor Roosevelt observed, "No one can hurt you without your consent." In the words of Gandhi, "They cannot take away our self respect if we do not give it to them." It
is our willing permission, our consent to what happens to us, that hurts us far more than what happens to us in the first place.

I admit this is very hard to accept emotionally, especially if we have had years and years of explaining our misery in the name of circumstance or someone else's behavior. But until a person can say deeply and honestly, "I am what I am today because of the choices I made yesterday." that person cannot say, "I choose otherwise."

Eleanor Roosevelt again observed & said that "Once in Sacramento when I was speaking on the subject of proactively, a woman in the audience stood up in the middle of my presentation and started talking excitedly. It was a large audience, and as a number of people turned to look at her, she suddenly became aware of what she was doing, grew embarrassed and sat back down. But she seemed to find it difficult to restrain herself and started talking to the people around her. She seemed so happy.

It's not what happens to us, but our response to what happens to us that hurts us. Of course, things can hurt us physically or economically and can cause sorrow. But our character, our basic identity, does not have to be hurt at all. In fact, our most difficult experiences become the crucibles that forge our character and develop the internal powers, the freedom to handle difficult circumstances in the future and to inspire others to do so as well.

We have all known individuals in very difficult circumstance, perhaps with a terminal illness or a severe physical handicap, who maintain magnificent emotional strength. How inspired we are by their integrity. Nothing has a greater, longer lasting impression upon another person than the awareness that some one has transcended suffering, has transcended circumstance and is embodying and expressing a value that inspires and ennobles and lifts life.
TAKING THE INITIATIVE

Our basic nature is to act, and not be acted upon. As well as enabling us to chose our response to particular circumstances, this empowers us to create circumstances.

Taking initiative does not mean being pushy, obnoxious, or aggressive. It does mean recognizing our responsibility to make things happen.

Holding people to the responsible course is not demeaning it is affirming. Proactively is part of human nature, and, although the proactive muscles may be dormant, they are there. By respecting the proactive nature of other, we provide them with at least one clear, undistorted reflection from the social mirror...

Of course, the maturity level of the individual has to be taken into account. We can't expect high creative cooperation from those who are deep into emotional dependence. But we can, at least, affirm their basic nature and create an atmosphere where people can seize opportunities and solve problems in an increasingly self-reliant way.
Proactive people focus their efforts in the Circle of Influence. They work on the things they can do something about. The nature of their energy is positive, enlarging and magnifying. Causing their Circle of Influence to increase.

Reactive people, on the other hand, focus their efforts in the Circle of concern. They focus on the weakness of other people, the problems in the environment, and circumstances over which they have no control. Their focus results in blaming and accusing attitudes, reactive language, and increased feelings of victimization. The negative energy generated by that focus, combined with neglect in areas they could do something about causes their Circle of influence to shrink.
As long as we are working in our Circle of Concern, we empower the things within it to control us. We aren’t taking the proactive initiative necessary to effect positive change.

But those things were in our Circle of Concern. As long as we focused our efforts on those things, we accomplished nothing, except to increase our own feelings of inadequacy and helplessness and to reinforce our son's dependence.

It was only when we went to work in our Circle of Influence, when we focused on our own paradigms, that we began to create a positive energy that changed ourselves and eventually influenced. Our son as well. By working on ourselves instead of worrying about conditions, we were able to influence the conditions. Because of position, wealth, role, or relationships, there are some circumstances in which a person's Circle of Influence is reduced.
Influence is larger than his or her Circle of Concern. This influence on interactive style of manager or executive.

EXPANDING THE CIRCLE OF INFLUENCE

It is inspiring to realize that in choosing our response to circumstance, we powerfully affect our circumstance. When we change one part of the chemical formula, we change the nature of the results.

This caused quite a stir in the organization. The reactive minds in the executive corridors began shooting their vindictive ammunition at this proactive man.

It's the nature of reactive people to absolve themselves of responsibly. It's so much safer to say, "I am not responsible." If I say "I am responsible," I might have to say," I am irresponsible." It would be very hard for me to say that I have the power to choose my response and that the response I have chosen has resulted in my involvement in a negative, collusive environment, especially if for years I have absolved myself of responsibility for results in the name of someone else's weaknesses.

So these executives focused on finding more information, more ammunition, more evidence as to why they weren't responsible.

But this man was proactive toward them, too. Little by little; his Circle of Influence toward them grew also. It continued to expand to the extent that eventually no one made any significant moves in the organization without that man's involvement and approval, including the president. But the president did not feel threatened because this man's strength complemented his strength and compensated for his weaknesses. So he had the strength of two persons, a complementary team.

This man's cusses were not dependent on his circumstances. Many others were in the same situation. It was his chosen response to that circumstance, his focus on his Circle of Influence that made the difference.
There are some people who interpret "proactive" to mean pushy, aggressive, or insensitive; but that isn't the case at all proactive people aren't pushy. They're value driven. They read reality, and they know what's needed.

The proactive approach is to change from the inside out to be different and by being different, to effect positive change in what's out there. I can be more resourceful, I can be more diligent, I can be more creative, I can be more cooperative. So this kind of thinking has positive effect on resilient interactive style.

(2) BEGIN WITH THE END IN MIND:

Above Habit applies to many different circumstances and levels of life, the most fundamental application of "begin with the end in mind" is to begin today with the image, picture, or paradigm of the end of your life as your frame of reference or the criterion by which everything else is examined. Each part of your life today's behavior, tomorrow's behavior, next week's behavior, next month's behavior can be examined in the context of the whole, of what really matters most to you. By keeping that end clearly in mind, you can make certain that whatever you do on any particular day does not violate the criteria you have defined as supremely important, and that each day of your life contributes in a meaningful way to the vision you have of your life as a whole.

To begin with the end in mind means to start with a clear understanding of your destination. It means to know where you're going so that you better understand where you are now and so that the steps you take are always in the right direction.

It's incredibly easy to get caught up in an activity trap, in the busy-ness of life, to work harder and harder at climbing the ladder of success only to discover it's leaning against the wrong wall. It is possible to be busy—very busy—without being very effective.
How different our lives are when we really know what is deeply important to us, and, keeping that picture in mind, we manage ourselves each day to be and to do what really matters most. If the ladder is not leaning against the right wall, every step we take just gets us to the wrong place faster. We may be very busy, we may be very efficient, but we will also be truly effective only when we begin with the end in mind.

**All things are created twice:**

"Begin with the end in mind" is based on the principle that all things are created twice. There's a mental or first creation, and a physical or second creation to all things.

For example, look at a business. If you want to have a successful enterprise, you clearly define what you're trying to accomplish. You carefully think through the product or service you want to provide in terms of your market target, then you organize, all the elements financial, research and development, operations, marketing, personnel, physical facilities, and so on to meet that objective. The extent to which you begin with the end in mind often determines whether or not you are able to create a successful enterprise. Most business failures begin in the first creation, with problems such as undercapitalization, misunderstanding of the market, or lack of a business plan.

(3) **TO THINK WIN/WIN (PHILOSOPHY OR INTERACTION)**

To think win/win is the essence of our life. And the habit of effective interpersonal interaction as well as interpersonal leadership is to think win/win.

**Six Paradigms of Human Interaction**

Win/win is not a technique; it is a total philosophy of human interaction. In fact, it is one of six paradigms of interaction. The alternative paradigms are win/lose, Lose/Win, Lose/Lose, Win, and Win/Win or no deal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Win/Win</th>
<th>Lose/Lose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Win/Lose</td>
<td>Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lose/Win</td>
<td>Win/Win or No deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Win/Win:

Win/Win is a frame of mind and heart that constantly seeks mutual benefit in all human interactions. Win/Win means that agreements or solutions are mutually beneficial, mutually satisfying. With a Win/Win solution, all parties feel good about the decision and feel committed to the action plan. Win/Win sees life as a cooperative, not a competitive arena. Most people tend to think in terms of dichotomies strong or weak, hardball or softball, win or lose. But that kind of thinking is fundamentally flawed. It's based on power and position rather than on principle. Win/Win is based on the paradigm that there is plenty for everybody, that one person's success is not achieved at the expense or exclusion of the success of others.

Win/Win is a belief in the Third Alternative. It's not your way or my way; it's better way, a higher way.

Win/Lose

One alternative to win/win is Win/Lose, the paradigm of the race to Bermuda. It says "If I win, you lose."

In leadership style. Win/Lose is the authoritarian approach: "I get my way: you don't get yours." Win/Lose people are prone to use position, power, credentials, possessions, or personality to bet their way.

Most people have been deeply scripted in the Win/Lose mentality since birth. First and most important of the powerful forces at work is the family. When one child is compared with another when patience, understanding or love is given or withdrawn on the basis of such comparisons people are into Win/Lose thinking. Whenever love is given on a conditional basis, when someone has to earn love, what's being communicated to them is that they are not intrinsically valuable or lovable. Value does not lie inside them, it lies outside. It's in comparison with somebody else or against some expectation.

And what happens to a young mind and heart, highly vulnerable, highly dependent upon the support and emotional affirmation of the parents, in the face of conditional love? The child is molded, shaped, and programmed in the Win/Lose mentality. Same thing happens with the managers & top management relationship.
Another powerful scripting agency is the peer group. A child first wants acceptance from his parents and then from his peers, whether they be siblings of friends. And we all know how cruel peers sometimes can be. They often accept or reject totally on the basis of conformity to their expectations and norms, providing additional scripting toward Win/Lose.

The academic world reinforces Win/Lose scripting. The "normal distribution curve" basically says that you got an "A" because someone else got a "C". It interprets an individual's value by comparing him or her to everyone else. No recognition is given to intrinsic value, everyone is extrinsically defined.

Most of life is an interdependent, not an independent, reality. Most results you want depend on cooperation between you and others. And the Win/Lose mentality is dysfunctional to that cooperation.

**Lose/Win**

Some people are programmed the other way-Lose/Win.

"I lose, you win."

"Go ahead. Have your way with me."

"Step on me again. Everyone does."

"I'm a loser. I've always been a loser."

"I'm a peacemaker. I'll do anything to keep peace."

Lose/Win is worse than Win/Lose because it has no standards, no demand, no expectations, no vision. People who think Lose/Win are usually quick to please or appease. They seek strength from popularity or acceptance. They have little courage to express their own feelings and convictions and are easily intimidated by the ego strength of others.

In negotiation, Lose/Win is seen as capitulation giving in a giving up. In leadership style, it's permissiveness or indulgence. Lose/Win means being a nice guy, even if "nice guys finish last."

Win/Lose people love Lose/Win people because they can feed on them. They love their weaknesses they take advantage of them. Such weaknesses complement their strengths.
But the problem is that lose/Win people bury a lot of feelings. And unexpressed feelings never die: they’re buried alive and come forth later in uglier ways. Psychosomatic illnesses, particularly of the respiratory, nervous, and circulatory systems often are the reincarnation of cumulative resentment, deep disappointment and disillusionment repressed by the Lose/Win mentality. Disproportionate rage or anger, overreaction to minor provocation, and cynicism are other embodiments of suppressed emotion.

People who are constantly repressing, not transcending feelings towards a higher meaning find that it affects the quality of their self-esteem and eventually the quality of their relationships with others.

Both Win/Lose and Lose/Win are weak positions, based impersonal insecurities. In the short run, Win/Lose will produce more results because it draws on the often considerable strengths and talents of the people at the top. Lose/Win is weak and chaotic from the outset.

Many executives, managers, and parents swing back and forth, as if on a pendulum, from Win/Lose in consideration to Lose/Win indulgence. When they can't stand confusion and lack of structure, direction, expectation, and discipline, and longer, they swing back to Win/Lose until guilt undermines their resolve and drives them back to Lose/Win until anger and frustration drive them back to Win/Lose again.

Lose/Lose

When two win/Lose people get together that is, when two determined, stubborn, ego invested individuals interact the result will be Lose/Lose. Both will lose. Both will become vindictive and want to "get back" or "get even," blind to the fact that murder is suicide, that revenge is a two edged sword.

Some people become so centered on an enemy, so totally obsessed with the behavior of another person that they become blind to everything except their desire for that person to lose, even if it means losing themselves. Lose/Lose is the philosophy of adversarial conflict, the philosophy of war.

Lose/Lose is also the philosophy of the highly dependent person without inner direction who is miserable and things everyone else should be, too. "If nobody ever wins, perhaps being a loser isn't so bad."
Win

Another common alternative is simply to think Win. People with the Win mentality don't necessarily want someone else to lose. That's irrelevant, what matters is that they get what they want.

When there is no sense of contest or competition, Win is probably the most common approach in everyday negotiation. A person with the Win mentality thinks in terms of securing his own ends and leaving it to others to secure theirs.

Which Option Is Best?

Of these five philosophies discussed so far Win/Win, Win/Lose, Lose/Win, Lose/Lose, and Win—which is the most effective? The answer is, "It depends." There are circumstances in which you would want to win, and you wouldn't be highly concerned with the relationship of that win to others. If your child's life were in danger, for example, you might be peripherally concerned about other people and circumstances. But saving that life would be supremely important.

The best choice, then, depends on reality. The challenge is to read that reality accurately and not to translate win/Lose or other scripting into every situation.

Most situations, in fact, are part of an interdependent reality, and then Win/Win is really the only viable alternative of the five.

Win/Lose is not viable because, although I appear to win in a confrontation with you, your feelings, your attitudes toward me and our relationship have been affected. If I am a supplier to your company, for example, and I win on my terms in a particular negotiation, I may get what I want now. But will you come to me again? My short term Win will really be a long term Lose if I don't get your repeat business. So an interdependent Win/Lose is really Lose/Lose in the long run.

If we come up with a Lose/Win, you may appear to get what you want for the moment. But how will that affect my attitude about working with you, about fulfilling the contract? I may not feel as anxious to please you. I may carry battle scars with me into any future negotiations. My attitude about you and your company may be spread as I
associate with others in the industry. So we're into Lose/Lose again. Lose/Lose obviously isn't viable in any context.

And if I focus on my own Win and don't even consider your point of view, there's no basis for any kind of productive relationship.

In the long run, if it isn't winning for both of us, we both lose, that's why Win/Win is the only real alternative in interdependent realities.

If this man had had a real Win/Win attitude, he would have stayed longer in the communication process, listened to the mall owner more, and then expressed his point of view with more courage. He would have continued in the Win/Win spirit until a solution was reached they both felt good about. And that solution, that Third Alternative, would have been synergistic probably some thing neither of them had thought of on his own.

Win/Win or No Deal

If these individual had not come up with a synergistic solution one that was agreeable to both they could have gone for an even higher expression of Win/Win or No deal.

No Deal basically means that if we can't find a solution that would benefit us both, we agree to disagree agreeably No. Deal. No expectations have been created, no performance contracts established. I don't hire you or we don't take on a particular assignment together because it's obvious that our values or our goals are going in opposite directions. It is so much better to realize this up front instead of downstream when expectations have been created and both parties have been disillusioned.

When you have No deal as an option in your mind, you feel liberated because you have no need to manipulate people, to push your own agenda, to drive for what you want. You can be open. You can really try to understand the deeper issues underlying the positions.

With No Deal as an option, you can honestly say, "I only want to go for Win/Win.I want to win, and I want you to win. I wouldn't want to get my way and have you not feel good about it, because downstream it would eventually surface and create a withdrawal. On the other hand, I don't think you would feel good if you got your way and I gave in. So let's work for a win/win. Let's really hammer it out. And if we can't find it, then let's agree that we won't make a deal at all. It would be better not to deal than to live
with a decision that wasn't right for us both. Then may be another time we might be able
to get together."

Anything less than Win/Win in an interdependent reality is a poor second best
that will have impact in the long term relationship. The cost of that impact needs to be
carefully considered. If you can't reach a true Win/Win, you're every often better off to go
for No deal.

Win/Win or No deal provides tremendous emotional freedom in the family
relationship. If family members can't agree on a video that everyone will enjoy, they can
simply decide to do something else No Deal rather than having some enjoy the evening at
the expense of others.

The Win/Win or No Deal approach is most realistic at the beginning of a business
relationship or enterprise. In a continuing business relationship, No Deal may not be a
viable option, which can create serious problems, especially for family businesses or
businesses that are begun initially on the basis of friendship.

In an effort to preserve the relationship, people sometimes go on for years making
one compromise after another, thinking Win/Lose or Lose/Win even while talking
Win/Win. This creates serious problems for the people and for the business, particularly
if the competition operates on Win/Win and synergy.

Without No Deal, many such businesses simply deteriorate and either fail or have
to be turned over to professional managers. Experience shows that it is often better in
setting up a family business or a business between friends to acknowledge the possibility
of No deal downstream and to establish some kind of buy/sell agreement so that the
business can prosper without permanently damaging the relationship.

Of course there are some relationships where No Deal is not viable. I wouldn't
abandon my child or my spouse and go for No Deal (It would be better, if necessary, to
go for compromise a low from of win/win) But in many cases, it is possible to go into
negotiation with a full win/win or No deal attitude. And the freedom in that attitude is
incredible.
Five Dimensions of Win/Win:

Think win/win is the habit of interpersonal leadership. It involves the exercise of each of the unique human endowments self awareness, imagination, conscience, and independent will in our relationships with others. It involves mutual learning, mutual influence, and mutual benefits.

It takes great courage as well as consideration to create these mutual benefits, particularly if we're interacting with others who are deeply scripted in Win/Lose.

That is why this habit involves principles of interpersonal leadership. Effective interpersonal leadership requires the vision the proactive initiative and the security, guidance, wisdom, and power that come from principle centered personal leadership.

The principle of Win/Win is fundamental to success in all our interaction, and it embraces five interdependent dimensions of life. It begins with character and moves toward relationships, out of which flow agreements. It is nurtured in an environment where structure and systems are based on Win/Win. And it involves process; we cannot achieve Win/Win ends with win/Lose or lose/Win means.

The following diagram shows how these five dimensions related to each other.

Now let's consider each of the five dimensions in turn.

Character

Character is the foundation of win/win, and everything else builds on that foundation. There are three character traits essential to the win/win paradigm.
INTEGRITY. We've already defined integrity as the value we place on ourselves. Habits 1, 2 and 3 help us develop and maintain integrity. As we clearly identify our values and proactively organize and execute around those values on a daily basis, we develop self awareness and independent will by making and keeping meaningful promises and commitments.

There's no way to go for a win in our own lives if we don't even know, in a deep sense, what constitutes a Win—what is, in fact harmonious with our innermost values. And if we can't make and keep commitments to ourselves as well as to others, our commitments become meaningless. We know it others know it they sense duplicity and become graded. There's no foundation of trust and win/win becomes an ineffective superficial technique. Integrity is the cornerstone in the foundation.

MATURITY, Maturity is the balance between courage and consideration. If a person can express his feelings and convictions with courage balanced with consideration for the feelings and convictions of another person, he is mature, particularly if the issue is very important to both parties.

If you examine many of the psychological tests used for hiring, promoting, and training purposes, you will find that they are designed to evaluate this kind of maturity. Whether it's called the ego strength empathy balance, the self confidence/respect for others balances the concern for people/concern for tasks balance. I'm okay, you're okay" in transactional analysis language, or 9,1,1,9,5,5,9,9, in management grid language the quality sought for is the balance of what I call courage and consideration.

Respect for this quality is deeply ingrained in the theory of human interaction, management, and leadership. It is a deep embodiment of the P/PC balance. While courage may focus on getting the golden egg, consideration deals with the long term welfare of the other stakeholders. The basic task of leadership is to increase the standard of living and the quality of life for all stakeholders.

Many people think in dichotomies, in either/or terms. They think if you're nice, you're not tough. But win/win is nice... and tough. It's twice as tough as win/lose. To go for win/win, you not only have to be nice, you have to be courageous. You not only have
to be empathic, you have to be confident. You not only have to be considerate and sensitive, you have to be brave. To do that, to achieve that balance between courage and consideration, is the essence of real maturity and is fundamental to win/win.

If I’m high on courage and low on consideration, how will I think? Win/Lose. I’ll be strong and ego bound. I’ll have the courage of my convictions, but I won’t be very considerate of yours.

To compensate for my lack of internal maturity and emotional strength, I might borrow strength from my position and power, or from my credentials, my seniority, my affiliations.

If I’m high on consideration and low on courage, I’ll think Lose/Win. I’ll be so considerate of your convictions and desires that I won’t have the courage to express and actualize my own.

High courage and consideration are both essential to win/win. It is the balance that is the mark of real maturity. If I have it, I can listen, I can empathically understand, but I can also courageously confront.

ABUNDANCE MENTALITY.

The third character trait essential to win/win is the Abundance Mentality, the paradigm that there is plenty out there for everybody.
Most people are deeply scripted in what I call the Scarcity Mentality. They see life as having only so much, as though there were only one pie out there. And if someone were to get a big piece of the pie, it would mean less for everybody else. The Scarcity Mentality is the zero sum paradigm of life.

People with a Scarcity Mentality have a very difficult time sharing recognition and credit, power or profit even with those who help in the production. They also have a very hard time being genuinely happy for the successes of other people even, and sometimes especially, members of their own family or close friends and associates. It's almost as if something is being taken from them when someone else receives special recognitions on windfall gain or has remarkable success or achievement.

Relationships:

From the foundation of character, we build and maintain Win/Win relationships. The trust, the Emotional Bank Account, is the essence of win/win. Without trust, the best we can do is compromise; without trust, we lack the credibility for open, mutual learning and communication and real creativity.

But if our Emotional Bank Account is high, credibility is no longer an issue. Enough deposits have been made so that you know and I know that we deeply respect each other. We're focused on the issues, not on personalities or positions.

Because we trust each other, we're open. We put our cards on the table. Even though we see things differently, I know that you're willing to listen with respect while I describe the young woman to you, and you know that I'll treat your description of the old woman with the same respect. We're both committed to try to understand each others point of view deeply and to work together for the Third Alternative, the synergistic solution that will be a better answer for both of us.

A relationship where bank accounts are high and both parties are deeply committed to win/win is the ideal springboard for tremendous synergy. That relationship neither makes the issue any less real or important, nor eliminates the differences in perspective. But it does eliminate the negative energy normally focused on differences in personality and position and creates a positive, cooperative energy focused on thoroughly understanding the issues and resolving them in a mutually beneficial way.
But what if that kind of relationship isn't there? What if you have to work out an agreement with someone who hasn't even heard of win/win and is deeply scripted in win/lose or some other philosophy?

Dealing with win/lose is the real test of win/win, rarely is win/win easily achieved in any circumstance. Deep issues and fundamental differences have to be dealt with. But it is much easier when both parties are aware of and committed to it and where there is a high Emotional bank Account in the relationship. If this is so, it will help to create well developed supportive & resilient interactive styles.

Agreements:

From relationships flow the agreements that give definition and direction to win/win. They are sometimes called performance agreements or partnership agreements, shifting the paradigm of productive interaction from vertical to horizontal, from hovering supervision to self supervision, from positioning to being partners in success.

Win/Win agreements cover a wide scope of interdependent interaction. The five elements we listed here provide the structure for Win/Win agreements between employers and employees, between manager & his subordinates, between groups of people cooperatively focused on a common objective, between companies and suppliers between any people who need to interact to accomplish. They create an effective way to clarify and manage expectations between people involved in any interdependent endeavor.

These five elements give Win/Win agreements a life of their own. A clear mutual understanding and agreement up front in these areas creates a standard against which people can measure their own success.

It is much more ennobling to the human spirit to let people judge themselves than to judge them. Anand in a high trust culture, it's much more accurate. In many cases people know in their hearts how things are going much better than the records show. Discernment is often far more accurate than either observation or measurement.


**Systems:**

Win/Win can only survive in an organization when the systems support it. If you talk win/win but reward win/lose, you've got a losing program on your hands.

You basically get what you reward. If you want to achieve the goals and reflect the values in your mission statement, then you need to align the reward system with these goals and values. If it isn't aligned systemically, you won't be walking your talk, You'll be in the situation of the manager as it is mentioned earlier who talked cooperation but practiced competition by creating a "Race to Bermuda" contest.

**Processes:**

There's no way to achieve win/win ends with win/lose or lose/win means. You can't say, "You're going to think win/win, whether you like it or not." So the question becomes how to arrive at a win/win solution.

Roger Fisher and William Ury, two Harvard law professors, have done some outstanding work in what they call the "principled," approach versus the "positional" approach to bargaining in their tremendously useful and insightful book, Getting to Yes. Although the words win/win is not used, the spirit and underlying philosophy of the book are in harmony with the win/win approach.

They suggest that the essence of principled negotiation is to separate the person from the problem, to focus on interests and not on positions, to invent options for mutual gain, and to insist on objective criteria some external standard or principle that both parties can buy into.

**Suggestions to buildup win/win approach:**

1. Think about an upcoming interaction wherein you will be attempting to reach an agreement or negotiate a solution. Commit to maintain a balance between courage and consideration.

2. Make a list of obstacles that keep you from applying the win/win paradigm more frequently. Determine what could be done within your Circle of Influence to eliminate some of those obstacles.

3. Select a specific relationship where you would like to develop a win/win agreement. Try to put yourself in the other persons place, and write down
explicitly how you think that person sees the solution. Then list, from your own perspective, what results would constitute a win for you. Approach the other person and ask if he or she would be willing to communicate until you reach a point of agreement and mutually beneficial solution.

4. Identify three key relationships in your life. Give some indication of what you feel the balance is in each of the Emotional Bank Accounts. Write down some specific ways you could make deposits in each account.

5. Deeply consider your own scripting. Is it Win/Lose? How does that scripting affect your interactions with other people? Can you identify the main source of that script? Determine whether or not those scripts serve well in your current reality.

6. Try to identify a model of win/win thinking who, even in hard situations, really seeks mutual benefit. Determine now to more closely watch and learn from this person's example.

All these suggestions will help managers to develop effective interactive styles in the organization.

(4) Be empathetic listener:-

"Seek first to understand" involves a very deep shift in parading. We typically seek first to be understood. Most people do not listen with the intent to understand; they listen with the intent to reply. They're either speaking or preparing to speak. They're filtering everything through their own paradigms, reading their autobiography into other people's lives.

When another person speaks, we're usually "listening" at one of four levels. We may be ignoring another person, not really listening at all. We may practice pretending. "Yeah. Uh-huh. Right." We may practice selective listening, hearing only certain parts of the conversation. We often do this when we're listening to the constant chatter of a preschool child. Or we may even practice attentive listening, paying attention and focusing energy on the words that are being said. But very few of us ever practice the fifth level, the highest form of listening, empathic listening.
When I say empathic listening, I mean listening with intent to understand. I mean seeking first to understand, to really understand. It’s an entirely different parading.

Empathic (from empathy) listening get inside another person’s frame of reference. You look out through it, you see the world the way they see the world, you understand their paradigm, you understand how they feel.

Empathic listening is so powerful because it gives you accurate data to work with. Instead of projecting your own autobiography and assuming thoughts, feelings, motives and interpretation, you’re dealing with the reality inside another person’s head and heart. You’re listening to understand. You’re focused on receiving the deep communication of another human soul.

In addition, empathic listening is the key to making deposits in Emotional Bank Accounts, because nothing you do is a deposit unless the other person perceives it as such. You can work your fingers to the bone to make a deposit, only to have it turn into a withdrawal when a person regards your efforts as manipulative, self serving, intimidating, or condescending because you don’t understand what really matters to him.

Empathic listening is, in and of itself, a tremendous deposit in the Emotional Bank Account. It’s deeply therapeutic and healing because it gives a person “Psychological air.”

When you listen with empathy to another person, you give that person psychological air. And after that vital need is met, you can then focus on influencing or problem solving.

This need for psychological air impacts communication in every area of life. In this way empathetic listening helps a manager to listen employees with full involvement. This helps to the manager to develop very effective interactive style in the organization.
Synergize: Improving quality through creative cooperation:

Synergy is everywhere in nature. If you plant two plants close together, the roots commingle and improve the quality of the soil so that both plants will grow better than if they were separated. If you put two pieces of wood together, the, will hold much more than the total of the weight held by each separately. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. One plus one equals three or more.

The challenge is to apply the principles of creative cooperation, which we learn from nature, in our social interactions. Family life provides many opportunities to observe synergy and to practice it.

The very way that a man and a woman bring a child into the world is synergistic. The essence of synergy is to value differences to respect them, to build on strengths, to compensate for weaknesses.

SYNERGISTIC COMMUNICATION

When you communicate synergistically, you are simply opening your mind and heart and expressions to new possibilities, new alternatives, new options. You're not sure when you engage in synergistic communication how things will work out or what the end will look like but you do have an inward sense of excitement and security and adventure, believing that it will be significantly better than it was before. And that is the end that you have in mind.

You being with the belief that parties involved will gain more insight, and that the excitement of that mutual learning and insight will create momentum toward more and more insights, learning and growth.

Many people have not really experienced even a moderate degree of synergy in their family life or in other interactions. They've been trained and scripted into defensive and protective communications or into believing that life or other people can't be trusted.

This represents one of the great tragedies and wastes in life, because so much potential remains untapped completely undeveloped and unused. Ineffective people live day after day with unused potential. They experience synergy only in small, peripheral ways in their lives.
They may have memories of some unusual creative experiences, perhaps in athletics, where they were involved in a real team spent for a period of time. Or perhaps they were in an emergency situation where people cooperated to unusually high degree and submerged ego and pride an effort to save someone’s life or to produce a solution to a crisis.

As we know most people have, times that were almost synergistic, times that hung on the edge of chaos and for some reason descended into it. Sadly, people who are burned by such experiences often begin their next new experience with that failure in mind. They defend themselves against it and cut themselves off from synergy.

It’s like administrators who set up new rules, and regulations based on the abuses of a few people inside an organization, thus limiting the freedom and creative possibilities for many or business partners who imagine the worst sensations possible and write them up in legal language, and killing the synergistic possibility.

As Carl Rogers taught, “That which is most personal is most general.” The more authentic you become, the more genuine in your expression, particularly regarding personal experiences and even self-doubts, the more people can relate to your expression and the safer it makes them feel to express themselves. That expression in turn feeds back on the other person’s spirit, and genuine creative empathy takes place, producing new insights and learning and a sense of excitement and adventure that keeps the process going.

People then begin to interact with each other almost in half sentences, sometimes incoherent, but they get each other’s meanings very rapidly. Then whole new worlds of insights, new perspectives, new paradigms that insure options, new alternatives are opened up and thought about. Though occasionally these new perspectives, new paradigms that insure options, new alternatives are opened up and thought about. Though occasionally these new ideas are left up in the air, they usually come to some kind of closure that is practical and useful.

Our mission is to empower people and organization to signification increases their performance capability in order to achieve worthwhile purposes through understanding and living principle centered leadership. To create positive environment in the organization.
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The synergistic process that led to the creation of our mission statement engraved it in the hearts and minds of everyone there and it has served us well as a frame of reference of what we are about, as well as what we are not about.

SYNERGY AND COMMUNICATION

Synergy is exciting. Creativity is exciting. Its phenomenal what openness and communication can produce. The possibilities of truly significant gain, of significant improvement are so real that it's worth the risk such openness entails.

The following diagram illustrates how closely trust is related to different levels of communication.

```
LEVELS OF COMMUNICATION

High

Respectful (Compromise)

Synergistic (Win/Win)

Defensive (Win/Lose or Lose/win)

Low

COOPERATION

Low

High
```

The lowest level of communication coming out of low trust situations would be characterized by defensiveness; protectiveness, and often legalistic language which covers all the bases and spells out qualifiers and the escape clauses in the event things go sour. Such communications produces only win/Lose or lose/lose. It isn't effective—there's no P/PC balance—and it creates further reasons to defend and protect.

Respectful communication works in independent situations and even in interdependent situations, but the creative possibilities are not opened up. In
Interdependent situations compromise is the position usually taken. Compromise means the $1 + 1 = 1 \frac{1}{2}$. Both give and take. The communication isn’t defensive or protective or angry or manipulative; it is honest and genuine and respectful. But it isn’t creative or synergistic. It produces a low form of Win/Win.

Synergy means that $1 + 1$ may equal 8, 16 or even 1,000. The synergistic position of high trust produces solutions better, than any originally proposed, and all parties know it. Furthermore, they genuinely enjoy the creative enterprise; a mini culture is formed to satisfy in and of itself. Even if it is short lived, the P/PC balances is there.

There are some circumstances in which synergy may not be achievable and No Deal isn’t viable. But even in these circumstances, the spirit of sincere trying will usually result in amore effective compromise.

**NEGATIVE SYNERGY**

Seeking the third alternative is a major paradigm shift from the dichotomous, either/or mentality. But look at the difference in results!

How much negative energy is typically expended when people try to save problems or make decisions in an interdependent reality? How much time is spent in confessing other people’s sins, politicking, rivalry, and interpersonal conflict, protecting one’s backside, masterminding, and second guessing? It’s like trying to drive down the road with one foot on the gas and the other foot on the brake!

The problem is that highly dependent people are trying to succeed in an interdependent reality. They’re either dependent on borrowing strength from position power and they go for Win/Lose, or they’re dependent on being popular with others and they go for Lose/Win. They may talk Win/Win technique, but they don’t really want to listen; they want to manipulate. And synergy can’t thrive in that environment.

Insecure people think that all reality should be amenable to their paradigms. They have a high need to clone others, to mold them over into their own thinking. They don’t realize that the very strength of the relationship is in having another point of view. Sameness is not oneness; uniformity is not unity, convenes, is complementariness, not sameness Sameness is uncreative and boring. The essence of
synergy is to value the differences. I've come to believe that the key to interpersonal synergy is intrapersonal synergy that is synergy within us. The heart of intrapersonal synergy is embodied in the principles incorporated in the principles of personal vision, begin with the end in mind, put first things first to thik win-win & to have a synergetic attitude. Which give the internal security sufficient to handle the risks of being open and vulnerable? By internalizing those principles, we develop the abundance mentality of win/win.

**Valuing the Differences:**

Valuing the differences is essence of synergy the mental, the emotional, the psychological differences between people. And the key to valuing those differences is to realize that all people see the world, not as it is, but as they would like to see it.

The person who is truly effective has the humility and reverence to recognize his own perceptual limitations and to appreciate the rich resources available through interaction with the hearts and minds of other human beings. That person values the differences because those differences add to his knowledge, to his understanding of reality. When we're left to our own experiences, we constantly suffer from a shortage of data.

And unless we value the differences in our perceptions, unless we value each other and give credence to the possibility that we're both right, that life is not always a dichotomous either/or, that there are almost always third alternatives, we will never be able to transcend the limits of that conditioning.

**1.3.4 What is Locus of Control?**

Locus of Control refers to an individual’s perception of what are the main causes of events in life. More simply put, do you believe that you control your destiny or that it is controlled by others or fate? According to Philip Zimbardo (a famous psychologist),
“A locus of control orientation is a belief about whether the outcomes of our actions are contingent on what we do (internal control orientation) or on events outside our personal control (external control orientation).”

- (Zimbardo, 1985, p. 275)

Thus, Locus of control can be understood as bipolar contract, ranging from external causes to internal causes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Locus of Control</th>
<th>Internal Locus of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual believes that his/her behavior is guided by fate, luck, or other external circumstances</td>
<td>Individual believes that his/her behavior is guided by his/her personal decisions and efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In psychology, Locus of Control is considered an important aspect of personality. The concept was developed by Julian Rotter in the 1960’s. The full name he gave it was Locus of Control of Reinforcement. Rotter bridged behavioral and cognitive psychology because he believed behavior was largely guided by “reinforcements” (rewards and punishments) and that through reinforcements individuals come to hold beliefs about what causes their actions. These beliefs then, in turn, guide what kinds of attitudes and behaviors people adopt.

A person’s Locus of Control orientation about themselves is also known as an “attribution”. Attribution refers to how people explain events that happen to themselves and others. Different kinds of attribution styles have been found to characterize and explain why people react quite differently, but predictably to events and how they explain the causes of those events. Basically people tend to have a self-serving bias. For example, with regard to internality-externality, people tend to make:

- *Internal attributions about themselves when they succeed* (i.e., *I did it myself*)
- *Internal attributions about others when they fail* (i.e., *it was their fault*)
• External attributions about themselves when they fail (i.e., something else made me fail)
• External attributions about others when they succeed (i.e., they got lucky)

In simplistic terms, a more internal locus of control is generally seen as desirable. Having an internal locus of control can also be referred to as “self-agency”, “personal control”, “self-determination”, etc. Research has found that the following trends (Mamlin, Harris, & Case, 2001):

• Males tend to be more internal than females
• As people get older they tend to become more internal
• People higher up in organizational structures tend to be more internal

In addition, many psychological and educational interventions have been found to produce long-term shifts towards internal locus of control (e.g., outdoor education programs; Hans, 2000; Hattie, Marsh, Neill & Richards, 1997).

However, overly internal people, particularly those lacking confidence and efficacy in their abilities, can be neurotic, anxious and depressed. And many people with an external locus of control live happy lives. But, in general, psychological research has found that people with a more internal locus of control are better off, e.g., they tend to get better paid jobs.

Also note that locus of control is largely learned. Seligman’s (1998) research on learned helplessness is an example, where he found that animals and people will learn to simply give up trying when they experience having no control over what happens to them. In prolonged circumstances without control, developing an external locus of control is an adaptive response. However, if circumstances change, having learned helplessness (external locus of control) is maladaptive.
Why Locus of Control?

Locus of Control is a construct developed by Rotter (1966) which has potential relevance for understanding individual differences in managerial performance. Therefore, the measurement of this trait can be used as a selection instrument for hiring and promoting candidates for managerial jobs.

The construct refers to individual differences in generalized belief in internal versus external control of reinforcements. Those with an external control (externals) see themselves as relatively passive agents and believe that the events in their lives are due to uncontrollable forces. Externals feel that the things they want to achieve are dependent on luck, chance and powerful persons or institutions. They believe that the probability of being able to control their lives by their own actions and effort is low. Conversely, those with an internal Locus of Control (internals) see themselves as active agents, feel that they are masters of their fates and trust in their capacity to influence the environment. Internals assume that they can control the events in their lives by effort and skill. Internal versus external Locus of Control expectancies are associated with behavioral tendencies which have direct implications for successful management and leadership.

In short locus of control refers to the extent to which individuals believe that they can control events affecting them. Individuals with a high internal locus of control believe that their own behaviour and action primarily, but not necessarily determine many of the events in their lives. In other words they believe that they can exert influence on others & also on events. They can determine their own fate. On the other hand, individuals who have a high external locus of control (externals) believe that chance, fate or other agents or people primarily determine what happens to them. Locus of control typically is considered to be a part of the conscientiousness factor. The study of relationships between political behaviour and individual differences, also supported the notion that the propensity to engage in political behaviour is stronger for individuals who have a high internal locus of control than for those who have a high external locus of control.
Many differences between internals and externals are significant in explaining aspects of behavior in organizations and other social settings. Study of Lefcourt (1982) indicates that internals control their own behavior better, are more active politically and socially, and seek information about their situations more actively than do externals. Compared to externals, internals are more likely to try to influence or persuade others and are less likely to be influenced by others. Internals often are more achievement oriented than externals. Compared to internals, externals appear to prefer a more structured, directive style of supervision. A study carried out by Blacke (1990) suggested that managers with a high internal locus of control adjusted more readily to international transfers than did managers with a high external locus of control. The internals are more prone to exert control over the events in their working lives.

1.3.5 Internal v/s External Locus of Control: General overview

Who controls your behavior? Are you the master of your own domain? Is your life already predetermined and everything that happens is fated? If you believe that you control your own destiny and that your be under your control, then you have an internal locus of control. This concept has quite a bit of importance when we try attributions for our behaviors. For example, if you did well on a test, how would you explain it? If you said that it was merely luck or the teacher made an easy test, then you would be exhibiting an external" locus of control. However, if you believe that your good performance is due to your hard work, good study habits, and interest in the topic, you would being exhibiting an internal locus of control.

If a person with an internal locus of control does badly on a test, he is likely to blame either his own lack of ability or preparation for the test. By comparison, a person with an external locus of control will tend to explain a low grade by saying that the test was too hard or that the teacher graded unfairly. The concept of locus of control was developed by psychologist Julian Rotter, who devised the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E) to assess this dimension of personality. Studies have found that this test is a valid predictor of behavior typically associated with locus of control.
Links have been found between locus of control and behavior patterns in a number of different areas. People with an internal locus of control are inclined to take responsibility for their actions, are not easily influenced by the opinions of others, and tend to do better at tasks when they can work at their own pace. By comparison, people with an external locus of control tend to blame outside circumstances for their mistakes and credit their successes to luck rather than to their own efforts. They are readily influenced by the opinions of others and are more likely to pay attention to the status of the opinion-holder, while people with an internal locus of control pay more attention to the content of the opinion regardless of who holds it. Some researchers have claimed that “internals” tend to be more intelligent and more success-oriented than “externals”. In the elementary grades, children with an internal locus of control have been found to earn higher grades, although there are conflicting reports about whether there is a relationship between college grades and locus of control. There is also a relationship between a child’s locus of control and his or her ability to delay gratification (to forgo an immediate pleasure or desire in order to be rewarded with a more substantial one later). In middle childhood, children with an internal locus of control are relatively successful in the delay of gratification, while children with an external locus of control are likely to make less of an effort to exert self-control in the present because they doubt their ability to influence events in the future.

Although people can be classified comparatively as “internals” or “externals,” chronological development within each individual generally proceeds in the direction of an internal locus of control. As infants and children grow older they feel increasingly competent to control events in their lives. Consequently, they move from being more externally focused to a more internal locus.

Success and Happiness Influenced by Locus of Control

How we perceive the cause of life events, be they positive or negative, has a lot to do with our capacity to succeed on a personal, professional and social level. Someone with an internal locus of control would generally perceive himself as responsible for the
outcome (his actions would have a direct bearing on the result), while a person with an external locus of control would most often blame (or thank) fate, destiny, luck, society, or some other force beyond their control. Having a positive outlook and a general sense of well-being is a force that influences risk-taking, choices, and the general course of one’s life.

**Perceived locus of control & its impact: An empirical evidence overview**

Using Locus of control, work behaviour may be explained by whether employees perceive their outcomes as controlled internally or externally. Employees who perceive internal control feel that they personally can influence their outcomes through their own ability, skills or efforts. Employees who perceive external control feel that their outcomes are beyond their own control; they feel that external forces control their outcomes. What is important is that this perceived locus of control may have a differential impact on their internal motivation, interpersonal relations and performance.

Winer (1979) in his study regarding locus of control and achievement motivation which presents a systematic achievement motivation theory and begins with the assumption that students attribute their successes and failures to internal or external causes. In this study it was observed that those who attribute their successes to internal causes have a greater degree of achievement motivation than those who attribute their successes to external causes. Those who attribute their failures to external causes, rather than to internal causes, have stronger self-esteem and achievement motivation than those who attribute failure to internal causes.

One area of research that developed from Rotter’s theory concerns the locus of control in individuals. The locus of control in people affects their perception of rewards they receive as controlled by internal factors, such as their personal ability, effort, or skill, or as controlled by external factors, such as chance, luck, or other people. Persons’ perceptions of their environments as skill-or-chance-determined influence positive or negative shifts of achievement expectancy in themselves following success and failure. In
addition, there are other characteristics that emerge as a result of individuals' perceptions of their environments as personally or externally controlled. For example, research investigations have suggested that people classified as internal in locus of control display more information-seeking behavior and make better use of this information than people classified as external in locus of control. (Weiner, 1979: 272)

Subsequent investigations of "internality-externality" have established that it is a useful and valid way of classifying students in terms of how they attribute the rewards and reinforcements they receive following their actions and behaviors. (Dweck, 1986) Such investigations may be especially important for females. Evidence suggests that, in American schools, males have the tendency to make more external attributions for failure than females. "American girls are more likely to blame themselves, attributing failure to lack of intelligence or ability. When the boy does well, however, he will often attribute his success to a personal trait." (Cushner, McClelland, and Safford, 1992: 32).

Furthermore, researchers have provided evidence that suggests the following: There is a positive relationship between internal locus of control and persistence. (Strain, 1993) Internal locus of control and achievement are positively related. (Lewin & Stephens, 1994) Internal locus of control is a significant factor in females' achievement motivation. (Teglasi, 1978) There is a positive relationship between locus of control and motivation. (Stone & Jackson, 1975) Locus of control and modeling are positively related. (Stone & Jackson, 1975) There is a positive relationship between locus of control in females and female competitors. (Teglasi, 1978) Women have stronger internal locus of control when in competition with women than with men. (Teglasi, 1978) Locus of control and cognitive ability are positively related. (Fry, 1975) There is a positive relationship between change in observers and role models. (Schwartz & Hawkins, 1965; Myrick, 1969; Marlatt, Jacobson, Johanson, & Morrice, 1970; Duke & Frankel, 1971; Sarason, Ganzer, & Singer, 1972; Stone & Stebbins, 1975; Stone & Gotlib, 1975; Dowling & Franz, 1975)
Thus, there is both indirect and direct evidence related to the question of the relationship, in the students & other employees between factor which is predictive of career orientation may be internal or external locus of control and probable career success.

1.3.6 Internal Locus of Control as a Facilitator:

Locus of control is a valuable construct in studying academic persistence and motivation. Strain states “other than identifying locus of control as an important motivational factor, research has revealed little about the complex relationship between student motivational behavior and persistence in college.” (Strain, 1993: 7) Evidence suggests that persons with internal locus of control are more cognitively able, mentally aware, better predisposed to learning, and more motivated than persons with external locus of control. For example, studies suggest that internal and external subjects differ in cognitive ability and mental awareness. (Stone & Jackson, 1975; Erlund, 1984)

Internal persons appear to possess more information regarding their status in certain institutions. (Seaman, 1963; Erlund, 1984) Internal persons show a greater readiness to perceive relevant information. (Stone & Jackson, 1975; Erlund, 1984) Internal persons have been found to be more prepared to seek necessary information in experimental tasks than external persons.

Rotter (1971) addresses the concept of locus of control and contends that persons with internal locus of control show more overt striving for achievement than persons with external locus of control. Who feel that they have little control over their rewards and punishments? Deci, Weiner, and Parsons (1975) see internal locus of control as a facilitator of achievement in relation to attributions. Lefcourt (1981) contends that students who believe they can influence the outcome of their work are more likely to be motivated in academic studies.

An extensive body of literature supports the premise that students with internal locus of control will show higher achievement motivation than students with external locus of
control (Coleman, 1966; Parsons, 1983; Weiner, 1978) and the premise that individuals who score high on achievement motivation assume personal responsibility for their work and attribute success to something they personally do, rather than to luck or ease of task. (Crandall, V.J. Katkovsky, & Preston, 1962.)

Joe (1971) reports that his survey of studies on locus of control supports the hypothesis that internals not only will show more initiative and effort in controlling their environments but control their own impulses better than externals but also - it appears safe to conclude that internals, in contrast to externals, would show a greater tendency to seek information and adopt behavior patterns which facilitate personal control over their environments. Roueche and Mink (1976) further address the value of internal locus of control in individuals. They have a higher self-concept and are generally better adjusted, more independent, more achieving, more realistic in their aspirations, more open to new learning, more creative, more flexible, more self-reliant, show more initiative and effort in controlling the environment, are less anxious, have higher grades, show more interest in intellectual and achievement matters, etc. It would seem reasonable then to try and aid people in changing to a more internal orientation, to help them realize the contingencies between their own behavior and relevant aspects of their environment thus increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of their behaviors.

A study of Stone & Jackson (1975) revealed that internal persons seem to be more cognitively active. Evidence suggests that external and internal subjects differ in their mental awareness of challenges inherent in certain tasks and of opportunities.

Since the control dimensions usually measured by scales stressing academic interests, it would seem likely that learning skills and achievement behaviors would be highly related to control. In investigations concerned with learning and achievement related variables, the control construct allows some predictions when the materials are relevant to the subjects’ goal strivings. However, successful predictions in this area were found only in male samples. Perceived control, as need achievement, may be less useful for predicting females’ achievement behaviors than it is for males'.
1.3.7 How does locus of control relate to our behavior?

Locus of control is the perceived source of control over our behavior. People with internal locus of control believe they control their own destiny. They tend to be convinced that their own skill, ability and efforts determine the bulk of their life experiences. In contrast, people with external locus of control believe that their lives are determined mainly by sources outside themselves—fate, chance, luck or persons having powers in their hands.

Your life is profoundly influenced by whether you perceive control over your life as predominantly internal or external. Locus of control influences the way you view yourself and your opportunities.

As an example, managers of industry with strong internal locus of control believe that their promotions are determined by their abilities and efforts. These managers believe, "The more I work, the better credit/promotions I get." They change their working strategies as they discover their deficiencies. They raise their expectations if they succeed, and they worry when they think they have no control over their assignments.

In contrast, managers with strong external locus of control believe that their promotions are the result of good or bad luck, the management's is good or God's will. They are more likely to say, "No matter how much I work the management determines my grade. I just hope I'm lucky on the test of promotion." Believing that luck essentially averages out, after they do well on a job they lower their expectations. Likewise, when they fail to justify their role they are optimistic that the next time will better. These externals are less likely to learn from past experiences and they have difficulty in persisting in tasks.

With all the studies done in this area, research findings have shown the following characteristics to be more typical of internals.
1. Internals are more likely to work for achievements, to tolerate delays in rewards and to plan for long term goals.

2. As indicated above—after experiencing success in a task, internals are likely to raise their behavioral goals. In contrast, externals are more likely to lower their goals.

3. After failing a task, internals re-evaluate future performances and lower their expectations of success. After failure, externals raise their expectations.

4. Internals are better able to resist coercion.

5. Internals are more likely to learn about their surroundings and learn from their past experiences.

6. Internals experience more anxiety and guilt with their failures and use more repression to forget about their disappointments.

7. Internals find solving their own billness of depression easier. Likewise, they are less prone to learned helplessness and serious depression.

8. Internals are better at tolerating ambiguous situations.

9. Internals are less willing to take risks.

10. Internals are more willing to work on self-improvement and better themselves through remedial work.

11. Internals derive greater benefits from social supports.

12. Internals make better mental health recovery in the long term adjustment to physical disability.

13. Internals are more likely to prefer games based on skill, while externals prefer games based on chance or luck.

The development of locus of control is associated with family style and resources, cultural stability and experiences with effort leading to reward. Many internals have grown up with families that modeled typical internal beliefs. These families emphasized effort, education, responsibility and thinking. Parents typically gave their children rewards they had promised them.
In contrast, externals are typically associated with lower socioeconomic status, because poor people have less control over their lives. Societies experiencing social unrest increase the expectancy of being out-of-control, so people in such societies become more external.

As children grow older, they gain skills that give them more control over their environment. In support of this, psychological research has found that older children have more internal locus of control than younger children. Many but not all psychologists believe that internals are psychologically more healthy than externals.

Numerous studies in the field of psychology have investigated internal locus as a changeable variable and as a variable which can be affected by modeling. Stone & Jackson (1975) explored the relationship between locus of control, modeling, and instructional effectiveness in a study using university students, divided into “internals” and “externals” according to scores on Mirel’s factor of “personality internality.” (Mirels, 1970) Subjects were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups: instructional (subjects instructed to be highly concrete in talking about experiences); modeling (subjects exposed to a model who discussed experiences in highly concrete fashion); and control (SUBJECTS GIVEN GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS IN TALKING ABOUT EXPERIENCES). All subjects participated in a monologue, after treatment, which was scored for concreteness. Results indicate that modeling is effective, and that internal modeling subjects are more effective in concretely talking about experiences than internal- instructions subjects.

1.4 Motivation :-

Motivation is a basic psychological process. Few would deny that it is the most important focus in the micro approach to organizational behavior. Many people equate the causes of behavior with motivation. It merits to mention here that the causes of behavior are much
broader and more complex than can be explained by motivation alone. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that motivation should not be thought of as the only explanation of behavior. It interacts with and acts in conjunction with other mediating processes and the environment. It must also be remembered that, like the other cognitive processes, motivation cannot be seen. All that can be seen is behavior. Motivation is a hypothetical construct that is used to explain behavior; it should not be equated with behavior. In fact, while recognizing the "central role of motivation," many of today's organizational behavior theorists "think it is important for the field to reemphasize behavior."

THE MEANING OF MOTIVATION

Today, virtually all people-practitioners and scholars-have their own definition of motivation. Usually one or more of the following words are included in the definition: "desires," "wants," "wishes," "aims," "goals," "needs," "drives," "motives," and "incentives." Technically, the term "motivation" can be traced to the Latin world, which means "to move." This meaning is evident in the following comprehensive definition: 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.

Definitions of Motivation:-

Motivation is defined by the different scholars in different ways based on different aspects of the behaviour. Following are the main definitions of the motivation.

"Motivation is nothing but, the process that initiate, directs, and sustains behaviour to satisfy physiological or psychological needs or wants.

-Robert S. Feldman (1975)

"Motivation basically means an individual's needs, desires, and concepts that cause him or her to act in a particular manner.

-Martin J. Gannon (1979)
high achiever. Very simply, the achievement motive can be expressed as a desire to perform in terms of a standard of excellence or to be successful in competitive situations. The specific characteristics of a high achiever are summarized in the following sections.

**Moderate Risk Taking.** Taking moderate risks is probably the single most descriptive characteristic of the person possessing high n Ach. On the surface it would seem that a high achiever would take high risks. However, once again research gives an answer different from the commonsense one. The ring-toss game can be used to demonstrate risk-taking behavior. It has been shown that when ring tosses are told that they may stand anywhere they want to when they toss the rings at the page, low and high achievers behave quite differently. Low achievers tend either to stand very close and just drop the rings over the peg or to stand very far away and wildly throw the rings at the peg: In contrast, high achievers almost always carefully calculate the exact distance from the peg that will challenge their own abilities. People with high n Ach will not stand too close because it would be no test of their ability simply to drop the rings over the peg. By the same token, they will not stand ridiculously far away because luck, not skill, would then determine whether the rights landed on the peg. In other words, low achievers take either a high or low risk, and high achievers take a moderate risk. This seems to hold true both for the simple children's game and for important adult decisions and activities in today's organizations.

**Need for Immediate Feedback.** Closely connected to high achievers taking moderate risks is their desire for immediate feedback. People with high n Ach prefer activities that provide immediate and precise feedback information on how they are progressing toward a goal. Some hobbies and vocations offer such feedback, and others do not. High achievers generally prefer hobbies such as woodworking or mechanics, which provide prompt, exact feedback, and they shy away from the coin-collecting type of hobby, which takes years to develop. Likewise, high achievers tend to gravitate toward, or at least to be more satisfied in, jobs or careers, such as sales or certain managerial positions, in which they are frequently evaluated by specific performance criteria. On the other end of the scale, high n Ach persons are generally not to be found, or tend to be frustrated, in
research and development or teaching vocations, where feedback on performance is very imprecise, vague, and long-range.

_Satisfaction with Accomplishments._ High achievers find accomplishing a task intrinsically satisfying in and of itself; they do not expect or necessarily want the accompanying material rewards. A good illustration of this characteristic involves money, but not for the usual reasons of wanting money for its own sake or for the material benefits that it can buy. Rather, high n Ach people look at money as a form of feedback or measurement of how they are doing. Given the choice between a simple task with a good pay off for accomplishment and a more difficult task with a lesser payoff, other things being equal, high achievers may choose the latter.

_Preoccupation with the Task._ Once high achievers select a goal, they tend to be totally preoccupied with the task until it is successfully completed. They cannot stand to leave a job half finished and are not satisfied with themselves until they have given their maximum effort. This type of dedicated commitment is often reflected in their outward personalities, which frequently have a negative effect on those who come into contact with them. High achievers often strike others as being unfriendly and as “loners.” They may be very quiet and may seldom brag about their accomplishments. They tend to be very realistic about their abilities and do not allow other people to get in the way of their goal accomplishments. Obviously, with this type of approach high achievers do not always get along well with other people. Typically, high achievers make excellent salespersons but seldom good sales managers. There is some research evidence that cooperative efforts may be more effective than the competitive, individualistic efforts characteristic of high achievers.

The accompanying Application Example. High Achieves in Action gives the strategies entrepreneurs use to start new businesses. Almost all such entrepreneurs have a relatively high need for achievement.
The Affiliation Motive

Affiliation plays a very complex but vital role in human behavior. Sometimes affiliation is equated with social motives and/or group dynamics. As presented here, the affiliation motive is neither as broad as is implied by the definition of group dynamics. The study of affiliation is further complicated by the fact that some behavioral scientists believe that it is an unlearned motive. Going as far back as the Hawthorne studies, the importance of the affiliation motive in the behavior of organizational participants has been very clear. Employees, especially rank-and-file employees, have a very intense need to belong to and be accepted by, the group. This affiliation motive is an important part of group dynamics.

The Security Motive

Security is a very intense motive in a fast-paced, highly technological society such as is found in modern America. The typical American can be insecure in a number of areas of everyday living—for example, being liable for payments on a car or house, keeping a lover’s or a spouse’s affections, staying in school, getting into graduate school, or obtaining and/or keeping a good job. Job insecurity, in particular, has great effect on organizational behavior. Various studies of Christensen, C.R. Berg, N.A. & Salter, M.S. (1976) on generational commitment indicate that, because of the downsizing mania of the last several years, most employees at all levels are feeling very insecure about their jobs. On the surface, security appears to be much simpler than other secondary motives for it is based largely on fear and is avoidance-oriented. Very briefly, it can be said that people have a learned security motive to protect themselves from the contingencies of life and actively try to avoid situations that would prevent them from satisfying their primary, general, and secondary motives.

In reality, security is much more complex than it appears on the surface. There is the simple, conscious security motive described above, but there also seems to be another type of security motive that is much more complicated and difficult to identify. This latter form of security is largely unconscious but may greatly influence the behavior of many
people. The simple, conscious security motive is typically taken care of by insurance programs, personal savings plans, and other fringe benefits at the place of employment. An innovative company such as the Washington, D.C. based insurance company Consumers United Group never lays off its employees and has a minimum annual salary designed to give a family a secure, decent living. On the other hand, the more complex, unconscious security motive is not so early fulfilled but may have a greater and more intense impact on human behavior. Although much attention has been given to the simple security motive, much more understanding is needed concerning the role of the unconscious, complex security motive.

The Status Motive

Along with security, the status or prestige motive is especially relevant to a dynamic society. The modern affluent person is often pictured as a status seeker. Such a person is accused of being more concerned with the material symbols of status – the right clothes, the right car, the right address, and a swimming pool or the latest computer software-than with the more basic, human-oriented values in life. Although the symbols of status are considered a unique by-product of modern society, the fact is that status has been in existence since there have been two or more persons on the earth.

Status can be simply defined as the relative ranking that a person holds in a group, organization, or society. Under this definition, any time two or more persons are together, a status hierarchy will evolve, even if both have equal status. The symbols of status attempt to represent only the relative ranking of the person in the status hierarchy. The definition also corrects the common misconception that “status” means “high status.” Everyone has status, but it may be high or low, depending on how the relative positions are ranked.

How are status positions determined? Why is one person ranked higher or lower than another? In the final analysis, status determination depends upon the prevailing cultural values and societal roles. Status-determining factors generally have quite different
meanings, depending on the values of the particular culture. An example of the impact of cultural values on status is the personal qualities of people. In some cultures, the older people are, the higher their status. However, in other cultures, once a person reaches a certain age, the status goes downhill. It must be remembered that such cultural values are highly volatile and change with the times and circumstances. There are also many subcultures in a given society that may have values different from the prevailing values of society at large and correspondingly different statuses.

1.6 WORK-MOTIVATION APPROACHES

So far, motivation has been presented as a basic psychological process consisting of primary, general, and secondary motives, and drives such as the n pow, N Aff, and n Ach motives. In order to understand organizational behavior, these basic motives must be recognized and studied. However, these serve as only background and foundation for the more directly relevant work-motivation approaches. The following figure 1.1 graphically summarizes the various theoretical streams for work motivation. In particular, the figure shows four major approaches. The content theories
Go as far back as the turn of the century, when pioneering scientific managers such as Frederick W. Taylor 1920, Frank Gilbreth, and Henry L. Gant 1927 proposed sophisticated wage incentive models to motivate workers. Next came the human relations movement and then the content theories of Maslow, Herzberg, and Alderfer. Following the content movement were the process theories. Based mainly on the cognitive concept of expectancy, the process theories are most closely associated with the work of Victor Vroom and Lyman Porter and Ed Lawler. More recently, equity and especially, attribution theories have received the most attention in work motivation.

Figure 1.1 purposely shows that at present there is a lack of integration or synthesis of the various theories. In addition to the need for integration, a comprehensive assessment of...
the status of work motivation theory also noted the need for contingency models and group/social processes. At present the content and process theories have become established explanations for work motivation, and there is continued research interest in equity and attribution theories, but no agreed upon overall theory exists. The rest of the chapter gives an overview of the various theories of work motivation.

THE CONTENT THEORIES OF WORK MOTIVATION

The content theories of work motivation attempt to determine what it is that motivates people at work. The content theorists are concerned with identifying the needs/drives that people have and how these needs/drives are prioritized. They are concerned with the types of incentives or goals that people strive to attain in order to be satisfied and perform well. The content theories are referred to as "static" because they incorporate only one or a few points in time and are either past or present time oriented. Therefore, they do not necessarily predict work motivation or behavior, but they are still important to understanding what motivates people at work.

At first, money was felt to be the only incentive (scientific management), and then a little later it was felt that incentives include working conditions, security, and perhaps a democratic style of supervision (human relations). More recently, the content of motivation has been deemed to be the so-called "higher-level" needs or motives, such as esteem and self-actualization (Maslow); responsibility, recognition, achievement, and advancement (Herzberg); and growth and personal development (Alderfer). A thorough study of the major content theories contributes to understanding and leads to some of the application techniques of motivation covered in the next chapter.

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

Although the first part of the chapter discusses the most important primary, general, and secondary needs of humans, it does not relate them to a theoretical framework. Abraham Maslow, 1943 in a classic paper, outlined the elements of an overall theory of motivation.
Drawing chiefly on his clinical experience, he thought that a person’s motivational needs could be arranged in a hierarchical manner. In essence, he believed that once a given level of need is satisfied, it no longer serves to motivate. The next higher level of need has to be activated in order to motivate the individual.

Maslow identified five levels in his need hierarchy. They are in brief as per below:

- **PHYSIOLOGICAL NEEDS**
  - SAFETY NEEDS
  - LOVE NEEDS
  - ESTEEM NEEDS
  - ACTUALIZATION
  - SELF

---

1. Physiological needs. The most basic level in the hierarchy, the physiological needs, generally corresponds to the unlearned primary needs discussed earlier. The needs of hunger, thirst, sleep, and sex are some examples. According to the theory, once these basic needs are satisfied, they no longer motivate. For example, a starving person will strive to obtain a carrot that is within reach. However, after eating his or her carrot, the person will not strive to obtain another one and will be motivated only by the next higher level of needs.

2. Safety needs. This second level of need is roughly equivalent to the security need. Maslow stressed emotional as well as physical safety. The whole organism may become a safety seeking mechanism. Yet, as is true of the
physiological needs, once these safety needs are satisfied, they no longer motivate.

3. Love needs. This third, or intermediate, level of needs loosely corresponds to the affection and affiliation needs. Like Freud, Maslow seems guilty of poor choice of wording to identify his levels. His use of the word “love” has many misleading connotations, such as sex, which is actually a physiological need. Perhaps a more appropriate word describing this level would be “belongingness” or “social.”

4. Esteem needs. The esteem level represents the higher needs of humans. The needs for power, achievement, and status can be considered part of this level. Maslow carefully pointed out that the esteem level contains both self-esteem and esteem from others.

5. Needs for self-actualization. This level represents the culmination of all the lower, intermediate, and higher needs of humans. People who have become self-actualized are self-fulfilled and have realized all their potential. Self-actualization is closely related to the self-concept discussed in Chapter 5. In effect, self-actualization is the person’s motivation to transform perception of self into reality.

Maslow 1943 did not intend that his need hierarchy be directly applied to work motivation. In fact, he did not delve into the motivating aspects of humans in organizations until about twenty years after he originally proposed his theory. Despite this lack of intent on Maslow’s part, others, such as Douglas McGregor, 1960 in his widely read book The Human Side of Enterprise, popularized the Maslow theory in management literature. The need hierarchy has had a tremendous impact on the modern management approach to motivation.

In a very rough manner, Maslow’s need hierarchy theory can be converted into the content model of work motivation shown in Figure 1.3. If Maslow’s estimates are applied to an organization example, the 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 more 10 percent of the self-actualization needs would be met.

Figure 1.3

On the surface, the content model shown in Figure 1.3 and the estimated percentages given by Maslow seem logical and applicable to the motivation of employees in today's organizations. Maslow's need hierarchy has often been uncritically accepted by writers of management textbooks and by practitioners. Unfortunately, the limited research that has been conducted lends little empirical support to the theory. About a decade after publishing his original paper, Maslow did attempt to clarify his position by saying that
gratifying the self-actualizing 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 unfulfilled or suppressed for a long period are satisfied. He stressed that human behavior is multidetermined and multimotivated.

Most research findings indicate that Maslow's is not the final answer in work motivation. Yet the theory does make a significant contribution in terms of making management aware of the diverse needs of employees at work. As one recent comprehensive analysis concluded, "Indeed, the general ideas behind Malsow's theory seem to be supported, such as the distinction between deficiency needs and growth needs." However, the number and names of the levels are not so important, nor as the studies show, is the hierarchical concept. What is important is the fact that employees in the workplace have diverse motives, some of which are "high-level." In other words, such needs as esteem and self-actualization are important to the concern of work motivation. The exact nature of these needs and how they relate to motivation are not clear. To try to overcome some of the Maslow hierarch. Alderfer has more recently proposed the ERG theory, which contains three well-known groups of needs. The ERG theory is conversed after the discussion of Herzberg's two-factor theory.

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation.

Herzberg 1959 extended the work of Maslow and developed a specific content theory of work motivation. He conducted a widely reported motivational study on about 200 accountants and engineers employed by firms in and around Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He used the critical incident method of obtaining data for analysis. The professional subjects in the study were essentially asked two questions: (1) When did you feel particularly good about your job-what turned you on; and (2) when did you feel exceptionally bad about your job-what turned you off?
Responses obtained from this critical incident method were interesting and fairly consistent. Reported good feelings were generally associated with job experiences and job content. An example was the accounting supervisor who felt good about being given the job of installing new computer equipment. He took pride in his work and was gratified to know that the new equipment made a big difference in the overall functioning of his department. Reported bad feelings, on the other hand, were generally associated with the surrounding or peripheral aspects of the job—the job context. An example of these feelings was related by an engineer whose first job was to keep tabulation sheets and manage the office when the boss was gone. It turned out that his boss was always too busy to train him and became annoyed when he tried to ask questions. The engineer said that he was frustrated in this job context and that he felt like a flunky in a dead-end job.

Tabulating these reported good and bad feelings, Herzberg concluded that job satisfiers are related to job content and that job dissatisfies are allied to job context. Herzberg labeled the satisfiers motivators, and he called the dissatisfies hygiene factors. The term "hygiene" refers (as it does in the health field) to factors that are preventive; in Herzberg's theory the hygiene factors are those that prevent dissatisfaction. Taken together, the motivators and the hygiene factors have become known as Herzberg's two factor theory of motivation.

Relation to Maslow's Need Hierarchy. Herzberg's theory is closely related to Maslow's need hierarchy. The hygiene factors are preventive and environmental in nature (see exhibit I) and they are roughly equivalent to Maslow's lower-level needs (see Figure 1.4). These hygiene factors prevent dissatisfaction, but they do not lead to satisfaction. In effect, they bring motivation up to a theoretical zero level and are a necessary "floor". To prevent dissatisfaction and they serve as a takeoff point for motivation. By themselves, the hygiene factors do not motivate. Only the motivators.
Exhibit 1  Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory

Hygiene Factors  Motivators

Company policy and administration  Achievement
Supervision, technical  Recognition
Salary  Work itself
Interpersonal relations, supervisor  Responsibility
Working conditions
Advancement

Alderfer’s  Maslow’s  Herzberg’s
ERG Needs  Hierarchy of Needs  Two Factors

SELF-ACTUALIZATION

GROWTH  MOTIVATORS

ESTEEM
Self
Others

RELATEDNESS  LOVE  

SAFETY  HYGIENE

PHYSIOLOGICAL

FIGURE 1.4 The relationship between Alderfer’s ERG needs, Maslow’s five-level hierarchy, and Herzberg’s two-factor theory.
Motivate employees on the job. They are roughly equivalent to Maslow's higher-level needs. According to Herzberg's theory, an individual must have a job with a challenging content in order to be truly motivated.

Contribution to Work Motivation. Herzberg's two-factor theory casts a new light on the content of work motivation. Up to this point, management had generally concentrated on the hygiene factors. When faced with a morale problem, the typical solution was higher pay, more fringe benefits, and better working conditions. However, as has been printed out, this simplistic solution did not really work. Management are often perplexed because they are paying high wages and salaries, have an excellent fringe benefit package, and provide great working conditions but their employees are still not motivated. Herzberg's theory offers an explanation for this problem. By concern trating only on the hygiene factors, management are not motivating their personnel.

There are probably very few workers or managers who donot feel that they deserved the raise they received. On the other hand, there are many dissatisfied workers and manages who feel they did not get a large enough raise. This simple observation points out that the hygiene factors seem tobe important in preventing dissatisfaction but do not lead to satisfaction. Herzberg would be the first to say that the hygiene factors are absolutely necessary to maintain the human resources of an organization. However, as in the Maslow sense, once "the belly is full" of hygiene factors, which is the case in most modern organizations, dangling any more in front of employees will not motivate them. According to Herzberg's theory, only a challenging job that has the opportunities for achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, and growth will motivate personnel.

Critical Aalysis of Herzberg's Theory. Although Herzberg's two-factor theory remains a very popular textbook explanation of work motivation and makes sense to practitioners, it also is true that from an academic perspective the theory oversimplifies the complexities of work motivation. When researchers deviate from the critical incident methodology used by Herzberg, they do not get the two factors. There seem to be job factors such as
pay that lead to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. For example, pay can be dissatisfying if not high enough, but also be satisfying as a form of achievement and recognition. These findings indicate that a strict interpretation of the two-factor theory is not warranted.

In spite of the obvious limitations, few would question that Herzberg has contributed substantially to the study of work motivation. He extended Maslow's need hierarchy concept and made it more applicable to work motivation. Herzberg also drew attention to the importance of job content factors in work. Motivation, which previously had been badly neglected and often totally overlooked. The job design technique of job enrichment is also one of Herzberg's contributions. Job enrichment is covered in detail in the next chapter. Overall, Herzberg added much to the better understanding of job content factors and satisfaction, but, like his predecessors, he fell short of a comprehensive theory of work motivation. His model describes only some of the content of work motivation; it does not adequately describe the complex motivation process of organizational participants.

Alderfer's ERG Theory

An extension of the Herzberg 1959 and, especially, the Maslow 1943 content theories of work motivation comes from the work of Claytoin Alderfer 1969. He formulated a need category model that was more in line with the existing empirical evidence. Like Maslow and Herzberg, he does feel that there is value in categorizing needs and that there is a basic distinction between lower-order needs and higher-order needs.

Alderfer 1969 identified three groups of core needs; existence, relatedness, and growth (hence ERG theory). The existence needs are concerned with survival (physiological well-being). The relatedness needs stress the importance of interpersonal, social relationships. The growth needs are concerned with the individual's intrinsic desire for personal development. Figure 1.4 shows how these groups of needs are related to the
Maslow and Herzberg categories: Obviously, they are very close, but the ERG needs do not have strict lines of demarcation.

Alderfer is suggesting more of a continuum of needs than hierarchical levels or two factors of prepotency needs. Unlike Maslow and Herzberg, he does not contend that a lower-level need has to be fulfilled before a higher-level need becomes motivating or that deprivation is the only way to activate a need. For example, according to ERG theory the person's background or cultural environment may dictate that the relatedness needs will take precedence over unfulfilled existence needs and that the more the growth needs are satisfied, the more they will increase in intensity.

There has not been a great deal of research on ERG theory. Although there is some evidence to counter the theory's predictive value, most contemporary analyses of work motivation tend to support. Alderfer's theory over Maslow's and Herzberg's. Overall, ERG theory seems to include some of the strong points of earlier content theories but is less restrictive and limiting. The fact remains, however, that the content theories in general lack explanatory power, regarding the complexities of work motivation and, with the possible exception of the implications for job design of Herzberg's work, do not readily translate to the actual practice of human resource management.

THE PROCESS THEORIES OF WORK MOTIVATION

The content models attempt to identify what motivates people at work (for example, self-actualization, responsibility, and growth); they try to specify correlates of motivated behavior. The process theories, on the other hand, are more concerned with the cognitive antecedents that go into motivation or effort and, more important, with the way these relate to one another. As Figure 1.1 shows, the expectancy notion from cognitive theory makes a significant contribution to the understanding of the complete processes involved in work motivation. After the process theories are examined, equity and attribution theories are presented and analyzed as modern cognitive model of work motivation.
Vroom's Expectancy Theory of Motivation

The expectancy theory of work motivation has its roots in the cognitive concepts of pioneering psychologists Kurt Lewin and Edward Tolman, as shown in Figure 1.1 and in the choice behavior and utility concepts from classical economic theory. However, the first to formulate an expectancy theory directly aimed at work motivation was Victor Vroom 1973. Contrary to most critics, Vroom 1973 proposed his expectancy theory as an alternative to content models, which he felt were inadequate expiations of the complex process of work motivation. At least in academic circles, his theory has become a popular explanation for work motivation and continues to generate considerable research.

Figure 1.5 briefly summarizes the Vroom model. As shown, the model is built around the concepts of valence, instrumentality, and expectancy, and is commonly called the VIE theory.

Meaning of the Variables. By valence, Vroom means the strength of an individual's preference for a particular outcome. Other terms that might be used include value incentive, attitude, and expected utility. In order for the valence to be positive, the person must prefer attaining the outcome to not attaining it. A valence of zero occurs when the individual is indifferent toward the outcome; the valence is negative when the individual prefers not attaining the outcome to attaining it. Another major input into the valence is the instrumentality of the first level outcome in obtaining a desired second-level outcome. For example, a person would be motivated toward superior performance because of the desire to be promoted. The superior performance (first level outcome) is seen as being instrumental in obtaining a promotion (second-level outcome).

Another major variable in the Vroom motivational process is expectancy. Although psychological theorists all agree that expectancies are mental, or cognitive, states, there is little agreement about the nature of these states. Although at first glance the expectancy concept may seem to be the same as the instrumentality input into valence, it is actually quite different: Expectancy relates efforts to first level outcomes (see Figure 6.6), while
instrumentality relates first level outcomes and second level outcomes. In other words, expectancy in Vroom’s theory is the probability (ranging from 0 to 1) that a particular action or effort will lead to a particular first level outcome. Instrumentality refers to the degree to which a first level outcome will lead to a desired second-level outcome. In summary, the strength of the motivation to perform a certain act will depend on the algebraic sum of the products of the valences for the outcomes (which include instrumentality) times the expectancies.

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

Although the Vroom model does not directly contribute much to the techniques of motivating personnel in an organization, it is of value in understanding organizational behavior. It can clarify the relationship between individual and organizational goals. For example, suppose workers are given a certain standard for production. By measuring the workers’ output, management can determine how important their various personal goals (second-level outcomes such as money, security, and recognition) are; the instrumentality of the organizational goal (the first level outcomes, such as the production standard) for the attainment of the personal goals; and the workers’ expectancies that their effort and ability will accomplish the organizational goal. If output is below standard, it may be that the workers do not place a high value on the second level outcomes, or they may not see that the first level outcome is instrumental in obtaining the second level outcomes; or they may think that their efforts will not accomplish the first level outcome. Vroom feels that any one, or a combination, of these possibilities will result in a low level of motivation to perform. The model is designed to help management understand and
analyze workers' motivation and identify some of the relevant variables; it does not provide specific solutions to motivational problems. Besides having an application problem, the model also assumes, as earlier economic theory did, that people are rational and logically calculating. Such an assumption may be too idealistic.

**MOTIVATIONAL DRIVES**

Each person tends to develop certain motivational drives as a product of the cultural environment in which that person lives, and these affect the way people view their jobs and approach their lives. Much of the interest in these patterns of motivation was generated by the research of David C. McClelland of Harvard University. He developed a classification scheme highlighting three of the more dominant drives and pointed out their significance to motivation. His studies revealed that people's motivational drives reflect elements of the culture in which they grow up their family, school, church, and books. In most nations, one or two of the motivational patterns tend to be strong among the workers because they have grown up with similar backgrounds. In addition to McClelland's discussion of the drives for achievement, affiliation, and power, the competence motive is an important factor in current attempts to attain high quality products and services.

**The Porter Lawler Model**

The content theories implicitly assume that satisfaction leads to improved performance and that dissatisfaction detracts from performance. The Herzberg model is really a theory of job satisfaction, but still it does not adequately deal with the relationship between satisfaction and performances. The Vroom model also largely avoids the relationship between satisfaction and performance. Although satisfactions make an input into Vroom's concept of valence and although the outcomes have performance implications, it was not until Porter and Lawler 1973 refined and extended Vroom's model (for example, the relationships are expressed diagrammatically rather than mathematically, there are more variables, and the cognitive process of perception plays a central role) that the
relationship between satisfaction and performance was dealt with directly by a motivation model.

Porter and Lawler start with the premise that motivation (effort or force) does not equal satisfaction or performance. Motivation, satisfaction, and performance are all separate variables and relate in ways different from what was traditionally assumed. Figure 1.6 depicts the multivariable model used to explain the complex relationship that exists among motivation, performance, and satisfaction. It is important, however, that Porter and Lawler point out that effort force or motivation does not lead directly to performance. It is mediated by abilities and taints and by role perceptions. More important in the Porter-Lawler model is what happens after the performance. The rewards that follow and how these are perceived will determine satisfaction. In other words, the Porter-Lawler model suggests and this is a significant turn of events from traditional thinking – that performance leads to satisfaction.

The model has a fair degree of research support over the years. For example, a recent field study found that effort level and direction of effort are important in explaining individual performance in an organization. Also a comprehensive review of research verifies the importance of rewards in the relationship between performance and satisfaction. Specifically, it was concluded that performance and satisfaction will be more strongly related when rewards are made contingent upon performance than when they are not.
Implications for practice. Although the Porter-Lawler model is more applications oriented than the Vroom model, it is still quite complex and has proved to be a difficult way to bridge the gap to actual management practice. To Porter and Lawler's credit, they have been very conscientious of putting their theory and research into practice. They recommend that practicing managers go beyond traditional attitude measurement and attempt to measure variables such as the values of possible rewards, the perceptions of effort reward probabilities, and role perceptions. These variables, of course, can help managers better understand what goes into employee effort and performance, Porter and Lawler also recommend that organizations critically reevaluate their current reward policies. They stress that management should make a concentrated effort to measure how closely levels of satisfaction are related to levels of performance, and recently a practitioner oriented article emphasized that the accuracy of role perceptions maybe the missing link in improving employee performance. The inference here is that employees need to better focus their efforts on high impact behaviours and activities that result in higher performance. However, both recent studies and comprehensive analyses continue...
to point out the complex impact that the cognitive process has in relation to rewards and other outcomes in organizations.

Contributions to Work Motivation. The Porter and Lawler model has definitely made a significant contribution to the better understanding of work motivation and the relationship between performance and satisfaction, but, to date, it has not had much impact on the actual practice of human resource management. Yet the expectancy models provide certain guidelines that can be followed by human resource management. For example, on the front end (the relationship between motivation and performance), it has been suggested that the following barriers must be overcome:

1. Doubts about ability, skill, or knowledge
2. The physical or practical possibility of the job.
3. The interdependence of the job with other people or activities.
4. Ambiguity surrounding the job requirements.

In addition, on the back end (the relationship between performance and satisfaction), guidelines such as the following have been suggested:

1. Determine what rewards each employee values
2. Define desired performance
3. Make desired performance attainable
4. Link valued rewards to performance

The last point above is getting recognition in the management compensation plants of many big companies, as indicated by the accompanying TQM in Action: Linking Managers' Rewards with Unit Performance.
CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF WORK MOTIVATION

Although it is recognized that work motivation theories are generally categorized into content and process approaches, equity and attribution theories have emerged in recent years and command most of the research attention. An understanding of these two theoretical developments is now necessary to the study of work motivation in organizational behavior.

Equity Theory of Work Motivation

Equity theory has been around just as long as the expectancy theories of work motivation. However, equity has received more recent attention in the organizational behavior field. As Figure 1.1 indicates, its roots can be traced back to cognitive dissonance theory and exchange theory. As a theory of work motivation, credit for equity theory is usually given to social psychologist J. Stacy Adams. Simply put, the theory argues that a major input into job performance and satisfaction is the degree of equity (or inequity) that people perceive in their work situation. In other words, it is another cognitively based motivation theory, and Adams depicts how this motivation occurs.

Inequity occurs when a person perceives that the ratio of his or her outcomes to inputs and the ratio of a relevant other's outcomes to inputs are unequal. Schematically, this is represented as follows:

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

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

Equity occurs when

\[
\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} = \frac{\text{Other's outcomes}}{\text{other's inputs}}
\]
Both the inputs and the outputs of the person and the other are based upon the person’s perceptions. Age, sex, education, social status, organizational position, qualifications, and how hard the person works are examples of perceived input variables. Outcomes consist primarily of rewards such as pay, status, promotion, and intrinsic interest in the job. In essence, the ratio is based upon the person’s perception of what the person is giving (inputs) and receiving (outcomes) versus the ratio of what the relevant other is giving and receiving. This cognition may or may not be the same as someone else’s observation of the ratios or the same as the actual reality.

Equity as an Explanation of Work Motivation. If the person’s perceived ratio is not equal to the others, he or she will strive to restore the ratio to equity. This “striving” to restore equity is used as the explanation of work motivation. The strength of this motivation is in direct proportion to the perceived inequity that exists. Adams suggests that such motivation may be expressed in several forms. To restore equity, the person may alter the inputs or outcomes, cognitively distort the inputs or outcomes, leave the field, act on the other, or change the other.

It is important to note that inequity does not come about only when the person feels cheated. For example, Adams has studied the impact that perceived overpayment has on equity. His findings suggest that workers prefer equitable payment to overpayment. Workers on a piece rate incentive system who feel overpaid will reduce their productivity in order to restore equity. More common, however, is the case of people who feel underpaid (outcome) or overworked (input) in relation to others in the workplace. In the latter case, there would be motivation to restore equity in a way that may be dysfunctional from an organizational standpoint. For example, the owner of an appliance store in Oakland, California, allowed his employees to set their own wages. Interestingly, none of the employees took an increase in pay, and one serviceman actually settled on lower pay because he did not want to work as hard as the others.
Research Support for Equity in the Workplace. To date, research that has specifically tested the validity of Adams's equity theory has been fairly supportive. A comprehensive review found considerable laboratory research support for the "equity norm" (persons review the inputs and outcomes of themselves and others, and if in equity is perceived, they strive to restore equity) but only limited support from more relevant field studies. One line of field research on equity theory used baseball players. In the first study, players who played out their option year, and thus felt they were inequitably paid, performed as the theory would predict. Their performance decreased in three of four categories (not batting average) during the option year, and when they were signed to a new contract, the performance was restored. However, a second study using the same type of sample, only larger, found the opposite of what equity theory would predict. Mainly, performance improved during the option year. The reason, of course, was that the players wanted to look especially good, even though they felt they were inequitably paid, in order to be in a stronger bargaining position for a new contract. In other words, there are no easy answers nor is there 100 percent predictive power when applying a cognitive process theory such as equity.

Despite such inconsistencies, recent studies using more sophisticated statistical techniques to estimate pay equity among ball players and focusing more sharply on subsequent performance and other outcomes are more in line with equity theory predications. For example, one study found a significant relationship between losing final offer salary arbitration and post arbitration performance decline. The ball players who were losers in arbitration were also significantly more likely to change teams or leave major league baseball. In another recent study of baseball and basketball players, it was found that the under rewarded players behaved less cooperatively. This type of equity theory development and research goes beyond expectancy theory as a cognitive explanation of work motivation and serves as a point of departure for attribution theory and locus of control explanations.
Attribution Theory:

Recently people put more emphasis on attribution of task to explain the work motivation. Unlike the other motivation theories, attribution theory is more a theory of the relationship between personal perception and interpersonal behavior than a theory of individual motivation. There are an increasing variety of attribution theories. A recent analysis of these theories, however, concludes that all of them share the following common assumptions:

1. We seek to make sense of our world.
2. We often attribute people's actions either to internal or external causes.
3. We do so in fairly logical ways.

Well-known social psychologist Harold Kelley stresses that attribution theory is concerned mainly with the cognitive processes by which an individual interprets behavior as being caused by (or attributed to) certain parts of the relevant environment. It is concerned with the "why" questions of motivation and behavior. Since most causes, attributes, and "whys" are not directly observable, the theory says that people must depend upon cognitions particularly perception. The attribution theorist assumes that humans are rational and are motivated to identify and understand the causal structure of their relevant environment. It is this search for attributes that characterizes attribution theory.

Although attribution theory has its roots in all the pioneering cognitive theorists' work (for example, that of Lewin and Festinger), in de Charmer's ideas on cognitive evaluation, and in Bem's notion of "self-perception," the theory's initiator is generally recognized to be Fritz Heider. Heider believed that both internal forces (personal attributes such as ability, effort, and fatigue) and external forces (environmental attributes such as rules and the weather) combine additively to determine behavior. He stressed that it is the perceived, not the actual, determinants that are important to behavior. People will behave differently if they perceive internal attributes than they will if they perceive...
external attributes. It is this concept of differential ascriptions that has very important implications from work motivation.

Locus of Control Attributions. Using locus of control, work behavior may be explained by whether employees perceive their outcomes as controlled internally or externally. Employees who perceive internal control feel that they personally can influence their outcomes through their own ability, skills, or effort. Employees who perceive external control feel that their outcomes are beyond their own control: they feel that external forces control their outcomes. What is important is this perceived locus of control may have a differential impact on their performance and satisfaction. For example, studies by Rotter and his colleagues suggest that skill versus chance environments differentially affect behavior. In addition, a number of studies have been conducted in recent years to test the attribution theory locus of control model in work settings. One study found that internally controlled employees are generally more satisfied with their jobs, are more likely to be in managerial positions, and are more satisfied with a participatory management style than employees who perceive external control. Other studies have found that internally controlled managers are better performers, are more considerate of subordinates, tend not to burn out, and follow a more strategic style of executive action. In addition, the attribution process has been shown to play a role in coalition formation in the political process of organizations. In particular, coalition members made stronger internal attributions, such as ability and desire and nonmembers made stronger external attributions, such as luck.

The implication of these studies is that internally controlled managers are some how better than externally controlled managers. However, such generalizations are not yet warranted because there is some contradictory evidence. For example, one study concluded that the ideal manager may have an external orientation because the results indicated that externally controlled managers were perceived as initiating more structure and consideration than internally controlled managers. In addition to the implications for managerial behavior and performance, attribution theory has been shown to have relevance in explaining goal setting behavior, leadership behavior and poor employee
performance. A review article concludes that locus of control is related to the performance and satisfaction of organization members and may moderate the relationship between motivation and incentives.

In addition, attributions are related to organizational symbolism, which in effect says that in order to understand organizations, one must recognize their symbolic nature. Much of organizations based on attributions rather than physical or observed realities under this view. For example, research has found that symbols are a salient source of information used by people in forming their impressions of psychological climate.

Other Attributions. Attribution theory seems to hold a great deal of promise for better understanding organizational behavior. However, in the future, other dimensions besides the internal and external locus of control will have to be accounted for and studied. One social psychologist, for example, suggests that a stability (fixed or variable) dimension must also be recognized. Experienced employees will probably have a stable internal attribution about their abilities but an unstable internal attribution concerning effort. By the same token, these employees may have a stable external attribution about task difficulty but an unstable external attribution about luck.

Besides the stability dimension, Kelley 1973 suggests that dimensions such as consensus (do others act this way in a situation? Consistency (does this person act this way in this situation at other times?) and distinctiveness (does this person act this way in this situation at other times?) will affect the type of attributions that are made. To keep these dimensions straight, it can be remembered that consensus related to other people, distinctiveness related to other risks, and consistency relates to time. As shown in Figure 1.7 if there is high consensus, consistency and distinctiveness, then attribution to external or situational environmental causes will probably be made. The external attribution may be that the task is too difficult or that outside pressures from home or coworkers are hindering performance. However, if there is low consensus, high consistency, and low distinctiveness, then attributions to internal or personal causes for the behavior will probably be made. The supervisor making an internal attribution may conclude that the
subordinate just doesn’t have the ability, or is not giving the necessary effort, or does not have the motivation to perform well. There is some research evidence from field settings to directly support predictions from the Kelley model.

In addition to Kelley, other well known motivation theorists, such as Bernard Weiner 1972 use attribution theory to help explain achievement motivation and to predict subsequent changes in performance and how people feel about themselves. Some research findings from Weiner’s work include the following.

1. Bad-luck attributions (external) take the sting out of a negative outcome, but good luck attributions (external) reduce the joy associated with success.

2. When individuals attribute their success to internal rather than external factors, they have higher expectations for future success, report a greater desire for achievement, and set higher performance goals.

Attribution Errors. Recently, social psychologists have given attention to two potent biases when people make attributions. The first is called the fundamental attribution error.
Example of Organizational Attribution

Behavior (poor performance of a subordinate)

Coworkers are also performing poorly on this task.

High consensus

Coworkers are performing very well on this task.

Low consensus

The subordinate does not do well on this task at any time.

High consistency

The subordinate does well on other tasks as well as this one.

Low distinctiveness

The subordinate does well on of the tasks, but not this one.

High distinctiveness

FIGURE 1.7 Kelley’s model of attribution.
Research has found that people tend to ignore powerful situational forces when explaining others' behavior. People tend to attribute others' behavior to personal factors (for example, intelligence, ability, motivation, attitudes, or personality), even when it is very clear that the situation or circumstances caused the person to behave the way he or she did.

Another attribution bias that has emerged from the research is that people tend to present themselves favorably. This self-serving bias has been found in study after study; people readily accept credit when told they have succeeded (attributing the success to their ability and effort), yet often attribute failure to such external, situational factors as bad luck or the problem's inherent "impossibility." For example, in explaining their victories, athletes commonly credit themselves, but they are more likely to attribute losses to something else—bad breaks, poor officiating, or the other team's superior effort.

When something goes wrong in the workplace, there is a tendency for the boss to blame the problem on the inability or poor attitude of the subordinates, but the situations blamed as far as he or she personally is concerned. The reverse is true of the subordinates. They blame the situation for their difficulties but make personal attribution in terms of their boss. By the same token, if something goes well, the boss makes personal attributions for him or her self and situational attributions for subordinates, and the subordinates make personal attributions for themselves but situational attributions for the boss. In other words, it is typical to have conflicting attribution biases among managers and subordinates in organizations. As a way of creating more productive relationships, researchers suggest that efforts must be made to reduce divergent perceptions and perspectives among the parties through increased interpersonal interaction, open communication channels and workshops, and team building sessions devoted to reducing attribution errors.

The Role of Self-Efficacy in Attributions. Closely related to attribution errors is the recently popular concept of self-efficacy. Taking off from the self-serving bias, self-efficacy (how effective people believe they themselves are) will affect the attributions
people make. If individuals have high self-efficacy, they will tend to make positive internal attributions about their successes and attribute setbacks as situational, or as a fluke, or to think, "Indeed a new approach." By the same token, attributions also affect a person's self-efficacy. If people make internal attributions for their successful performance, this will enhance and strengthen their self-efficacy beliefs.

These various dimensions of attribution theory recognize the complexity of human behavior, and this realization must be part of a theory that attempts to explain and understand organizational behavior. Although Martinko in his recent book on Attribution Theory demonstrates the validity and potential of attribution perspectives within an organizational context, theoretical, information processing, and situational factors all affect the attribution models of organizational behavior. Despite this complexity, and unlike some of its predecessors in the cognitive approaches to motivation discussed earlier, attribution theory does seem to have more potential for application and relevance, instead of being a purely academic exercise in theory building.

INTERPRETING MOTIVATIONAL MODELS

Several motivational models have been presented in the present chapter. All the models have strengths and weaknesses, advocates and critics. No model is perfect, but all of them add something to our understanding of the motivational process. Other models are being developed, and attempts are being made to integrate existing approaches.

The cognitive models are likely to continue dominating organizational practice for some time, as indicated by the recent attention to the attribution model. They are most consistent with our supportive and holistic view of people. However, behavior modification also has some usefulness, especially in stable situations with minimum complexity, where there appears to be a direct connection between behavior and its consequences. In more complex, dynamic situations, cognitive models will be used more often. In other words, the motivational model used must be adapted to the situation as well as blended with other models.
Micromotivation

The emphasis of the last two chapters has been on motivation on the job and within the firm. This kind of motivation is called micro motivation, or type A motivation. It focuses on motivation within one individual organization. The idea is to change conditions within the firm in order to increase employee productivity, that is, to motivate employees better. However, we cannot ignore the fact that firms employ whole people who live and play away from their work. They bring to the job many attitudes that are conditioned by their environment, and these attitudes influence their job performance.

The macro motivation model

The area of interest that focuses on environmental conditions outside the firm that influence job performance is basically a macro motivation model, or type B motivation. This external environment may have a major influence on performance. For example, does society support work, or does it emphasize leisure as a primary value? Does it perceive factory workers as alienated moneygrubbers or as major contributors to society? Does it increase the tax rate as one earns more money from a promotion, thus restricting its use? All these environmental conditions affect the rewards one derives from work.

Summary of motivation theory

Three additional approaches to motivation presented in this chapter are the expectancy, equity and attribution models. The expectancy model states that motivation is a product of how much one wants something and the probabilities that effort will lead to task accomplishment and reward. The formula is valence $\times$ expectancy $\times$ instrumentality = motivation. Valence is the strength of a person's preference for an outcome. Expectancy is the strength of belief that one's effort will be successful in accomplishing a task. Instrumentality is the strength of belief that successful performance will be followed by a reward.
Russell (1986) has provided a useful scheme for talking about the different ways that individuals relate to others at work. His analysis focuses on two aspects of team interaction style. First, is an individual more task oriented or people oriented: does a team member prefer to focus more on the job at hand or on relationships with coworkers? Second, is an individual more of a thinker or a doer: thinkers are reflective about their work whereas doers are more likely to discuss their work openly? Even though everyone is both task and people oriented, both thinker and a doer, every individual strikes his or her own balance between these choices. This gives every team member a distinctive profile.

As we know Groups tend to require not one but two types of leadership roles: that of the task leader and that of the social leader or employee related leader. The task leader’s job in a meeting is to help the group accomplish its objectives and stay on target. The idea is to provide necessary structure by stating the problem, giving and seeking relevant facts, periodically summarizing the progress, and checking for agreement.

Difficulties sometimes arise because the task leader may irritate people and injure the unity of the group. It is the role of employee related leader to restore and maintain group relationships by recognizing contributions, reconciling disagreements, and playing a supportive role to help the group develop. A especially challenging task is to blend the ideas of a deviant member with the thoughts of other participants. Although one manager can fill both the task and social roles, often they are separate. When they are separate, it is important for the task leader to recognize the social leader or employee related leader and try to form a coalition of the two leaders for improved effectiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Interaction Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If this is a member’s profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A take charge person, exerts strong influence to get things done, focuses on results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A social specialist, expresses opinions and emotions easily; prefers strong interaction with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes to be well organized and thought out; prefers specific project and activities; enjoys putting structure to ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive specialist, high concern for good relationships, seeks stability and predictability, wants to be part of larger picture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main aim of this present study is to examine the relationship between locus of control and interactive styles, to examine the relationship between motivation and experience with interactive styles. The result of this study will serve as a guide line to the management of the organization to prepare a interactive style profile of the managers. This study will also serve as a guide line to the management for creating congenial and healthy environment in the organization so as to develop effective interactive styles. This effective interactive style will help the managers to handle the work force & other employees so as to achieve the organizational goals.

In next coming chapter No. II, III & IV review of past studies, research methodology of the present study & result and discussion respectively will be taken on hand. In chapter No.V, summary & conclusions, relevance of the study, limitations of the study as well as the suggestions for follow up will be incorporated to complete the whole report writing of the present research work done.