Motivation Theories

When people join together to do some work, an organization is formed. An organization may be a simple partnership of two persons; it may be vast and complex like the General Motors or the Indian Army. But in all cases, an organization consists of people working jointly to achieve some commonly shared objectives.

But in every organization, people must be motivated to work, to contribute towards these objectives. Managing involves the creation and maintenance of an environment where people can perform with a view to accomplish these common objectives. It is clear that a manager cannot do this task without knowing what motivates people. Most successful managers know this almost instinctively, but a systematic study and understanding of the motivating factors is likely to make the task easier.

Chester I. Barnard, the Chief Executive of Bell Telephones for number of years, observed:

*If all those who may be considered potential contributors to an organization are arranged in order of willingness to serve it, the scale gradually descends from possibly intense willingness, high neutral or zero willingness to intense unwillingness or opposition or hatred. The preponderance of persons in a modern society always lies on the negative side with reference to any existing or potential organization.*

This implies that the majority—in fact a vast majority of—the members of an organization need to be motivated by some means other than by the mere fact of their membership in the organization. What are these means?

*Need – Want – Satisfaction Chain*

We may first recognize the fact that every conscious action of an individual has an origin in a need. If a person works, this may be:
• For money for necessities
• Due to the desire for power
• Due to their being part of a social group (social need)
• Due to creative urge (creative need)
• To fill in time and avoid boredom (need not to be idle)
• Due to fear (need for security or need for comfort)
• A result of social norms.

Whatever may be the need, it is satisfied or partially, through an action. This is the so-called need-want-satisfaction chain:

Though the chain does appeal to common sense, there are problems in using this as a model for devising a motivation system. One problem is that the needs are not autonomous; they may arise from the environment and hence are subject to change over a time. For example, the smell of food makes us feel hungry; advertisements arouse our needs. This two way interaction makes the design of a motivation system starting from the identification of various needs very difficult in practice. Another problem arises from the fact that while needs do result in behaviour, behaviour may also cause needs. A good example of this is the trade union leader. Normally, the need for power in such persons is high. The leader behaves in a particular way so as to consolidate and increase his power in his constituency; this behaviour is the result of his basic needs. But his behavior itself may lead to the arousal of more needs, and it is difficult to identify when various needs are satisfied – which makes it difficult to design a system accordingly.

In spite of these difficulties, since need do form the basis for the motivation process, much work has been done to understand what kinds of needs exist in human beings, and how they are satisfied. We shall now briefly review this work.

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs**

One of the earliest, and one of the most popular models of motivation was proposed by Maslow. Maslow first postulated that basis needs can be classified in an ascending order of importance as below:
1. Physiological needs: these are food, water, clothing, sex, etc.
2. Safety needs: Physical and psychological safety and security.
3. Social needs: Belonging, love, affection, friendship, etc.
4. Esteem needs: Self-respect, respect of others, competence, prestige, status, etc.
5. Self actualization: self-fulfillment and expression, creativity, need to become everything one is capable of becoming.

Maslow next proposed that these needs from a hierarchy, i.e. each of the lower level of needs are to be satisfied before the higher needs become operative. Once a lower order need is satisfied, it will no longer motivate the person. Thus first one looks for the basic survival needs, on satisfying which he turns to satisfy the lower needs of his subordinates, and then to progressively go in for the other needs; also, once the lower needs are satisfied, it will be pointless to design the motivation system addressed to these needs alone.

There seems to be considerable doubt about whether needs follow such a hierarchy. When do we say that basic needs are satisfied? How much of “enough” is enough? Does it not dependent on individuals? His social conditions? Similarly, there also exist clear indications that at one time more than one need exist together, all unsatisfied.

These would imply that Maslow’s classification, though useful, cannot be applied right away.

**Herzberg’s Approach**

Herzberg, building on Maslow’s ideas, developed a somewhat different model. He called the basic, security and affiliation needs as “maintenance” or “hygiene” factors. These, if absent, produce demotivation—like a dirty room that draws a remark—but if present, do not produce motivation. Herzberg got the idea from the fact that almost invariably, the “bad” aspects of the job that are recalled involve pay, security etc., while the “good” aspects involve the higher level needs.
Herzberg’s approach would imply that managers should approach the two needs differently. Pay, yes, to a reasonable level. But further increases in pay do not necessarily motivate. Having satisfied the lower needs, the managers should build motivation through building higher level needs into the job like giving people challenging jobs that appeal to their self actualization and esteem needs. Also preventing dissatisfaction is not the same as inducing satisfaction; motivation can be brought about only through motivators.

Mc Clelland’s Approach

David Mc Clelland of Harvard University has proposed that people have a mix of three needs – power, affiliation and achievement. The mix of these needs varies between individuals. To develop managers, according to him, the achievement need must be increased and according to him, this can be done through training programs.

Achievement motivation develops relevant work related attitudes such as moderate (calculated) risk taking, use of feedback for improving performance, looking for experts help rather than for help from friends for achieving results, taking personal responsibility for results, etc.

Power motivation is also important. This is reflected in an individuals concern to influence other persons, situations and events. The urge to make an impact, or to influence, or to control characterizes power motivation.

Managers need a mix of all the three – and a different mix at different levels. A high achievement motivation created by a system of result oriented rewards as in the case of salesman may be appropriate for lower level managers, but as one progresses higher up, affiliation motivations become more important. Such individuals rise to the middle level and are more comfortable there. But the top level managers appear to be driven by a need for power and achievement.

The above theories – by Maslow, Herzberg and Mc Clelland aim at identifying the basic needs and how to satisfy them. But they do not
address themselves to the question of how these needs get satisfied, in other words the process dimension. Now we look at this question.

Vroom’s Approach

Victor Vroom attempted to take the process dimension into consideration by examining the way a need is satisfied. He introduced two concepts: expectancy and instrumentality. The former refers to the probability of an outcome, if a manager feels that strenuous effort on his part is likely to lead to higher production, the expectancy is said to be high. But this is only a means to some other end, or it is only a first level outcome. This must lead to the second level outcome, or the end (such as a promotion) and the probability of this happening is the instrumentality. Work motivation is the product of expectancy and instrumentality. If one of them is low, the motivation is likely to be low. In addition, the end must also be relevant to the person: it should lead to an outcome of that he prefers. This is called the valence of the outcome (strength of the individual’s preference for a particular outcome).

This approach implies that managers, in designing a motivation system, have to (a) see what kinds of rewards will satisfy their subordinates and (b) establish clearly a condition in which the action on the part of employees (as desired by the management) will lead to the particular reward. Managers have to assess the reward structures, and through careful planning, managing by objectives and clear definition of duties and responsibilities through a good organization structure, have to ensure that such a motivation system is made operational.

Assumptions about people and motivation

Theory X and Theory Y Managers

Douglas Mc Gregor, to dramatize the difference between different assumptions held by managers about people, put forth his famous distinction between Theory ‘X’ and Theory ‘Y’ managers. The Theory ‘X’ managers believes that
• People dislike work
• They must be coerced, controlled and directed
• The average human being is lazy, prefers to be directed and wishes to avoid responsibility.

The Theory ‘Y’ managers believe on the other hand that
• Work is as natural as rest or play: people do not have to be forced or threatened to make them work
• With commitment and rewards they will work
• They can learn, exercise self-control and not only accept but even seek responsibility.

None of us are really pure ‘Theory X’ and ‘Theory Y’ but fall somewhere in between. We share some characteristics of Theory X managers and some of Theory Y managers.

An important consequence of the assumptions that we hold about others is that they very often come true, for managerial behavior itself is governed by these assumptions, and the responses are conditioned accordingly. This is the remarkable effect discovered by Sterling Livingston – the so called Pygmalion effect.

The Manager : A Pygmalion ?

From certain research evidence available, it seems that a person may be motivated to do higher things simply because higher ups expect him to do so and he (or she) knows it. This is the co-called Pygmalion effect.

A child, if told repeatedly by the parents that he or she is very bright and great things are expected of him/her, actually achieves a lot. On the other hand, one who is told that one is an idiot, actually becomes so. Similarly, it seems that

• What a manager expects of his subordinates and the way he treats them largely determine their performance and career progress.
• Superior managers are able to create high performance expectations for their subordinates, while less effective managers are not able to do so.
• Subordinates appears to do what they believe they are expected to do.

Hence it becomes quite important for a manager not to assume that his peers or subordinates are very lazy or stupid. He would find that his prophecy become self-fulfilling.

Conclusion: The above Theories in the Indian Context

The above theories have all been developed in the Western context. There are some implicit cultural and environment assumptions inherent in them. Indian culture is perhaps characterized by a high degree of dependency (higher affiliation needs) and a high need for the basic comforts of life. Also, achievement motive (at least as defined ad measured by Mc Clelland) is low. India has passed through a long era of feudalism and colonialism, hence motivation to progress is inherently less because of the social barriers that have always existed.

But the basic arguments of the theory appear to need little drastic revision. The way they get operationalized may vary, and Indian managers have to be careful about adopting motivation systems enbloc from the West. But to discard the useful theories and concepts saying that “it won’t work here” is like throwing out the baby with the bath water. All the above knowledge however does not exonerate managers from their basic responsibility to think about what applies to them in their specific situation.

MOTIVATION: PRACTICAL GUIDELINES

30 students of an MBA program in one of the better universities in India were asked for reasons why they were taking the course. All of them without exception wanted to become “good managers” not one wanted to pursue academics. They wanted to learn the nitty gritty of motivation – and were not interested in theoretical dissertations or scholarly research. This article is written for them and for all others who want practical guidelines which will enable them to develop motivational strategies for key personnel.
Let us first understand the purpose of any motivational strategy.

**Purpose of Motivation**

As managers we are not seeking to keep our employees happy and satisfied. We are rather seeking to make them effective. There is a basic difference between the two and must be reiterated. The primary purpose of motivation is to make the employees effective (or productive) and not to make them happy and/or satisfied. Satisfaction will hopefully flow from effectiveness. But even if it does not, and if management must choose between effectiveness on the one hand and satisfaction on the other hand, it must choose the former. Too many organizations have suffered by failing to appreciate this priority and by giving primacy to employee satisfaction and happiness and peace rather than to productivity and effectiveness.

The above truth was present to a group of middle level managers of a government sector organization. There was violent disagreement initially. They said that a dissatisfied employee cannot remain effective in the long run. True. But when it was pointed out that effective people are generally satisfied with their jobs, but all satisfied people are not necessarily effective, they relented.

The message therefore is: aim for greater effectiveness. Use satisfaction as a means to the end (more about this later), but never for its own sake. In other words, the purpose of any motivational strategy is to make the employee effective and to keep him that way.

Let us examine the factors that lead to effectiveness.

Effectiveness is a function of the following

- Right goals
- Capabilities and skills of the employee, or employee competencies
- The effort he puts in, and
- The support he receives from the organization

These are examined below:
Goals

Motivational strategies must always be related to a particular goal. This is a fundamental requirement. “Blanket” strategies which are aimed at motivating staff “generally” – without reference to a specific goal or output – do not work.

The goals or targets set before individuals always derive from corporate objectives. It helps however if the relationship between what he is doing and the overall objectives is explained to the employee. When he sees how he is contributing to the corporate objective his activities make more “sense” to him. This a motivator in itself.

Also, it helps if the goals are stated in specific, measurable terms. This has two advantages:

1. There is an objective measure of performance – which pre-empts all debate whether the goal has or has not been achieved.
2. The employee has immediate feedback regarding his performance. This feedback is in itself a motivator.

There is further motivation if – the situation permitting – the employee is involved in the goal setting process. Kenneth Blanchard reports that when goals are set by employees, i.e. they, together with their boss, decide what they will do, the goals themselves provide 15-25% of the motivation (1). This is one of the reasons for the success of participation in decision making, delegation and MBO.

To summarize the foregoing
• Let the employee see the larger meaning of what he is doing
• Specify the goals in measurable terms, and
• Where possible let him be involved in goal setting

Employee Competencies

Employee competencies can be broadly categorized as
• Professional or technical skills, e.g. training in foundry accountancy or pisciculture.
• Behavioural skills, e.g. leadership qualities, understanding of interpersonal and group behaviour.
• Managerial skills, e.g. financial management, materials management or PERT-CPM.
• Conceptual skills, e.g. the ability to learn from text books or real life, “think it through” and then apply it to other real life situations.
• Vision.

The competencies above are presented in their order of importance. At lower levels profession/technical skills are most important and vision least important. As the individual rises in the hierarchy however the order changes. At the highest level vision becomes most important with professional skill being least important. This change in order has behavioural ramifications.

At lower levels people are successful primarily because of their professional and managerial skills. These “lower level” skills thus get reinforced, and the individual does not feel the need to acquire behavioral and other higher level competencies. (An individual who is professionally incompetent invariably becomes and expert at managing people. He acquires this proficiency through the sheer need to survive.) Thus when people are promoted to higher levels they become increasingly unfit for their jobs – unless they recognize the reversal of priorities and change accordingly. This also explains why some people who show promise early in their careers fail, while others who had nothing to commend them in their early years are an outstanding success later in life.

Employee competencies are to be matched against job needs. It may be necessary at times to train an individual to obtain a fit. Alternatively, employee strengths can be built up on. Both provide an opportunity of motivation.

Training Vs Learning
At this stage it is necessary to appreciate the distinction between training on the one hand and learning on the other hand. The difference was well illustrated by Sharu Rangnekar in a seminar attended by the author. The MD of a public sector organization called his Training Manager and complimented him on his performance.

“You ran a very successful seminar at Goa last year. I also enjoyed the sessions earlier this year at Pahalgam. Please try and arrange next year’s training program at Kathmandu or Darjeeling”. “Certainly, Sir”, replied the Training Manager, “What subject would you like me to focus on?” “How do I know”, said the MD. “You are the expert on training. You decide.”

The above was an illustration of training – as it is usually conceived in India. Learning in contrast is goal oriented. The employee feels the need to learn, to acquire the competency necessary for effective performance or personal on-the-job growth. When a learning program flows from personal or job needs, there is motivation.

To summarise

- Let the employee see the proposed job as desirable
- Let him identify the competencies required and his shortcomings
- Then send him for the relevant training program(s)

Alternatively

- Let the employee recognize his strengths,
- See how they can be built up further
- See how they benefit the company and/or himself, and
- Then send him for the training program

**Effort**

Employee effort is a function of his motivation and his health

We will not touch upon management of health in this article. Suffice to say that management of health is an important input to corporate
performance. See, e.g., The New Aerobic Way (2) and The One Minute Manager Gets Fit(3)

Motivation will however be discussed in detail.

Let us first define motivation. In the context of effectiveness, motivation is getting the employee to do what he should be doing.

The various strategies for motivation can be grouped under the following five categories:

- Associating good performance with a consequence which the employee wants – a reward or, using management jargon, a “carrot”
- Associating bad performance with a consequence which he wants to avoid – a “stick”
- Building in something into the job which is intrinsically attractive to him – “job enrichment”
- Doing something to the employee so that he is self motivated – bringing about as it were a “change of heart”.
- Doing something so that the group as a whole is motivated towards organizational achievement – a “change of climate”.

Carrot

Whenever a particular behaviour results in an outcome which the employee sees as rewarding he is motivated to perform in that particular way. The strategy in its essence is then to find out what the employee wants, make it contingent upon his performance, communicate to him the relationship between performance and reward, and then administer the reward upon successful performance.

The foregoing is simple in its conception. The application however is not always straightforward.

The MBA students mentioned earlier in the article were asked to list out 20 items each which they felt would be seen as rewarding to employees as well as possible for organizations to administer.
Employees and managers in different organizations were consulted. The suggestions totaled to about fifty and showed evidence of inadequate understanding of motivation in some organizations. The various proposed “rewards” could be grouped as unders:

Potential Dissatisfiers

Variables such as annual increments, canteen facilities, good working conditions, etc were suggested as motivators. These do not motivate. Anything which the employee believes to be his “by right” is not a motivator. In organizations which have a tradition of seniority or seniority – cum – suitability even a promotion is not a motivator. Herzberg in his research found that there are some factors which if absent lead to dissatisfaction, but if present do not lead to motivation (4). He calls them “hygiene” factors. Dearness allowance, for example, if not paid will lead to dissatisfaction. But payment of DA will in no way lead to better production.

There are many other variables which if present do not motivate, but if withdrawn cause dissatisfaction. Anything given across the board, i.e. to all employees irrespective of performance, e.g. free medical facilities, or subsidized schooling for children will not motivate. There will be increased satisfaction but not increased production. If these facilities are subsequently withdrawn however they may result in reduced output. Anything given “for free” – e.g., an additional barfi as part of the subsidized meal, or three instead of two uniforms per year or central air conditioning – is not a motivator. Generosity at best leads to employee good will – which can sometimes be “encashed” if there is a crisis, e.g. the threat of a strike at a future date. And can therefore be good insurance. It does not however result in increased production – certainly not a sustained increase. (some managerial actions do result in improved climate and are therefore motivators. These will be referred to later.)

Anything that my colleague has but I do not is a dissatisfier. If he sits in an air-conditioned room while I though of the same rank and status do not, I am dissatisfied. Installing an air-conditioner in my office will reduce dissatisfaction but not increase effectiveness.
To summarize

- Things which I believe ought to be mine by right
- Things which have been given without reference to specific performance, and
- Things which I do not have but a co-worker of the same status has (and has received it not because of some specific outstanding performance)

Are not motivators. They are only potential dissatisfiers.

Let us now look at motivators.

“Specific” and “Finite” Motivators

A motivator is that which
- I want but do not have
- I believe is not mine by right and
- I believe I can get by reasonable exertion

Abraham Maslow has suggested that people want different things at different times (5). If one need is satisfied it “submerges” and another need “emerges” and begins to influence behaviour. This is true for a wide range of needs. For example, an individual needs to fill his stomach. He can therefore be motivated to exert himself to earn enough to buy three square meals a day. If in due course he gets a permanent job which is reasonable well paying, the need for food is satisfied. He cannot then be motivated by offering him an additional meal. What he wants now is perhaps a certain measure of physical comfort, and will be motivated if taken off from shift duty and put on a regular nine to five job. His needs have changed. A motivational strategy which worked well in the past is no longer effective. A new strategy will have to be devised. The previous strategy was thus finite in its effect.

McClelland suggests that there are some needs which remain reasonably stable over the years – unless there is a deliberate effort to change them./ These are: the need to influence others (the need for Power), to enter into satisfactory social relationships (the need
for Affiliation), and the need for Achievement (6). Different people may exhibit different proportions of these needs.

To illustrate McClelland’s theory: One machine operator may for example, aspire to become a supervisor – and will be motivated by jobs which require co-ordination of effort. He is exhibiting a high need to influence people, his colleague, in contrast, may be seeking companionship at work and will give his best in jobs which permit him to interact socially with his peers. He is exhibiting a high need for affiliation. A motivational strategy devised for one will not work with the other. It is necessary therefore that motivational strategies be specific to individuals.

The foregoing were illustrations of the fact that some motivators are specific to individuals and may be finite or limited in their effect. There are other motivators however which are relevant to all and continue to be relevant no matter how high the individual rises in the organizational hierarchy.

“Universal” and “Infinite Motivators

It has been seen that recognition and appreciation for work well done motivates everyone, one never gets tired of praise – as long as it is genuine and linked to specific performance. Praise is a powerful tool for reinforcing desirable behaviour and is a key variable in the One Minute Management technique recently popularized by Kenneth Blanchard (7).

It must be pointed out that praise alone cannot fill the stomach or pay for e.g., the children’s education. The employee must have job security and a certain minimum amount of money. There is no substitute for these basics. In the organizational context however, assuming that the basic needs have been satisfied, recognition, appreciation and praise are the nearest one can get in the search for a motivator that is “universal” in its applicability and “infinite” in its effect. And these cost nothing. All that is required is a willingness on the part of the manager to recognize, appreciate and praise.

Which Carrot to Choose
We have seen above that many variables which are commonly believed to be motivators fail to motivate because

- They are not motivators at all, hygiene factors or potential dissatisfiers, or
- Were effective in the past but are not longer relevant because the particular needs to which they are addressed have been satisfied, or
- Are addressed to a particular need, e.g., a desire for praise, when a more basic need, e.g., the need for food has not been satisfied.

Attempts at motivation fail because the above limitations are not fully understood. Well meaning managers introduce “motivators” which they think will work, but don’t, and consequently feel frustrated. This brings us to the question: how does one find out which motivators – carrots or combinations thereof – to use? The answer is: you decide what is the best applicable in your situation; but before implementing your strategy, confirm its suitability by asking the persons concerned. The asking may be either direct or indirect, e.g., through an opinion survey.

So much for the carrot as a motivational strategy. Let us now turn to the stick.

Stick

A stick is an unpleasant consequence which the employee may expect if he fails to perform. Examples are a reprimand, a less challenging job, loss of emoluments or even the sack. Judicious use of the stick, or the threat thereof, results in improvement in performance – and as long as the punishment is seen as fair it does not “demotivate”. Not using the stick when it is clearly called for does however lower effectiveness – both on the part of the employee who has allowed to get away with poor performance, as also other who see failure to punish as “unfair” to them or as alicence for non-performance.
Attention is invited to the debate (referred to earlier in the paper) between effectiveness on the one hand and satisfaction on the other hand. A “satisfaction” based concept of motivation precludes use of the stick. The manager is thus deprived of a powerful motivational tool (the definition of motivation being: getting the employee to do what he should be doing). Because the stick has sometimes been used indiscriminately, protective legislation has made it relatively difficult to use – and rightly so. The possibility of using a stick must however be considered while developing a motivational strategy.

Which stick to choose

It is relatively more easy to identify a stick than a carrot

In its essence a stick is what an employee
- Has, and does not want to lose
- Cannot retain as a matter of right
- Can retain by working at a certain level.

Even here however it helps if you find out what the employee perceives as a stick rather than what you think is a stick. In organizations which, for example, have a tradition of heaping punishment upon punishment, such punishment ceases to be effective.

Relationship between Performance and Consequences

A carrot or stick are two possible consequences of performance. Their efficacy as motivators depend upon

- The intensity with which the consequences is desired or abhorred, as the case may be.
- Communication of the relationship between performance and the consequence, e.g., “if you finish this report over the weekend you will get two days off.”
- The employee’s belief that the consequence will in fact follow the performance. If he has doubts regarding the management’s ability to demote him, for example, the threat of demotion will not motivate.
• The immediacy of the consequence, i.e., how soon after the performance is the reward or punishment delivered. If there is too much delay the motivational effect of the reward/punishment will be weakened the next time round.

According to Kenneth Blanchard, 75-85% of the motivating in achieving One Minute Goals comes from praises/reprimands which are delivered as soon as possible after the performance(8).

Job Enrichment

The carrot and the stick were extrinsic motivators. We will now consider intrinsic motivators: “job enrichment” “change of heart” and “change of climate”.

The job enrichment strategy in its essence is making the job so attractive that it is sought as an end in itself. Some people, for example, race cars for the thrill of it. To them speed driving is an end in itself. Others seek outlets for creativity. Still others respond to challenges of time or quality. All of these can be harnessed – where possible – by building them into the job at hand.

A word of caution is in order. Jobs which carry a lot of power (e.g. that of an Auditor), or powerful departments (e.g. finance), or even close to a person in power (e.g. PA to the MD) are also attractive. While people will exert themselves to secure the job, they will not necessarily continue to exert themselves in the job. It is necessary therefore to distinguish between such jobs and those which will continue to motivate.

The number of jobs which are inherently rich, e.g. product development or construction projects, are limited. The genius of management lies in adding to, or enriching existing jobs to make them attractive to specific individuals or matching employees to jobs which they find attractive.

It has been generally seen that jobs which carry a measure of autonomy and authority are attractive. Autonomy and authority can be added on to almost all managerial jobs through delegation –
informal or formal. Such enrichment acts as a motivator “before the fact”, i.e., encourages the employee to work harder on the particular job. Recognition and praise, referred to earlier, are in contrast “after the fact” motivators. Praise for a job well done will ensure that the employee works harder the next time round. The two together, namely autonomy and authority on the one hand and recognition and praise on the other hand make a powerful combination.

Change of Heart

If the number of rich jobs are limited the number of self-motivated employees is even more so. A self-motivated person is one who exerts himself, no matter what the task. A self-motivated person who is also capable is an extremely valuable resource. The strategy in such a case is simply to put him in jobs which bring the highest return to the organization and also enable the individual to grow.

As mentioned earlier the number of self-motivated people is limited. What we are looking for is a motivational strategy which converts ordinary people into self-starters.

Studies of leadership reveal that leaders are able to enthuse average people into remarkable levels of performance. They are able to bring about as it were a “change of heart” in ordinary people. Leadership therefore provides the answer.

Change of Climate.

Change of climate is different from change of heart as the latter focuses on individuals while the former influences the entire group or organization. The right quality of leadership results in development of an espirit de corps, high morale and climate where people are emotionally involved in the organization as a whole, and therefore pursue its various goals with zeal and fervour.

The strategy for both change of heart and change of climate involves using leadership skills to motivate. Leadership is too vast a subject to be dealt here. All that will be said is that, in the organizational context, leadership requires at minimum.
• A vision for the organization as a whole (or for the larger meaning of the job in question)
• This vision being communicated through personal example, as well as through
• Personal example and
• Clear enunciation

If a leader has these, and even if he is not able to sell the goal to the subordinate, the latter end up being “sold” on the boss as a person. In the other words, even if you do not succeed in bringing about a climate where people work hard because they think that the work is important, the people will work hard because they “like” you. So such a strategy, if genuine, always bears fruit.

Leadership skills can – within certain limits – be taught. Managers who are encouraged to develop a vision and are also trained in leadership skills are more likely to cause their subordinates to become effective. Leadership training should therefore be considered while developing a strategy for motivation.

Organizational support

Various strategies for motivation – aimed at increasing employee effectiveness – were presented above.

We will now consider the role of organizational support in increasing effectiveness.

Organizational support can take many forms, e.g., proper tooling, necessary materials, clear instructions requisite authority, etc. While lack of support de-motivates, infrastructural support in and of itself is not necessarily a motivator. It is however, necessary for effectiveness. It follows therefore that organizational support must be an integral part of any motivational strategy.

The Role of Managerial Expectations
The foregoing contained some suggestions to be considered while developing motivational strategies. Their essence was:

- Identify jobs
- Select individuals and identify their competencies as well as needs
- Train the individual or add to the job to obtain a fit
- Develop motivational strategies appropriate to employee needs,
- Provide organizational support

There are two additional variables however which must be kept in mind.

Studies have shown that employees tend to rise or fall to meet managerial expectations. If a manager thinks highly of an employee and genuinely believes that he will succeed, the employee often rises to the occasion merely because of his boss belief in him. The reverse is also true. If an employee is believed to be a poor performer, his performance is likely to come down to the level subconsciously ascribed to him. This phenomenon is called “self-fulfillment of prophecy”; that which a manager believes of an employee is likely to come true merely because the manager so expects it.

The other variable is the manager’s self image, i.e. his expectations of himself. If a manager believes in himself, believes and that he can motivate his employee, he is more likely to succeed.

Motivation and Satisfaction

In the beginning of the article we had said that effectiveness is to be given priority over satisfaction, and that satisfaction is at best to be used as a means to the end. In this section we will examine the relationship between effectiveness and satisfaction. Let us however first consider the dynamics of satisfaction.

According to need theory a dissatisfied person is one who has an unmet need, while a satisfied person is one whose need has been met. A dissatisfied person will therefore hopefully exert himself to satisfy his need, while a satisfied person will continue to work to the extent that he does not lose the satisfier of the need which is
Currently fulfilled. There is a qualitative difference between the degree of effort exerted by the two: the satisfied person has (perhaps) worked hard to acquire a need satisfier. In order to ensure its retention therefore he must continue to operate at the same level of exertion. The person whose need has not been met will, in contrast, have to work harder than he has done heretofore. For organizational purposes therefore the satisfied person has no further potential. The dissatisfied person can in contrast contribute yet more to the organization.

The foregoing is admittedly a simple-minded view of the dynamics of need satisfaction. Needs are never fully satisfied – in theory. It is possible however that beyond a certain level the organization cannot supply the satisfiers of unmet needs, or the cost of satisfying those needs exceeds the possible return to the organization. When such a condition obtains, the organization has – organizationally speaking – tapped the full potential of the employee. It now addresses itself to maintaining the existence level of need satisfiers and, consequently, employee effectiveness.

If the employee is dissatisfied however, and need satisfiers can be provided within the organizational context, then both the employee and the organization benefit. This is the ideal situation. The employee benefits in as much as he acquires additional competencies as well as experiences psychological growth (according to psychologists, e.g., Maslow, fulfillment of needs leads to psychological growth). And the organization benefits as a consequence of the increase in his contribution.

Summary
To summarise the foregoing, a manager who

- Understand the factors that lead to dissatisfaction
- Knows what motivates key individuals
- Has high expectation of them, and
- Believes in himself.

will be successful in bringing about increased effectiveness. May it be that you are one of those.