

° According to Herzberg, both sets of -- needs are "unidimensional". Each relates to only one side of man's nature. It would -- therefore follow that environmental factors which affect a man's attitude toward his job must also be divided into mutually exclusive categories. This view is in marked contrast to the traditional one-factor theory of job attitudes in which any job-related factor -- may be a source of both satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction.

In seeking empirical data to test these postulates, Herzberg and his associates developed an interview method by which they could gain insight into individual motivational patterns. They undertook to study as a unit the "factors-attitudes-effects" (FAE) complex.

"Satisfiers" and "Dissatisfiers" Findings of Herzberg's first major study are pictured in Figure 6-1, in which the length of each block shows the frequency with which first-level factor appeared in the sequence of -- events reported as satisfying or dissatisfying. The width of each block shows the reported duration of satisfied or dissatisfied feelings.

As hypothesized, the directly job-related factors (at the top and right side of --

Figure 6-1) were found to have a more lasting effect than those at the bottom and to the left of figure 6-1, which concern the context or surroundings in which a person -- does his job.

Herzberg's interview data (and subsequent studies made by other researchers using the same method) also confirmed the hypothesis that factors of job content (the satisfiers) can stimulate high motivation and increased productivity. The factors classified as dissatisfiers were reported more often as part of a negative job attitude. Moreover, according to Herzberg, even when they are adequately provided for and occasion no dissatisfaction, they cannot raise employee morale above a neutral level. Among these -- "Hygiene" or "Maintenance" factors, Herzberg found that "company policy and administration" was the most important in "determining bad feelings about a job, "and that salary -- "has more potency as a job dissatisfier than as a job satisfier".

Critics of Herzberg's motivator-hygiene duality question the validity of classifying money as a hygiene factor. But the feature that has aroused widespread criticism is the idea that satisfiers and dissatisfiers are -- unidimensional; namely, that a factor such as achievement, which can be strongly motiva

ting, cannot also be demotivating (demoralizing) when there is no opportunity to satisfy this need.

Interviews which we have held with managers and supervisors during management development seminars have led us to disagree -- with Herzberg's classification of interpersonal relationships as a dissatisfier and also with his statement that a motivator cannot operate in reverse-as a demoralizing factor. First, there were frequent indications that an interpersonal relationship had been a -- strong motivator for many people when support that could have been withheld-was offered by an organizational superior or an associate. Second, our interview material clearly showed that interpersonal relationships can also be a powerfully demotivating factor. Many persons reported that their will to work had been undermined by evidence that an organizational superior lacked integrity and failed to follow through on promised support. This lack of confidence in certain superiors was frequently cited as a primary reason for -- having requested a transfer or for having -- quit.

Nevertheless, these interviews have also convinced us that Herzberg's contrast between job content and job context is significant for the understanding of inner motiva-

tion. Intrinsic interest of the work itself, opportunity to develop one's potential and -- growth on the job, were uniformly regarded as more important than the physical surroundings in which such meaningful work was done.

Convincing support for Herzberg's theory of satisfiers (responsibility, achievement, - recognition, and career development) has been given by controlled experiments in the Bell - Telephone System. The results convinced members of top management that reshaping jobs to provide maximum satisfaction in the work itself is worth far more than it costs-not only because there is a dramatic reduction in employees turnover, and therefore also greatly reduced training costs, but also in higher productivity and in career development for employees. The large proportion of employees who were able to meet gradually increasing opportunities for responsibility demonstrated -- their promotion caliber.

Consequently, we find ourselves in complete agreement with Ford that Herzberg has - (1) made a great contribution in emphasizing the significance of "work itself" (job content) as potentially motivational; (2) provided a simple and stimulating framework for -- further research; but (3) overstated the case for disregarding "hygiene or maintenance factors". Unless pay and benefits are high, --

even a satisfied employee may quit.

Hackman's Multidimensional Concept of the - Motivation to Work

Hackman (working independently) agrees with Maslow and Herzberg that there is a hierarchy of basic needs. However, he strongly emphasizes the significance of differences between individuals and notes that there probably are no pure types of motivational patterns. Using a structured questionnaire as part of an attitude survey, Hackman found that the words a person uses to describe his motivational feelings (for example, feelings of recognition, confidence, and accomplishment) indicate his degree of independence. Hackman agrees with Herzberg in differentiating between work itself and the conditions surrounding work. He finds that some people are primarily "task-oriented", while others are "situation-oriented". Both types of responses are classified as "work-activity-oriented". His motivational theory is based on responses to the total work situation, including interpersonal relations especially supervision as a potentially positive factor in the work situation that can reinforce motivation. Moreover, he is convinced that his system of describing work motivation applies to men and women, salaried or hourly rated, and regardless of length of employment.

According to Hackman, a work-motivated adult can be described by considering seven basic dimensions: (1) His characteristic level of physical energy, and (2) the extent to which his energy-high or low-is work directed. Highly motivated people "are identified with work in a social context that yields closure experiences". e.g., opportunities to complete a given task. Such an adult regards work (3) as a medium through which to exercise skills, or (4) as a means to attain and exercise responsibility over other people and their activities, or (5) as a means to some end extrinsic to work itself (such as wealth, security, or prestige). To some individuals, ordinary pressures of work and of the "conditions which surround it" (6) feel threatening and arouse anxiety, or (7) seem irritating and arouse aggressive reactions.

In summary, Hackman sets up the following classification of motivational patterns: (a) "closure seekers," (b) "responsibility seekers," (c) "instrumentalists" means-to-end seekers, and (d) "emotional types," "who feel threatened or irritated by normal work pressures.

Other Motivational Studies

Patchen's research, which was conducted in selected units of the Tennessee Valley Authority, took account of the following indicators

of motivation: "General job interest, interest in innovation, and attendance, as well as pride in work and symptoms of stress". "Aroused motivation" was found to be a function of three variables (one in the employee himself and two in the work situation): (1) an employee's inner need for achievement; -- (2) the degree of achievement possible in his job; and (3) the probability that increased effort on his part will lead to greater achievement. However, research showed that one cannot expect an employee to be strongly motivated unless all three conditions exist simultaneously. For example, if an employee sees his job as one in which genuine achievement is impossible or thinks that greater effort on his part would not result in greater achievement, what incentive is there for him to exert himself-even if he has an inner drive to achieve?

According to the above findings, the level of performance by an employee who has inner motivation for achievement can be raised by the following features in the work situation: (1) a degree of difficulty in his job that is great enough to constitute a challenge to him but not so great as to induce stress; (2) a considerable degree of control over his own methods; (3) the existence of appropriate standards for measuring performance; and (4) feedback-that he regards as relevant and reliable-as to his degree of success.

Patchen also emphasizes the importance of individual differences in regard to rewards that people value. For example, some employees value an extrinsic reward, such as money, more than an intrinsic reward, such as opportunity for psychological growth on the job. He also notes that when these four situational variables (a match of individual differences and situational factors) appear in combination, their effect on motivation is multiplicative rather than merely additive.

Porter and Lawer start by recognizing -- that behavioral research has long since exposed as a myth the notion that a happy employee is necessarily more productive than if he were dissatisfied. However, they make three significant qualifying statements. studies -- have shown that (1) job satisfaction is often associated with high performance, (2) high satisfaction is associated with low employee turnover and low absenteeism, and (3) it may be more fruitful to think about job satisfactions as a result rather than as a cause of high job performance.

In addition to the significant motivational differences noted by Patchen-those between extrinsic and intrinsic rewards and individual differences in value attitudes by employees to a given reward-Porter and Lawler -- speak of an employee's "expectation" that --

greater effort on his part will enable him - to obtain the kind of reward that he values most. For example, if a rank-and-file employee puts a high value on money but works in an organization where pay raises are given - only according to length of service, why - - should he be expected to exert himself beyond the point where he meets minimum requirements? Conversely, if another employee has strong drives toward achievement and for control over his own work methods (intrinsic rewards), then satisfying these high-level - - needs tends to result in high performance by him.

M. Scott Myers agrees with major findings summarized in the previous paragraphs. In addition, he draws on experience at Texas Instruments in Dallas, Texas, with reference to the following hypotheses:

- ° A job becomes meaningful when the incumbent (1) can see that his task relates to a "meaningful chunk" of his personal goals and (2) can plan and measure his achievement -- according to an effective "do-and-control - system".

- ° To have maximum effect on inner motivation, a goal must be (1) influenced by the - employee as a goal setter; (2) visible-that is, by direct feedback; (3) desirable; (4) -

challenging; and (5) attainable. Such a -- goal satisfies needs for growth, achievement, responsibility, recognition, affiliation-the need to belong and security.

- ° Management systems must satisfy human - needs that are both high-level and maintenance-oriented. Participation by lower-level - employees in planning and implementing such systems is a form of job enrichment that can give meaning to work experience of an employee whose daily task would not, in itself, - appeal to an achievement-motivated individual.

What Might All These Hypotheses Mean for a - Manager?

After considering such research findings on motivation, a manager might select those -- which seem to him most significant, and most practicable, for his organization:

- 1 Motivation needs to be thought of -- both in relation to individual differences - and in the context of the total work situation.

- 2 Inner motivation to satisfy high-level needs can result in high performance on the job if these currently felt needs are satisfied.

3 Intrinsic rewards, such as recognition from within and outside the group for attainment of goals, derived from job content, can greatly stimulate inner motivation and -- therefore high performance. But extrinsic rewards, such as increased pay or promotion, -- may be seen as appeasers and annoyers if they seem unrelated to high performance.

4 "Hygiene seekers" should not be appointed to managerial positions, chiefly because (a) they are to some extent mentally ill; (b) they do not naturally plan and organize work for their subordinates so that intrinsic rewards can be attained, and (c) their juniors are likely to imitate them.

5 For purposes of placement and selection, (a) "closure seekers" should not be given top-management positions because work requirements at that organizational level do -- not characteristically permit this kind of experience; (b) "responsibility seekers" should be placed in managerial and supervisory positions because human relationships are extremely important to them; (c) instrumentalists" --who regard work as means to their own ends-- can be useful in hourly rated positions; but (d) those who become anxious and irritable, -- even under normal work pressures, are poor employment risks.

6 Supervisors can stimulate and reinforce inner motivation when they give every employee (their subordinates) the highest -- practicable degree of responsibility and control in regard to the methods by which they work.

7 Goal setting for each employee should be both career-oriented and task oriented. Progress toward each goal should be challenging for him, as well as visible and attainable. Even for rank-and-file workers, task-oriented goals can thus satisfy high-level -- as well as low-level needs.

Any manager interested in testing possible connections between job attitudes, interpersonal relationships, and high performance needs to clarify the meanings of key terms -- such as "team-work," "team spirit," "partnership," and "cooperative relationships". These terms have a core of generally accepted meanings, but they also have special -- connotations for every individual. Here is what the following terms connote to us.

TEAM RELATIONSHIPS

By teamwork we mean well-coordinated and -- effectively synchronized interaction to achieve a shared objective.