1997

Employee Motivation: What Works, What Doesn't

Michelle A. Koenig

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION:
WHAT WORKS, WHAT DOESN'T

Michelle A. Koenig, B.A.

An Abstract Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Lindenwood University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Business Administration

1997

ABSTRACT

Corporate America has seen a multitude of changes in the last century, but the change with the greatest impact is that of the employees. In the 'old' days, it was an employer's market. Employees felt lucky just to have a job. Companies did not spend time or money worrying about whether or not their employees were happy or motivated. The majority of jobs required manual labor and little or no education. This made replacing an unhappy or unmotivated worker much easier. In addition, there weren't as many U.S. or foreign companies competing for employees.

In today's competitive market, hiring and retaining the best employees is vital to a company's success. Therefore, keeping one's employees happy and motivated has become a hot topic over the last 25 years. This thesis will focus on the study of motivation, more specifically, employee motivation. However, before focusing on employee motivation, the theories of human intrinsic motivation must be understood and discussed at great

length. Unless managers understand the basics of human motivation, they will not be able to apply techniques to motivate their employees.

The purpose of this study is to determine not only what influences a person's intrinsic motivation, but extrinsic motivators as well. It will attempt to identify what works and what doesn't, so that managers will have the tools they need to develop effective motivational programs and techniques.

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION: WHAT WORKS, WHAT DOESN'T

Michelle A. Koenig, B.A.

A Culminating Project Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Lindenwood University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Business Administration

1997

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:

Associate Professor Daniel W. Kemper,
Chairperson and Advisor

Adjunct Assistant Professor Jan R. Kniffen

Adjunct Assistant Professor Lisa Boling

Table of Contents

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Motivation

Keeping employees motivated in the 1990's and beyond is becoming more and more complex. Today's corporations face tough competition and have responded by tightening their belts. In addition, downsizing and corporate mergers have had a seriously negative effect on employees' morale and motivation.

As company's ask their employees to work harder and longer hours, employees become more and more disgruntled. Thus, today's managers must reevaluate their current managerial styles as well as company compensation, incentive, appraisal, and bonus programs. Traditional programs are no longer benefiting the company or the employee. Therefore, it is necessary to study what motivates today's employee in order to make effective changes in company programs and managerial styles. However, in order to begin to understand how to motivate employees, one must first understand motivation.

Each and every scientist, researcher, and business professional agrees that motivation is an individual's emotion, desire, physiological need, or similar impulse that acts as an incitement to action. However, there is much disagreement as to what motivates people and why. For example, according to David Bain, author of <u>The Productivity Prescription</u>, there are three basic types of motivation: fear motivation, incentive motivation, and achievement motivation. Fear motivation is based on negative reinforcement, or punishment. Incentive motivation is based on positive reinforcement, or reward. Achievement motivation is based on accomplishment for its own sake (31-34).

<u>Maslow</u>

One of the most popular and well-known theories is Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs developed in 1943. According to Maslow, man has five basic needs: 1) *Physio-logical* - food, water, sleep, etc., 2) *Safety* - physical and psychological, 3) *Social* - attention, belonging, and acceptance, 4) *Esteem* - respect, recognition and achievement, and 5) *Self-Actualization* - desire to reach one's full potential. Once the lowest need is met (physiological), then the desire to satisfy the next need begins. This process continues with the highest need being self-actualization (Timpe 10).

McGregor

Another well-known theory on motivation is that of Douglas McGregor. In 1960, Douglas McGregor reinterpreted Maslow's hierarchy of needs and applied it to organizational settings. McGregor's interpretation states that due to the organizational structure of our society most Americans have essentially satisfied their physiological and safety needs. Therefore, since money and job security satisfy the lower order needs, increasing these rewards generally does not motivate employees to be more productive (Timpe 65-66).

McGregor is also responsible for developing the Theory X and Theory Y theories of management. Theory X is regarded as the "conventional" approach and assumes that human beings are inherently lazy, that people must be controlled and motivated by the fear of punishment and that they try to avoid responsibility as much as possible. In contrast, Theory Y management, known as the "behavioral" approach, assumes that physical and mental effort is as natural in a work setting as it is in a play setting, that the threat of punishment is not a viable means of inducing people to work, that a commitment to objectives is a reward in itself and that the average human being seeks responsibility rather than avoids it (66).

Herzberg

The two-factor theory, developed by Frederick Herzberg in the late 1950's, is regarded as being significant in the development of an understanding of motivation. According to Herzberg, the factors involved in producing job satisfaction are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. Therefore, since separate factors are involved, it stands to reason that the two feelings (satisfaction and dissatisfaction) are *not* opposite of each other. Thus, the opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction, but *no* job satisfaction, and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction but *no* job dissatisfaction (Timpe 270).

Herzberg identified the two factor groups as "hygiene" factors and "motivator" factors. Hygiene factors are considered basic, and deficiencies in them can create job dissatisfaction but are not capable of motivating an employee to work harder under normal circumstances. Examples of hygiene factors would be company policy and administration, supervision, inter-personal relationships, working conditions, personal life, salary, and security. Motivator factors, in contrast, are things like achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or advancement. Motivator factors are said to be capable of creating job satisfaction, but only if there is an acceptable level of hygiene factors (270).

Skinner

According to behavioral scientist B.F. Skinner, people learn to behave in ways that help them avoid unpleasant outcomes (punishment) and attain pleasant outcomes (reward or reinforcement). Additionally, people will drop or forget a behavior that produces neither. In short, behavior is determined by the consequences (Matejka 51).

Employee Motivation

The demands on organizations today are so great that they cannot operate without high commitment from their employees, but too many organizations have needlessly alienated their key resource---people. With downsizing, cost-cutting, mergers, and other changes, employees have been given the distinct feeling that they are simply costs to be trimmed. Those who are left are told to work harder to keep their jobs. They are asked to sacrifice and give up benefits. This atmosphere does not exactly inspire high morale, or a willingness to take responsibility. Instead, employees feel betrayed and have lost faith in their organizations. The effect of organizational upheaval has been an increasing distrust and the employees' decision to look out for themselves. What people want is not just higher pay and more benefits. They want to work where they are able to give their best and where work is meaningful and rewarding in a personal sense.

If organizations want more from their people, then they have to give more of what it is that employees value. The conventional wisdom that employees want only money and power must be discarded, not only because organizations can't offer these in difficult times, but also because these are not the most critical or effective motivators. Dennis Young suggests that the notion of being part of a greater whole, doing something important, and having a sense of control over the way the work is completed are critical components of feeling a connection to the organization, which is a prime motivator. Jeffe, Scott, and Tobe believe he is onto something important: people want their company and its leaders to show them respect, to treat them with dignity, to offer them jobs with meaning, to let them know what is going on, to invite them into decision making, and to offer them opportunities to control their work (23). Unlike money, these resources are not scarce, and any corporation can provide them without cost.

Although commitment cannot be bought, high-commitment firms believe they can't get commitment without healthy hard-side rewards. In other words, soft-side rewards like worker involvement, a sense of achievement, and the feeling of oneness that communion bring are not enough. To paraphrase psychologist Abraham Maslow, one can't appeal to someone's need to achieve until his belly is filled and he is made secure. That's why high commitment firms offer packages of above-average pay combined with incentives and extensive benefits (Dessler 119).

Most efforts to enhance organizational productivity look for universal motivators that can generate more motivated workers. These universal motivators range from heightened manager-employee communication and mutual involvement in decision making to bonuses, salary incentives, work redesign, and competitions. However, no one motivator will work for more than a small portion of the whole process and for a small percentage of the people. Any one motivational technique will fit certain people and it will be effective for those whom it fits. But for every person that the technique fits, it will neither fit nor motivate the great majority, and there will always be those individuals that the technique will discourage or even disable (Fletcher 17-18).

The majority of the research conducted on motivation is based on either Maslow's hierarchy of needs or Skinner's system of positive and negative reinforcement. Bain bases most of his beliefs on Maslow's needs theory, however, he also tosses in a little Skinner for good measure. According to Bain, all human behavior is caused by a person's need for structure. Human behavior can be influenced by motivating a person to fulfill needs as the person sees them. A person is not motivated by what other people think the person should want, but rather by what that person wants. Management has two ways by which it can motivate any employee. It can either get the employee to see that a desired action will increase need fulfillment, or it can convince the worker to follow a certain course of action to avoid a decreased need fulfillment. Management's power to motivate is effective only to the extent that, from the employee's point of view, management controls the means by which the employee can satisfy his needs (29).

Bain states that it is the job of managers to motivate those with whom they work to achieve higher levels of productivity. In a sense, one person can never motivate another, as motivation is an internal desire and can come only from within the person. However, with an understanding of human motivation comes the knowledge of what conditions cause people to act. This knowledge enables managers to create a climate that is favorable to getting employees to act in the desired manner (30).

Everyone agrees that motivation is the key to effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, and performance. Unfortunately for employers, modern workers are far more independent and sophisticated than their predecessors. They are better educated and more aware of management processes, failures, and motivational techniques. They demand more from employers in terms of working conditions and support. How workers are managed, what they perceive, and the realities of the environment are all important variables in determining worker motivation levels.

According to Kennish, workers have higher levels of motivation when they perceive that management cares about their welfare, when they are involved in the management process, and when the total management-worker environment is positive (22). Money is important but only relevant to short-term worker satisfaction levels. Over the long-term, workers are motivated by a sense of achievement, recognition, enjoyment of the job, promotion opportunities, responsibility, and the chance for personal growth. Control stifles motivation while involvement creates a more productive environment (22).

True worker motivation must come from within the workers themselves. If they feel they are being treated fairly and with respect, this attitude will develop and guide their behavior in a positive direction. To be motivated, workers must be excited and interested. Activities that can foster interest on the part of workers include employee participation committees, task force efforts, training programs, opportunities for outside education, newsletters, contests, and congratulatory messages from management (23).

Virtually everybody uses incentives. Virtually everybody is wrong. "What gets measured gets done." "What gets rewarded gets done more and better." "Do this and you'll get that." "Do that and this will happen to you." Hear something often enough, and it becomes conventional wisdom. Kohn not only strongly opposes these ideas, he replies with this favorite quote, "Between a carrot and a stick is a jackass" (Vogl 39).

Vogl believes that the central problem with rewards is that, like punishment, they are attempts to control people. In everyday language, rewards turn play into work, and work into drudgery, so that if people are less committed to and excited by their tasks as a result of chasing goodies, they can't very well be expected to reach quality in the process. That's not to say that people don't like to be paid, or well-paid. It means that more is going on with respect to human motivation that the quest for cash (41).

Although most corporations believe monetary incentives are the best employee motivators, studies have shown that people who are trying to earn a reward end up doing a poorer job on many tasks than people who are not. Researchers suggest that the results must be due to the fact that rewards distract people from the task at hand (Kohn 49). The underlying assumption is that there are exactly two alternatives: punitive responses or positive reinforcement, sticks or carrots, slaps or sugar plums. Rewards are less destructive than punishments, and the difference between the two becomes more important as the punishment in question becomes more harsh. According to Kohn, the troubling truth is that rewards and punishments are not opposites at all: they are two sides of the same coin. And it is a coin that does not buy very much. The long-term use of either tactic elicits the very same pattern---eventually the person in authority will need to raise the stakes and offer more and more treats or threaten more and more sanctions to get people to continue acting the way they want (50).

Not only are incentive systems and pay-for-performance plans pervasive in U.S. companies, but there exists a deep and rarely questioned commitment to the belief that offering people rewards will cause them to do a better job. The evidence, however, suggests that extrinsic motivators in the workplace are not only ineffective but are often positively counterproductive. The bottom line is that any approach that offers a reward for better performance is destined to be ineffective (119).

Making money shouldn't be the driving force in people's lives is a message that has echoed through all cultures and in all ages. Of course, everyone wants to be paid. Money buys the things people need and the things they want. Moreover, the less someone is paid---or at least, the less control he has over his own work---the more concerned he is likely to be about financial matters. As James Baldwin once remarked, "Money is like sex. We are preoccupied with it mostly when it is missing from our lives" (130).

Several studies over the last few decades have found that when people are asked to guess what matters to their coworkers, they assume money is at the top of the list. When asked what matters to them, money is fifth or sixth on the list---interesting work was number one. Other national surveys have found that people who were unhappy with their jobs pointed to reasons like the lack of variety or challenge, conflicts with coworkers or the boss, and too much pressure. Salary was not a major issue (130-131).

Extrinsic rewards become an important determinant of overall job satisfaction only among workers for whom intrinsic rewards are relatively unavailable. There is a tendency to focus by default on the size of one's paycheck when work is lacking more important features: deprive someone of a genuinely engaging and meaningful task, the capacity to exercise choice over what one does, social support, the chance to learn and to demonstrate one's competence, and that person will likely turn his attention to what he earns (131-132).

Frederick Herzberg once stated that just because too little money can irritate and demotivate does not mean that more and more money will bring about more and more satisfaction, much less more motivation to do one's best (133). The task the person performs is equally if not slightly more important than their compensation. As Herzberg once put it: "Idleness, indifference and irresponsibility are healthy responses to absurd work. If you want people motivated to do a good job, give them a good job to do" (189).

None of the aforementioned explanations offers managers a justification for being stingy in paying their employees. Everyone wants to be and should be compensated adequately and fairly. These explanations simply substantiate the belief that motivation is typically highest when the job offers an opportunity to learn new skills, to experience some variation in tasks, and to acquire and demonstrate competence. Different people prefer different levels of challenge and a different balance between predictability and novelty, but the basic points are essentially universal (190). Herzberg put it best when he said,

> Managers do not motivate employees by giving them higher wages, more benefits, or new status symbols. Rather, employees are motivated by their own inherent need to succeed at a challenging task. The manager's job, then, is not to motivate people to get them to achieve; instead, the manager should provide opportunities for people to achieve so they will become motivated. (190)

Summary

Although over 90% of corporate America uses some form of incentive or pay-for-performance plan, it appears to be the general consensus among top researchers that these types of "motivators" only work short-term and cause more problems in the long-term than their short-term benefits can justify. Researchers may disagree on the various methods of motivation (reward/punishment, achievement, etc.), but they all agree that there are no universal motivators. Every person/employee responds differently to his or her environment, and reacts to a given stimulus based upon his or her personal needs, wants, past experiences, and future goals.

Today's managers and leaders of corporate America must acknowledge that each individual will respond differently to his or her motivational techniques. In other words, no one technique will motivate all the employees. The manager must adjust his or her technique according to the individual. The purpose of this study is to take a closer look at some of the theories on motivation, to evaluate the various motivational techniques, and to determine what works and what doesn't.

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Bain's Human Need Structure

David Bain is president of his own management consulting firm and publisher of *Productivity Perspectives*, a management newsletter. Bain has served as general manager, vice president, and consultant to diverse manufacturing and distributing businesses whose annual sales have ranged from $3 million to over $1 billion.

According to Bain, all human behavior is caused by a person's need structure. Managers can influence behavior by motivating the individual to fulfill needs as the person sees them. However, managers must remember that the person is not motivated by what other people think they should want, but rather by what that person wants. Bain goes on to say that managers must also keep in mind that every person is unique. Thus, each person cannot be managed using the same technique (28-29).

Bain believes management has two ways by which it can motivate any employee. It can either 1) get the employee to see that the desired action will increase need fulfillment, or 2) convince the employee to follow a desired action to avoid a decreased need fulfillment. Bain admits that one person can never actually "motivate" another since motivation is an internal desire and can only come from within the person. However, by utilizing an understanding of human motivation, managers know what conditions cause people to act and can create a favorable environment (29-30).

Although Bain concluded that there are only two ways managers can motivate employees, he believes there are three basic types of motivation: fear motivation, incentive motivation, and achievement motivation. Fear motivation is based on negative reinforcement, or punishment. It is the ability to punish or deprive an individual or group of something they need (30). In spite of the problems involved with fear motivation, Bain insists it will always have a place in our organizations:

> It is a fundamental part of the exchange system by which the needs of both the employer and employee are satisfied. Unless employees at all levels of the organization are aware that

> failure to perform adequately will lead to undesirable consequences, the motivational structure of the organization is totally destroyed. (31)

The second type of motivation is incentive motivation which is based on positive reinforcement or reward. Bain states that although there is nothing inherently wrong with offering tangible rewards for outstanding effort, the rewards invariably become progressively less effective when they are expected to carry the primary responsibility for keeping employees motivated and productive. What motivates a person today will not necessarily motivate them tomorrow. More and more tends to be paid for less and less. As time goes on, bonuses or incentive compensation becomes expected just like a regular paycheck. According to Bain, both fear motivation and incentive motivation can be temporarily effective, but both are inherently weak because neither one touches the inner nerve of accomplishment for its own sake (32-33).

The third type of motivation is achievement motivation. Achievement motivation is based on accomplishment for its own sake, and according to Bain, the only lasting type of motivation. Achievement-motivated employees work because of the sense of challenge, accomplishment, and service to others which they feel. Managers who support achievement motivation believe in people and their potential. They encourage employees to accept responsibility and help them reach their personal goals. Using achievement motivating techniques, the manager can not only change an individual's work-related attitudes and habits for the better but can also improve organizational performance. Therefore, Bain concludes, "Without question, achievement motivation is the most powerful and lasting force a manager can use" (33-34).

Deci's Autonomy Theory

Edward L. Deci, Ph.D., is a professor of psychology at the University of Rochester and director of its human motivation program. In studying human motivation, Deci found that the proper question was not, "how can people motivate others?" but rather, "*how can people create the conditions within which others will motivate themselves?*" When the question was formulated this way, Deci's investigations repeatedly confirmed that the orientations and actions of people in positions of authority do play an important role in determining whether those they supervise will effectively motivate themselves (10).

There is no doubt that money motivates. People drag themselves to work at jobs they hate because they need the money. Employees take on additional assignments because of the extra money. They engage in a wide variety of nefarious activities that promise large sums of money. The point is that although money is motivating people, it is also undermining their *intrinsic* motivation and having a variety of other negative effects as well (27).

In 1968, psychological theoretician Richard deCharms published a book detailing an important concept he called personal causation. He believed that the key to intrinsic motivation is the desire to be the "origin" of one's own action rather than a "pawn" manipulated by external forces. His experiments suggested that rewards undermine a person's intrinsic motivation. Deci found many other studies were done over the years that supported this theory. Experiments had shown that when subjects began getting paid for doing a task they previously did strictly for their own pleasure, they lost interest. Although they continued to do the activity for money, their relation to the activity had become strained and instrumental (27-28).

The Economic Policy Institute announced that the average work year is now 158 hours longer than it was when the first intrinsic motivation experiment was performed in 1968. An extra month has been added on to what was considered a full-time job! According to Deci, money is the seducer that has expanded the work year and brought with it countless stresses and real costs to the individual. The first cost is that people lose interest in many of the activities they perform. The activity is merely an instrument for attaining monetary rewards. Deci goes on to say that as people lose contact with their inner selves, they become controlled by monetary rewards. Therefore, he believes when people say that money motivates, what they really mean is that money controls. "And when it does, people become alienated---they give up some of their authenticity---and they push themselves to do what they think they must do" (28-29).

Although experiments found some negative consequences from the use of rewards as a motivator, the research had just begun. The next step in the research was to determine what other events or circumstances might undermine people's feeling of autonomy--- making them feel controlled---thus, decreasing their intrinsic motivation. The most obvious candidate, one commonly used as a motivator that must certainly feel controlling, was threat. People threaten others all the time. For example, parents tell their children "If you don't do your homework, you can't watch television." Managers tell employees "If you don't get to work on time, you will be fired." However common, Deci reminds us that a threat is not intended to punish but instead is meant to motivate people through their desire to avoid the punishment (30-31).

Using the same general paradigm as he did in the money (reward) experiment, Deci motivated the subjects by threatening to punish them if they failed to perform well. The subjects did do well enough that they did not get punished, however, the experience was a negative one nonetheless. Other researchers, such as Mark Lepper, expanded the list of events that produce similar negative consequences to include deadlines, imposed goals, surveillance, and evaluations. All of these represent frequently used strategies for pressuring and controlling people.

People experience them as being antagonistic to their autonomy, thus undermining their intrinsic motivation (31).

At this point, Deci realized he must determine what factors might increase intrinsic motivation. After all, people cannot be and should not be allowed to do anything they please. People need some structure and limits set on their behavior, however, it must be done in a way that does not weaken their intrinsic motivation or spirit (33).

Deci decided that if controlling people decreases their feelings of autonomy or self-determination, then giving them choices about how to behave ought to enhance it. He decided to use a variant of his previous behavior experiments to prove this theory. As he expected, the subjects who were given some choice in their behavior had increased intrinsic motivation. Deci then concluded that choice 1) encourages people to fully endorse what they are doing; 2) it pulls them into the activity and allows them to feel a greater sense of volition; and 3) it decreases their alienation. In short, providing people with choice leaves them feeling as if others are responsive to them as individuals (33-34).

Although Deci takes a general stance against reliance on rewards, demands, threats, surveillance, competition, and critical evaluations as methods for motivating people's behavior, he does not by any means advocate permissiveness. Deci acknowledges the importance of goals, structures, and limit setting and believes that they must exist. However, he believes they should co-exist with autonomy support. Autonomy support means actively encouraging self-initiation, experimentation, and responsibility. It means taking the other person's perspective into consideration (42).

Being autonomy supportive requires more effort and more skill than being coercive or controlling. It can be difficult, but it is possible and it does work. As Deci proved through his experimentation, if one sets limits in an autonomy-supportive manner---in other words, by aligning yourself with the person being limited, recognizing that he or she is a proactive subject, rather than an object to be manipulated or controlled---it is possible to encourage responsibility without undermining authenticity (43).

Gellerman's Six Steps To Motivation

Saul Gellerman, Ph.D., is Professor of Management and Dean of the Graduate School of Management at the University of

Dallas. He is the author of eight books and internationally recognized as an expert on motivation.

Gellerman believes motivation is what makes the difference between people doing as little as they can get away with and doing everything they possibly can. Defining motivation exclusively in terms of its effects on productivity, Gellerman refers to motivation as the art of helping people to focus their minds and energies on doing their work as effectively as possible. In other words, it is the art of creating the conditions that allow every individual to get his work done at his own peak level of efficiency (3-4).

One common mistake managers make is believing enthusiasm and motivation are the same thing. Corporations continually send their executives to "motivational" seminars or hire "motivational" speakers to come to their company. According to Gellerman, these inspirational speakers play on emotions and have people on their feet cheering and applauding in complete excitement by the end of their talk. However, fifteen minutes later, most people will have calmed down and the effects of the "motivational" talk will have evaporated. Therefore, Gellerman believes the inspirational speakers are not motivators, but cheerleaders. Gellerman concludes, "Real motivation is the serious, never-ending task of creating conditions to which the natural response of ordinary people is to accomplish extraordinary things" (4-6).

Another tactic Gellerman believes companies confuse with motivation is making people happy. Employers sometimes sponsor programs and give people things in order to make employment fun. The purpose is to make people less argumentative and hostile. This is not motivation. It is a distraction. Gellerman agrees that it works well as a supplement to motivation, but not as a substitute for motivation. In his opinion, real motivation is not about making people happy. It is about making them productive (6-7).

According to Gellerman, defining motivation as a purely economic transaction is another common mistake in corporate America. Managers assume that effort is for sale and can be bought if the price is right. If that were true, motivation would be a simple matter of negotiating a price, striking a deal, and then making sure that the deal was kept. Unfortunately, things are not so simple. It takes a lot of money to produce a little extra effort. Thus, making money the most expensive and inefficient of all motivators. Gellerman concedes that money is a wonderful communicator, a great attention-getter, an excellent recruiter, and an all-too-effective corrupter, but a great motivator it is not. He reminds managers that money *alone* will not buy you a lot of motivation (9-10).

Gellerman's observations of motivation systems in American companies have led him to believe that the most effective ones owe their success to the following six policies:

1. selectivity in hiring,
2. generous pay and benefit programs,
3. encouragement of long-term employment,
4. flexible implementation of policies, rather than rigid rules,
5. cooperative unions, or no unions at all, and
6. a conscious policy of putting employee motivation above all other priorities. (283)

Companies that practice selective hiring are looking for the people who are easiest to motivate. They want the best and the brightest. According to Gellerman, companies attract these types of people by screening extensively and hiring so selectively that being hired by this company becomes a distinction in itself (284).

Gellerman confirms the wisdom of companies with generous compensation packages,

> The primary reason why the smartest companies pay salaries that are above the market is to be able to attract and hold people who can get more work done, and do it better, than ordinary people can. (285)

Gellerman cites several other advantages to paying higher salaries: 1) it gives the companies an abundance of applicants which permits them to select the best, 2) it decreases the likelihood of other companies luring away their employees, 3) it contributes to an elite image for the company, and 4) it makes the employees less interested in unions, and unions less interested in the employees (285).

Gellerman states that there are three understandings to the concept of long-term employment in American companies. The first is that an employee can only get fired for gross violations of written policies. If an employee's job must be eliminated due to lack of work, the employee will be retrained for another position. The second understanding is that the individual will provide honest, unremitting effort. The third understanding is that the individual should plan on having their entire career fulfilled with the company (285-286).

Long-term employment policies by themselves are no guarantee of high productivity, although Gellerman believes they have three important motivational effects. The tendency to do less work for fear of working oneself out of a job is eliminated. There is an increased willingness to do more than is normally required, and they contribute to a company's elitist image (286).

Gellerman insists that policy manuals in American companies that do the best job of motivating are brief and sparely written. They focus on general guidelines, rather than listing dos and don'ts. They rely on managers' judgement and deliberately lack spelled-out rules. There are some "thou shalt nots," but in general, it is more of a guide (286-287).

Gellerman believes employees do not need unions if the company and its management are fair, honest, and trustworthy. Contrary to popular belief, the primary reason for keeping unions out is not to keep wages down. Companies avoid unions mostly due to the restrictive work rules, the loss of the ability to fire unproductive employees, and in Gellerman's opinion, the implication that managers can't be trusted (288-290).

Gellerman states that companies who have a policy that puts employee motivation above all else must be prepared to do three things. The first is to keep everyone on payroll, even when business is slow. Realistically, this can be accomplished if the organization is kept lean. Managers should staff departments so that everyone will have plenty to do when business is bad. Thus, when business is good and everyone has too much to do, management can cover the difference with temporary help or subcontractors (290-291).

The second item that must be addressed if a company is committed to putting motivation first is avoiding morale problems. Gellerman suggests firms implement full-scale attitude surveys periodically. Then, do whatever must be done to clean up whatever problems the surveys may reveal (291).

Gellerman believes the third part of a motivation first policy is propaganda. Companies need to make sure everyone knows that the organization is committed to them and that the firm is not merely better than other employers, but different (291).

Goren's Three Needs Theory

Steven A. Goren, Ph.D., is CEO of Goren and Associates, a management consulting firm in Michigan. Dr. Goren and his associates consult for a number of organizations, including General Motors, the Veterans Administration, and Dean, Witter, Reynolds.

For years managers have believed there are only two motivators---fear and money. Both probably do motivate, but most managers misuse them and end up demotivating rather than motivating. It's a simple fact that managers are motivators. Producing nothing, their job is purely to get others to produce. According to Goren, the theory of how to motivate people is not that complicated; you simply reward them with something they need. People will always be willing to work toward something they feel they need or want (130).

Goren goes on to say that there are no unmotivated people, just people whose needs are not being met. Although people have a myriad of needs, Goren believes that there are only two or three needs on which a manager must focus.

Beyond that, management only has to provide an environment where the employee can get the rest of his needs met himself (131).

Goren states that there is one human need that is common to all of us and so overwhelmingly strong that to simply help the individual fulfill it will result in a highly motivated employee. All people have a need to feel good about themselves. Everyone wants to be happy, energetic (healthy), and productive. It is Goren's opinion that if we feel good about ourselves, all of the rest just happens. He calls this the "positive cycle". Conversely, if we don't feel good about ourselves, we will fall into a "negative cycle" and be depressed, unhappy, and unproductive (131-132).

The second need Goren believes must be met is people's need to feel they are in control. Human beings need to feel in control of their lives, even if it is only an illusion. Managers can elicit a feeling of control by bringing employees into the decision-making process and by asking their opinions about things in general. Another method used by most successful managers is to tell the employee what needs to get done and then let that person accomplish the task however he sees fit (132).

Goren believes the last need to which a manager must attend is the need to belong. As a human being, one of the worst things we can experience is aloneness. This statement is proven by the correctional system where the most severe form of punishment for the inmates is solitary confinement. The need to be with people and to be accepted by people is one of the strongest motivating forces in the workplace today (133).

Goren goes on to say that the answer to management's problems is not in quality circles, quality of work life programs, or employee involvement programs. It is not in any "people oriented" gimmick. The answer is in caring about people regardless of the form it takes. People are highly motivated to work for managers who they know care about them(136).

In summary, Goren states that people's need to get a reward or avoid punishment is tied into the three emotional needs (the need for high self-esteem, the need for control, and the need to belong). People will work or perform in a given manner in order to receive a reward or avoid a punishment. However, it is important to remember that money is not the only motivator. Some of the psychological factors discussed may be even more motivating (137).

Kohn's Three C's of Motivation

Alfie Kohn is the author of several books and dozens of articles about human behavior and education. Kohn lectures widely to teachers, parents, managers, and researchers. He has even been a guest on Oprah twice, most recently in August 97.

Kohn agrees that it is possible to get people to do something or behave in a certain way. That is what rewards, punishments, and other instruments of control are all about. However, eliciting people's *desire* to do something simply cannot be imposed. In this context, Kohn says, one cannot motivate other people. Kohn believes that all managers, teachers, or positions of authority can do is set up certain conditions that will maximize the probability of individuals developing an interest in what they are doing and remove the conditions that function as constraints (181).

Kohn suggests that the first step managers take to improving conditions for employee motivation is to eliminate incentive and pay-for-performance plans. In his opinion any system that offers a reward for better performance is destined to be ineffective. Kohn illustrates this point with the analogy that carrots are good for your eyes. This is true, but only in a very limited sense. Carrots provide carotene, which your body turns into vitamin A. Complete deprivation of vitamin A would cause night blindness. However, eating more carrots or ingesting vitamin A above the amount you need, doesn't improve your vision at all. Therefore, it is for a carrot like money: less of it may hurt, but that doesn't mean more of it will help. Another example Kohn provides is that if your regular pay were cut in half, it is reasonable to assume that the effect on your morale might be so devastating as to undermine your performance. However, this does not mean that if your pay were doubled you would do a better job than you do now (133-134).

Kohn proposes the following principles for setting compensation policy, "Pay people generously and equitably. Do your best to make sure they don't feel exploited. Then do everything in your power to help them put money out of their minds" (182).

The second step Kohn suggests corporations take in their efforts to create favorable conditions for motivating employees is to reevaluate the use of the performance appraisal. Performance appraisals are most commonly defended on the grounds that they are needed to:

1. determine how much each employee is paid or who will receive various awards and incentives;

2. make employees perform better for fear of receiving a negative evaluation or in the hope of getting a positive one;

3. sort employees on the basis of how good a job they are doing so we know whom to promote; or

4. provide feedback, discuss problems, and identify needs in order to help each employee do a better job. (184)

Kohn does not recommend eliminating the evaluations, however, he does recommend separating the entire process of providing feedback, assessing progress, and making plans from all salary determinations.

> If such sessions are to be productive, there must be no reward or punishment hanging in the balance. The fact is that no matter how sensitively conducted and constructive an evaluation may be, it becomes a counter productive force if how much people are paid depends on what is said there. (186)

Alan S. Blinder, a Princeton University economist, recently summarized his findings as follows: "Changing the way workers are treated may boost productivity more than changing the way they are paid." This statement agrees with Kohn's third step of creating the conditions for genuine motivation. Kohn suggests that there are three fundamental factors, known as the "three C's" of motivation---collaboration, content, and choice (186-187).

Collaboration, more commonly referred to as team-work, is an important factor to the success of the company and the satisfaction of the individuals. Most of the time, people are able to do a better job in a well-functioning group than they can on their own. This is due to the exchange of talent and resources that occurs as a result of cooperation, and also to the emotional support provided by the social interaction. Kohn states that people will normally be more enthusiastic when they feel a sense of belonging and see themselves as part of a community than they will in a workplace in which each person works alone and independently (187-188).

The second "C", content, is also extremely important because employees will not be motivated if they are bored with the task they are doing all day. Herzberg once put it: "Idleness, indifference and irresponsibility are healthy responses to absurd work. If you want people motivated to do a good job, give them a good job to do." Kohn expresses the same point this way,

> . . . most people who have the chance to engage in work they think of as important are profoundly committed to what they do. . . . for people to care about their work, it is necessary to attend to what the work consists of---the content, not merely the context, of a job. Motivation is typically highest when the job offers an opportunity to learn new skills, to experience some variation in tasks, and to acquire and demonstrate competence. (189-190)

Kohn suggests that the easiest way to make this change is to hire people (or reassign them) not only on the basis of what their resumes say they are most qualified to do, but also on the basis of what they *like* to do. This means allowing employees to sample a variety of jobs in the company until a good fit is found, and giving them the opportunity to transfer periodically in order to keep things interesting. Kohn also recommends restructuring jobs so they are more interesting to more people, however, this can be much more difficult than his first suggestion of reassigning people (190-191).

The third "C" is choice. Employees are most likely to become enthusiastic about what they are doing when they have the freedom to make decisions about the way the task is completed. Kohn states that managers must do more than just avoid the techniques that prohibit autonomy. Managers must take proactive steps to make sure employees have real choices about how they do their jobs. Employees are most motivated when they are able to participate in making decisions about organizational goals---even when those goals are determined by others. Kohn's theory on choice was confirmed when he reviewed forty-seven studies that measured the extent to which participation in decision-making affected productivity and job satisfaction. He found a positive effect on both, regardless of the kind of work people did (192-195).

Matejka's Three Premises, Five Steps, Two Approaches

Ken Matejka, Ph.D., is the Professor of Management at Dusquesne University's School of Business Administration in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He has also been a consultant to numerous organizations, including Hewlett-Packard, DuPont, Miller Brewing, the City of Richmond, SEC Computers, and Sovran Bank. Matejka believes there are three basic premises for managing human performance. The first is an adaptation from the thoughts of B.F. Skinner:

> *Premise 1*: Almost all employee behavior is purposeful and designed to bring employees the

> most pleasure and/or least pain, given (1) their perception of the options available to them, (2) their perception of the potential consequences for each action, and (3) their expectations regarding the behavior of others, especially that of their immediate supervisors. (1)

Matejka's second premise states that the solutions to most organizational problems are obvious to almost everyone involved, however, nothing much is done towards a resolution because continuation of the problem is actually preferable to the alternatives. His third and final premise is simply that ownership and vision build commitment (2-3).

Using the three aforementioned premises as a basis, Matejka believes there are five steps in the path to human performance:

1. *The Contradictions*. Assess what you are doing instead of what you know you should be doing.

2. *The Consequences*. Motivate through clear targets, rewards, and disciplines.

3. *The Contacts*. Communicate consequences effectively.

4. *The Contraries*. Assess and manage the problem, people, including yourselves.

5. *The Commitments.* Manage employee participation, development, involvement, and ownership. (5)

In order to effectively manage people at work, one must understand two basic approaches. The first approach focuses on understanding how motivation occurs. The second approach concentrates on understanding what motivates. Matejka provides a great example from his own life as to how the five step process in conjunction with the two basic approaches can make a difference.

> . . . I guess it's just the models provided by my professors and my own conditioning, but for fifteen years I ended my university classes by asking if there were any questions. How mindless that was! Who was motivated by this exercise? Me! Most of the students were motivated to leave for their next class. If a student asked a question, he was often perceived as a villain by his classmates. The social pressure in the room was to be quiet so we could leave on time (or a little early) and get to our next class or work situation. The inquisitive student kept the class late and was punished by his peers in the hall afterwards. Rather than admonishing the class for not being willing to participate, I finally saw the ludicrousness of my request. Now, I simply announce that as soon as I get three good questions we will leave. The inquisitive student now becomes a hero or heroine for (1) facilitating the class's learning while (2) facilitating its leaving. Life is so simple if you think about it! (4-5)

Matejka believes the single most useful and powerful tool for changing or maintaining behavior at work is the art of managing rewards and punishments. Simplified, *behavior is determined by the consequences*. Every person will try to maximize his pleasure and minimize his pain. B.F. Skinner, the founder of this approach, states that people tend to repeat behavior that is rewarded, avoid behavior that is punished, and drop or forget behavior that produces neither (51).

Organizational Behavior Modification by Fred Luthans is a program that focuses on the management of consequences in the organizational environment. The program sets goals, monitors the work behavior, and applies consequences to elicit the behavior the manager considers desirable (52). Managers are continually shaping worker behavior by their actions, reactions, or lack of actions. Most managers think there are only two possible methods to motivate employees---rewarding or punishing. However, Matejka states that there are two distinct ways to reward and two separate ways to punish.

A manager can reward an employee by either 1) adding a consequence that the employee finds pleasant, or 2) taking away a consequence that the employee finds unpleasant. In either case, the employee's work life is enhanced in exchange for some behavior the manager finds desirable. The only word of caution in the use of rewards is that the pleasantness (reward) is determined by the *employee's* perception, *not* the manager's. Managers usually select what they would want and assume their employees would want it also. This may not be the case. The employee's perception of the consequence used will determine whether the action is rewarding and *how* pleasant or rewarding it is (53-56).

Just as there are two ways to reward, there are two ways to punish. A manager can punish or discipline an employee by either 1) adding a consequence that the employee finds unpleasant, or 2) taking away something the employee finds pleasant. Punishment (discipline) is complex and controversial. In organizations, Matejka believes punishment should only be used when rewards have been exhausted. However, he goes on to say that punishment can be instructive and helpful when properly administered and reminds managers that the goal of punishment is improvement, *not* retribution. Therefore, in order to punish effectively and remove most of the guilt associated with being the punisher, Matejka suggests that managers adopt the following ten rules:

1. Use punishment sparingly and only when you are unable to get the desired behavior through either of the two reward strategies.

2. Be very clear about defining and communicating exactly what is desirable and undesirable work behavior.

3. Make sure the punishment is connected to a specific, observable, performance-related behavior.

4. Tell employees *why* the behavior is undesirable, *how* the behavior can be changed, and *what* the alternative behaviors are.

5. Make sure that the consequences of a particular behavior were clearly understood before you punish and that the employee knows that you mean what you say.

6. Apply the punishment as immediately after the undesirable behavior as possible to decrease confusion and increase the effectiveness of the punishment.

7. Make the punishment appropriate to the crime.

8. Apply the punishment consistently across your work force.

9. Try to punish in private.

10. Try not to follow punishment with a free reward---consoling (57-62).

Wendover's Five Factor Theory

Robert W. Wendover is an instructor for the University of Colorado and on the adjunct faculty of the University of Phoenix. He has spent more than twelve years advising top companies on how to motivate employees and as an author/researcher produces more than a dozen articles per year for national and local publications.

According to Wendover, motivating people is not a complicated, time-consuming process. It does, however, require keen observational skills and the ability to organize the information you gather about others. Every person's motivation is a result of his or her experiences, perceptions, and attitudes. You cannot force other people to be motivated, but you can provide the stimulus for them to motivate themselves (5).

Wendover believes the key to understanding a person's motivation is by listening and observing. The comments an employee makes in the office, during meetings, or to others over lunch can provide valuable keys to the nature of his or her self-talk. Self-talk is the voice one uses to talk to themselves as they go through the day. Each individual reveals his or her attitudes by using self-talk (6-9).

How he or she acts, the decisions he or she makes, and the quality of work can also help managers understand what is going on inside the employee's head. If a manager takes these observations and adds them to the information they already know about the worker, he or she will develop a detailed picture of how to best motivate that employee. Wendover understands that today's managers don't have the time to sit down with each employee for hours to figure out what makes them tick. Therefore, managers must accomplish this through observing and interacting with their employees repeatedly, but for just minutes at a time (9-11).

Wendover reminds managers that they should never assume their employees see a situation the same way they see it. What inspires one person may completely turn off someone else. To be a good motivator, a manager must develop the ability to keep his or her values separate from those of his or her co-workers. Above all, managers must be consistent and sincere when trying to motivate others (13-14).

Wendover's two minute motivational process consists of three stages. The first stage is to consider the individual's actions and attitudes as they are revealed in the workplace. The second stage is for the manager to consider how his or her actions and attitudes influence his or her ability to motivate other people. The third stage is to consider the employee's reaction to the attempted motivation technique (17).

Every individual has a different set of experiences. That person's perceptions of the workplace are based on those experiences. In trying to motivate employees, Wendover believes it is the managers job to discover which variables impact each person within the organization and how these variables affect their behavior (33). He goes on to say that inspiring motivation in others is both an opportunity and a risk. If a manager succeeds in motivating an individual, they will also arouse that individual's interest and productivity. If the manager fails to motivate that person, he or she runs the risk of losing their effectiveness as a supervisor (93).

According to Wendover, employee motivation in the workplace depends on five factors: 1) job content; 2) personal values and experiences; 3) physical environment; 4) perceptions of co-workers; and 5) observations about the person motivating him or her. He goes on to say that a manager's ability to motivate depends on six factors: 1) understanding the person's job content; 2) observations about him or her; 3) personal values and experiences; 4) physical environment; 5) perceptions of co-workers; and 6) results of past efforts to motivate (111-112).

Wendover concludes that motivation does not mean creating cash incentives (though he admits money can help motivate people). In his opinion, motivation means giving people the opportunity to express themselves and to feel a sense of accomplishment, contribution, and value (122).

Summary

The experts all agree on two facts. The first fact is that motivation comes from within. One person cannot motivate another person. They can only provide the conditions or stimulus that will enable the individual to motivate themselves.

The second fact is that every person is a unique individual and thus, there are no black and white answers in the quest to find a motivational system that works for everyone. One technique may work well on person A, a little on person B, and not at all on person C. Therefore, this research will most likely prove that there is *not* a finite number of motivational techniques. If a person wants to be a good motivator, he or she will have to not only understand human behavior, but be intuitive, flexible, and creative in developing a motivational system.

Chapter III

SELECTIVE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

A Quick Review

As a doctoral student of psychology in 1969, Deci became captivated by the question of what happens to people's curiosity and vitality over time. Behaviorists believe that there is no inherent motivation to learn. People are fundamentally passive and will respond only when the environment tempts them with the opportunity to get rewards or avoid punishments. Deci disagreed and cited the following as proof:

> . . . but this does not square with the fact that young children---in preschools and at home---ceaselessly explore and manipulate the objects they encounter. They challenge themselves to become competent, apparently just for the enjoyment of doing it. Children are not passively waiting to be drawn into learning by the offer of rewards but rather are actively engaged in the process of learning. Indeed, they are *intrinsically motivated* to learn. (20)

Deci also concluded that intrinsic motivation describes the behavior of all people who engage in a variety of activities (like hobbies and leisure pursuits) simply for the feelings of excitement, accomplishment, and personal satisfaction they yield. With this concept in mind, Deci set out to determine what kinds of experiences affect people's intrinsic motivation. More specifically, Deci wanted to know what happens to people's intrinsic motivation for an activity when they receive an extrinsic reward for doing the activity that they had previously been willing to do without the reward (21-22).

To do the experiment, Deci used a puzzle by Parker Brothers called Soma. The puzzle had seven pieces, each shaped differently, and when fitted together in a specific way, it formed a three-inch cube. In addition, there were thousands of different ways the pieces could be assembled to form a variety of patterns. Some of the shapes were simple to assemble, others were very difficult. The fun came in the feeling of accomplishment when reproducing the designs. Soma was perfect because it allowed flexibility for experimental purposes: the same pieces could form many different designs; the difficulty level could be varied as needed; impossible patterns could be made to look easy; and, most importantly, Soma was challenging and interesting. Pilot testing revealed that students loved the puzzles and would do them just for fun. In the experiment, subjects were shown several designs on paper and were asked to try to reproduce them in three-dimensional space using the actual puzzle pieces (23-24).

In a second experiment Deci persuaded the editor of the school newspaper to put him in charge of headline writing---an interesting activity students had been doing for free. Deci started paying some of them for doing it, while the others still got nothing. After a few weeks, Deci stopped paying the students and measured their intrinsic motivation in hopes that he would find support to his theory that once people get paid for doing an activity, if the payment is stopped, their interest in the activity will decrease. Deci recounts an old Jewish fable:

> It seems that bigots were eager to rid their town of a Jewish man who had opened a tailor shop on Main Street, so they sent a group of rowdies to harass the tailor. Each day, the ruffians would show up to jeer. The situation was grim, but the tailor was ingenious. One day when the hoodlums arrived, he gave each of them a dime for their efforts. Delighted, they shouted their insults and moved on. The next day they returned to shout, expecting their dime. But the tailor said he could afford only a nickel and proceeded to hand a nickel to each of them. Well, they were a bit disappointed, but a nickel is after all a nickel, so they took it, did their jeering, and left. The next day, they returned once again, and the tailor said

> he had only a penny for them and held out his hand. Indignant, the young toughs sneered and proclaimed that they would certainly not spend their time jeering at him for a measly penny. So they didn't. And all was well for the tailor. (26)

Deci's experiments and the Jewish fable display the power of money. Money causes people to lose interest in many of the activities they perform. They begin to see the activities merely as instruments for attaining monetary rewards and lose the excitement and vitality they once had for the activity itself. Deci believes that when people say that money motivates, what they really mean is that money controls. It causes people to become alienated---to give up some of their authenticity---and they push themselves to do what they think they must do (29).

It is the general consensus of many researchers that any occurrence that undermines people's feeling of autonomy (that leaves them feeling controlled) will decrease their intrinsic motivation and most likely have other negative consequences. Edward Deci was the first to formally investigate the effects of external incentives on intrinsic motivation to perform an activity.

Deci's research consisted of three separate experiments that established the basic paradigm which subsequent researchers in the area have followed. These steps include: 1) assessing subjects' levels of interest in the experimental activity, 2) randomly dividing subjects into two groups in which one expects and receives external incentives for engaging in the experimental activity and the other neither expects nor receives such incentives, and 3) re-assessing subject interest in the activity after task participation. In order to assess interest in the activity, the amount of time subjects spend reengaging in the experimental task from the first to the second assessment serves as the primary measure of the effects of reward on intrinsic interest (Fair 3).

The Experiments

In Deci's initial experiment two groups of twelve subjects each worked on puzzles indicated to be interesting to college students by the results of pilot work and questionnaires administered. One group was offered one dollar for each puzzle solved, while the other group was not offered and did not receive incentives. Three sessions were conducted. To assess intrinsic motivation the experimenter left the room for eight minutes in the middle of each session under the pretext of needing to computer analyze the data from the experiment. While the experimenter was gone subjects were instructed that they could do whatever they liked. In addition to the puzzles, magazines were available. The experimenter then measured the amount of time during the eight minute free-choice situation that the subjects spent manipulating the puzzles (Fair 4).

The second experiment Deci conducted was a field replication of the first. Eight subjects were employed and a different task, writing headlines, was utilized. In this experiment four college newspaper staff writers were paid fifty cents per head line, while the other four received no pay. Deci recorded the time it took subjects to write each headline and used it as the measure of motivation. Deci assumed that the more quickly a subject performed, the more highly motivated he was to do the task. After three weeks, paid subjects were told that all funds had been exhausted and they would no longer be paid for writing headlines. Deci then measured the change in these subjects' interest or productivity (Fair 5).

The third experiment in the 1971 series was a direct replication of the first with the exception that verbal praise such as "that's very good" instead of money was used as the extrinsic incentive. Once again, the measure of intrinsic interest was the amount of time spent working on the puzzles during a free-choice period. Due to the differing effects of verbal and monetary incentives, Deci conducted another replication in 1972 using a three-factor design. Ninety-six college students participated in a one-hour session solving puzzles. The first variable was verbal reinforcement with two levels, reinforcement or no reinforcement. The second variable was money. Subjects either received no money, received one dollar for each puzzle solved before the 8-minute free-choice period, or received money after the free-choice period. The third variable was the subjects' sex. In addition, Deci examined the effects of contingent and noncontingent rewards on motivation. To do this, experimental subjects were paid two dollars (noncontingent reward) regardless of their performance on puzzles, while control subjects received no pay. Additionally, Deci studied the threat of punishment for poor performance and the effects of positive and negative feedback upon performance (Fair 5-6).

In two experiments with college students and office workers, a researcher named Overskeid examined the effect of reward size and choice on subjective autonomy and interest in an initially uninteresting task. To test the hypothesis that rewards increase rather than decrease subjective autonomy, Overskeid asked participants to play with a puzzle that did not interest them very much, and then measured their subjective autonomy and interest in the puzzle. To separate the effects of reward from reduced autonomy caused by instructions, different groups of subjects performed the task with or without reward under choice and no-choice conditions. Thirty participants were randomly assigned to one of the three following conditions: 1) Choice + reward, 2) No choice + reward, and 3) No choice, no reward. The first part of the instructions was the same for all participants:

> You are going to take part in an experiment in which we are interested in the things that people think and feel during the performance of an every-day activity. Let me show you this puzzle, called Gripple. Gripple is a puzzle in which you can arrange different patterns by turning these platforms (experimenter demonstrates). (321)

After the puzzle had been explained and the participants had a chance to get to know it for about 1 minute, they were asked to indicate their interest in Gripple by marking a visual analog scale

(VAS). Subsequently, the following instructions were given to the participants in the choice + reward condition:

> What you choose to do in this room is totally up to you, except that you should not take out things that you may have brought with you. You can sit here and entertain yourself with the Gripple puzzle if you like. If you want to, you can read the magazines, but you do not have to do anything at all. It is up to you. Your thoughts and feelings are the things that interest us, not what you do. Nevertheless, because it also interests us to see what significance a reward could have for your thoughts and feelings, you will, if you choose to play Gripple for 20 minutes, receive these three instant lottery tickets afterwards (experimenter shows participant the lottery tickets). In case you do choose Gripple, it is not interesting to us whether you choose to form specific patterns or not. The point is to engage in an activity. But as I told you, we will be as interested if you do not choose Gripple. (322)

Participants in the no choice + reward conditions were instructed as follows:

> Your task in this room is to play Gripple. For playing Gripple during the 20 minutes that the experiment will last, you will receive these three instant lottery tickets afterwards (experimenter shows participant the lottery tickets). It is not interesting to us whether you choose to form specific patterns or not. The point is to engage in this activity. (322)

Participants in the no choice, no reward condition were instructed as follows: "Your task in this room is to play Gripple. It is not interesting to us whether you choose to form specific patterns or not. The point is to engage in this activity". Finally, all participants were told the following: "When the 20 minutes are over, you will be given some questions. Do you have any questions for me now?" Questions were answered by repeating relevant passages from the instructions. Participants in the no choice + reward and no choice, no reward conditions were then asked to start playing Gripple until the experimenter told them it was time to stop. Participants in the choice + reward condition were told to go ahead and do what they felt like doing (322).

After 20 minutes, the experimenter told them that the experiment was over, and that he had to go and get the questionnaire and would be back in 5 or 6 minutes. During the 6 minute period that the experimenter stayed away, participants behavior was recorded on video cameras by a person blind to the experimental conditions. Upon the experimenters return, all participants were asked again to rate Gripple on VAS. They were also asked to rate on VAS if they felt they had a choice or no choice in playing with Gripple (323).

In order to expand upon the results of the first experiment, Overskeid performed a second experiment utilizing the boring game of Gripple. The procedures were exactly the same, however, this time participants were randomly assigned to one of six conditions: 1) choice, no reward; 2) choice, low reward; 3) choice, high reward; 4) no choice, no reward; 5) no choice, low reward; and 6) no choice high reward (325-326).

According to cognitive evaluation theory by Deci and Ryan in 1985, factors that influence people's feelings of self-determination (autonomy) and competence also influence their intrinsic motivation. Supervisory style has been found to be one such factor. Studies indicate that when teachers or parents are autonomy supportive, children's feelings of competence and intrinsic motivation are enhanced relative to those of children who were supervised by controlling adults. Most researchers have examined the effects of only one type of controlling style, the punitive controlling style, on intrinsic motivation.

The punitive controlling style involves the use of punishment or threats by the supervisor. It is necessary to compare the punitive controlling style to a nonpunitive controlling style. In addition, most researchers have not studied whether or not an autonomy supportive style increases intrinsic motivation relative to a neutral supervisory style. The only comparisons made are between a controlling style and an autonomy supportive style.

Richer and Vallerand decided to compare the effects of three supervisory styles---autonomy supportive, nonpunitive controlling, and punitive controlling---on subordinates feelings of self-determination and competence, and on their intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In addition, they explored the effects of the supervisory styles in relation to the types of tasks---interesting or boring (2-3).

Richer and Vallerand's first experiment consisted of a group of 125 graduate students who completed a questionnaire that was administered by two trained experimenters, according to standardized instructions. All responses were anonymous and confidential. The questionnaire included three hypothetical scenarios that contained 22 questions each. The three scenarios were presented in two random orders. Five dependent variables---intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, feelings of competence, feelings of self-determination, and perceptions of autonomy support from one's supervisor---were assessed on a 7-point scale (3-4).

Richer and Vallerand conducted a second study, this time using a control group in the form of a neutral supervisory style. The participants were 40 athletes who were members of a swim club. The subjects were told that the purpose of the questionnaire was to provide information about athletes attitudes and behaviors concerning competitive swimming with respect to various supervisory styles. All responses were anonymous and confidential. The first part of the questionnaire assessed the athletes general level of motivation toward swimming. The second part of the questionnaire included three scenarios with 20 questions each. Five dependent variables were assessed in each scenario---intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, feelings of self-determination and competence, and perceptions of supervisory style (5-6).

Evaluation/Discussion

The most widely used definition of intrinsic motivation in literature refers to Deci's conclusion that a person is intrinsically motivated if he performs an activity for no apparent reward except the activity itself. This definition has led to the commonly used free-time operationalization of intrinsic motivation, Richer and Vallerand conducted a second study, this time using a control group in the form of a neutral supervisory style. The participants were 40 athletes who were members of a swim club. The subjects were told that the purpose of the questionnaire was to provide information about athletes attitudes and behaviors concerning competitive swimming with respect to various supervisory styles. All responses were anonymous and confidential. The first part of the questionnaire assessed the athletes general level of motivation toward swimming. The second part of the questionnaire included three scenarios with 20 questions each. Five dependent variables were assessed in each scenario---intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, feelings of self-determination and competence, and perceptions of supervisory style (5-6).

Evaluation/Discussion

The most widely used definition of intrinsic motivation in literature refers to Deci's conclusion that a person is intrinsically motivated if he performs an activity for no apparent reward except the activity itself. This definition has led to the commonly used free-time operationalization of intrinsic motivation, in which subjects are confronted with an interesting problem-solving task, often a Soma (Rubik) cube puzzle-game, and are asked to solve a series of puzzles under various extrinsic reward conditions. The experiment is then interrupted and subjects are led to believe that the experiment is finished and that the experimenter needs to retrieve some forms or perform a few calculations. Subjects are left by themselves with nothing specific to do while waiting for the experimenter to return. Recent issues of several magazines, and whatever materials were used during the experiment are left in the room. No extrinsic rewards are offered for any activity in the free-time period. To obtain the dependent measure of motivation the experimenter observes the subject secretly through a one-way mirror and records the amount of time the subject continues to work on the puzzle. Subjects who work on the puzzles during the free-time period are presumed to be intrinsically motivated because they could have been doing other things.

Deci explained these findings with cognitive evaluation theory, that is, intrinsic motivation declines when one has the self-perception that one's behavior is under external rather than internal control. However, the difference between measuring task behavior during a free-time period as opposed to measuring task performance during the experimental session is important.

A key difference between the two measures concerns the timing of the extrinsic reward. A second important difference is the degree to which the subject knows that his or her behavior is being recorded. The free-time measure is less obtrusive than the performance measure. The degree to which a measure is obtrusive can have important consequences for the outcome of an experiment. A third difference between the two measures concerns the issue of choice. Task performance measures have no element of choice. How long one persists in a given activity will vary depending upon the alternatives available in the situation. Therefore, it is conceivable that more attractive alternatives (such as watching television) could have changed the results of studies using free-time or free-choice measures.

In addition, the external validity of the free-time or free-choice measure is questionable. If a laboratory session is magnified and compared to a day's work, then the free-time period would logically correspond to analyzing work behavior during a coffee break, lunch break, or at the end of the day when work is over.

A second manner in which the free-time measure differs significantly from an applied setting concerns the extrinsic reward contingency. There is a contract of labor in exchange for money in a business setting. An employee may fail to get an anticipated raise, but his or her extrinsic monetary reward will never be entirely withdrawn. By definition, the free-time measure means that the extrinsic reward is withdrawn and the contract is broken. Thus, it cannot be determined that extrinsic rewards decrease intrinsic motivation; it can only be concluded that withdrawing a previously administered extrinsic reward may decrease intrinsic motivation.

Third, the free-time measure stems from the theoretical definition that intrinsic motivation occurs when an activity is performed for no apparent reward except the activity itself. In a work environment one cannot be sure that behavior performed in the absence of immediate extrinsic rewards is intrinsically motivated. It may be that the individual behaves in a certain manner without immediate rewards because he or she expects to receive some kind of extrinsic reward in the future (i.e. paycheck, bonus, promotion or perk).

During Deci's experiment with the headline writers, he made the assumption that the faster the person wrote the headlines the more motivated that person must be. This assumption is dangerous since it does not allow for variations in an individual's skill level, the creativity of the headline, nor the difficulty of the subject matter. An individual's productivity or quantity of output does not necessarily reflect their level of interest or intrinsic motivation. Therefore, the results from this experiment may not be interpreted accurately without those factors being taken into consideration as well.

Since Overskeid's experiments followed the same basic design as Deci's, the free-choice measure is subject to the same validity questions previously discussed. However, in contrast to Deci, Overskeid sought to prove that rewards increase motivation for an uninteresting activity and that the size of the reward makes a difference.

Richer and Vallerand's research consisted of carefully designed questionnaires. There were no rewards and no free-time measurements. Subjects were asked to simply respond to each scenario honestly. Their goal was to measure the impact of supervisory styles on an individual's feelings of autonomy, self-determination, and competence.

The most respected researchers in the world all agree that no matter how perfectly designed and methodically performed, the results of lab experiments must always be scrutinized at length. And, unless the results can be reproduced over and over in study after study, they should not be considered fact or accurate. In addition, a controlled lab experiment may or may not have the same result in a 'real-world' environment. Thus, one must remember that a lot of scientific research results are not black and white fact, even if they are presented that way.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

Examining the free-choice data from Deci's initial experiments, the results indicated that when the monetary incentives were introduced the rewarded subjects spent more time working on the puzzles in the free-choice period. However, when the money was no longer offered, time spent working on the puzzles dropped below baseline measures (Fair 4).

The results of Deci's second experiment utilizing headline writers concluded that paid subjects showed an initial increase in performance, but this trend did not continue after the monetary reward was removed. However, the unpaid subjects tended to increase performance by writing headlines faster than the subjects who were paid for three of the four week study (Fair 5).

Deci's third experiment using verbal praise as the extrinsic reward resulted in no significant differences between the groups in terms of time spent with the experimental task or on interest ratings taken at the end of each session. The third experiment suggested that verbal incentives do not have the same effect on intrinsic interest as do monetary incentives (Fair 5).

Due to the differing results of verbal and monetary incentives upon intrinsic interest, Deci conducted another experiment utilizing both. The results lent support to Deci's hypothesis that when a person is rewarded with money for performing an intrinsically motivated activity the intrinsic motivation would decrease. Consistent with the results of experiment 3 in the 1971 series, verbally reinforcing subjects for working a puzzle did not have a negative effect on intrinsic motivation. Although there was no significant main effect for sex, verbal reinforcement increased male subjects intrinsic motivation but had no effect on female subject intrinsic motivation. There was no significant difference between the control group and the group that received both money and verbal reinforcements. Deci concluded that when both types of reward are present they counteract each other; however, prolonged experience with monetary rewards tended to decrease intrinsic motivation in spite of verbal reinforcement (Fair 6).

The results of Deci's experiments examining the effects of contingent and noncontingent rewards on intrinsic motivation indicated that when monetary rewards were made contingent upon performance the subjects' intrinsic motivation decreased, whereas when monetary rewards were not contingent upon performance, intrinsic motivation did not decrease. In addition, subjects who received verbal rewards were more intrinsically motivated than subjects who received no rewards, and negative feedback and threats of punishment for poor performance resulted in a decrease in intrinsic motivation (Fair 6).

The results of Overskeid's first experiment involving an uninteresting puzzle indicated that participants in the choice + reward and the no choice + reward groups felt significantly more autonomous than the no reward group. The promise of a reward increased subjective autonomy (324).

Examining the data from Overskeid's second experiment, the results were as expected. The groups given a choice felt more autonomous than those instructed to play. However, participants promised a high reward demonstrated greater feelings of autonomy relative to those who received no, or only a low reward---regardless of whether participants were instructed to engage in the task or allowed to choose. No correlation was found between autonomy and interest measures, nor between reward size and interest (327).

The results of Richer and Vallerand's first experiment with supervision styles indicated that the three styles of supervision were perceived as expected: the autonomy-supportive supervisor was perceived as more supportive than the non-punitive-controlling supervisor, and the non-punitive-controlling supervisor was perceived as more supportive than the punitive-controlling supervisor. This finding is consistent with previous research indicating that an autonomy-supportive style leads to positive effects on subordinates intrinsic motivation and perceptions of competence and self-determination. It appears that the degree of control exercised by the supervisor is what affected the level of subordinates intrinsic motivation (4-5).

Richer and Vallerand's second experiment utilized a control group. Consistent with their first experiment, the results showed that intrinsic motivation and associated feelings of competence and self-determination were lower in a punitive-controlling situation than in a neutral or autonomy supportive situation. However, intrinsic motivation was not higher in the autonomy-supportive condition than in the neutral condition. Thus, demonstrating that an autonomy-supportive supervisory style does not increase subordinates' intrinsic motivation, and that a controlling supervisory style decreases subordinates' intrinsic motivation (9-10).

The main reason people are interested in motivation research is so that they can get subordinates (whether children, employees, or students) to do a desired function or task. Focusing on the business environment, employee motivation is critical not only for task completion, but for employee retention and productivity. Businesses must understand how to satisfy their employees needs in order to remain competitive in the market. A corporation is only as good as its employees.

A survey was sent to thousands of employees, supervisors and managers. It was entitled "*What Do People Want From Their Jobs?*" and consisted of a list of ten items that related to job satisfaction. Employees were asked to rank the items in order of importance, with the most important factor being #1 and the least important factor #10. Supervisors and managers were asked to rank the same items in the order of importance to their subordinates/employees. The results of the employee and manager surveys were as follows:

Employees Want:

1. Full appreciation of work done
2. Feeling of being in on things
3. Help on personal problems
4. Job security
5. High wages
6. Interesting work
7. Promotion in the company
8. Personal loyalty of supervisor
9. Good working conditions
10. Tactful discipline

Managers Think Employees Want:

1. High wages
2. Job security
3. Promotion in the company
4. Good working conditions
5. Interesting work
6. Personal loyalty of supervisor
7. Tactful discipline
8. Full appreciation of work done
9. Help on personal problems
10. Feeling of being in on things (Lane 4:12-13).

Note that the top three items marked by the employees are the last three felt to be important for them by the managers.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION

Summary

This study summarizes the findings of research concerning the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation that has been published in psychological literature, business periodicals, and books. The theory that contingently applied extrinsic rewards reduce intrinsic motivation is supported when task behavior is measured during a free-choice period. However, it is not supported when task performance is measured while the extrinsic reward is in effect. The results of both field and laboratory studies indicate that experiments which use performance measures show that extrinsic rewards have an additive effect on motivation. Whereas, experiments that measure free-time indicate a decrease in intrinsic motivation. The lack of convergence between the two measures suggests that different constructs may be being measured and that the two measures should not be used interchangeably as operationalizations of intrinsic motivation.

It is the general consensus of many researchers that any occurrence that undermines people's feeling of autonomy (that leaves them feeling controlled) will decrease their intrinsic motivation and most likely have other negative consequences. Edward Deci was the first to formally investigate the effects of external incentives on intrinsic motivation to perform an activity. In order to assess interest in the activity, the amount of time subjects spend reengaging in the experimental task from the first to the second assessment serves as the primary measure of the effects of reward on intrinsic interest.

For example, the results of Deci's first experiments indicated that when subjects were rewarded for playing with the puzzles, they did not play with the puzzles during the free-choice period. Thus, their intrinsic motivation decreased due to the extrinsic reward. Deci's next experiment using the headline writers gave similar results. Those rewarded or paid for writing the headlines displayed an increase in performance while they were paid. However, once the money was taken away, their performance decreased. This result displays the additive effect of reward on task performance and the negative effect of reward on intrinsic motivation once the reward is taken away. These findings can be interpreted as demonstrating that contingently paid subjects lose intrinsic interest in the activity because of their reevaluation of the activity produced by the perception that their performance is motivated by money rather than an internal desire to participate.

Although Deci expanded his experiments to verbal and monetary rewards and contingent and noncontingent rewards, he continued to measure intrinsic motivation by the free-choice period. These experiments concluded that noncontingent rewards, whether monetary or verbal, had no effect on intrinsic motivation, and contingent monetary rewards decreased intrinsic motivation.

It has been hypothesized that when an individual's intrinsic interest is reduced by the presence of rewards, this occurs because the rewards have reduced their subjective autonomy. It is believed that human beings have a need to feel autonomous. In two experiments with college students and office workers, a researcher named Overskeid examined the effect of reward size and choice on subjective autonomy and interest in an initially uninteresting task. To test the hypothesis that rewards increase rather than decrease subjective autonomy, Overskeid asked participants to play with a puzzle that did not interest them very much, and then measured their subjective autonomy and interest in the puzzle. To separate the effects of reward from reduced autonomy caused by instructions, different groups of subjects performed the task with or without reward under choice and no-choice conditions. Overskeid's research concluded that subjective autonomy was increased if a reward was promised, regardless of whether or not the person was given a choice. The higher the reward, the more autonomous the individual felt; even if they had no choice in the situation.

According to cognitive evaluation theory by Deci and Ryan, factors that influence people's feelings of self-determination (autonomy) and competence also influence their intrinsic motivation. Supervisory style has been found to be one such factor. Studies indicate that when teachers or parents are autonomy supportive, children's feelings of competence and intrinsic motivation are enhanced relative to those of children who were supervised by controlling adults.

Richer and Vallerand's experiments focused on supervisory styles. Their results indicated that although a controlling supervisory style decreases intrinsic motivation, an autonomy-supportive supervisory style does not increase intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is higher in an autonomy-supportive environment than in a controlling environment, however, it is the same in a neutral environment. Thus, disproving previous statements that an autonomy-supportive style has a positive effect on intrinsic motivation. When, in fact, it has no effect at all. This is valuable information for managers, teachers and parents. Although an autonomy-supportive environment does not increase intrinsic motivation, it does not decrease it like a controlling environment. Therefore, authoritarians who find it difficult to be autonomy-supportive can have the same effect by being neutral or noncontrolling.

The most important, straight-forward, indisputable research found during this thesis is the "*What Do People Want From Their Jobs?*" survey. Thousands of people were surveyed from all walks of life. The survey listed ten job related factors and asked the participant to rank them from #1 being the most important to #10 being the least important. Managers were asked to complete the survey twice. First, they must complete it from their point of view. Second, they must complete it from the perspective of what they think their employees want.

The results showed that the three factors employees valued the most (1. Full appreciation of work, 2. Feeling of being in on things, and 3. Help on personal problems), were the last three management thought they valued. Management believed that high wages, job security, and promotion in the company were the three factors employees valued the most.

It is no wonder corporations have such discontented and unsatisfied employees. Management and employees are on opposite ends of the playing field. It would be beneficial for all companies to take the time to find out what their employees want, instead of making unfounded assumptions. A few simple surveys can determine if management and its employees are on the right track, or heading in opposite directions. For example, a corporation may spend thousands of dollars on a complex awards program, when the employees would rather have an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) that could help them with personal or family problems. The bottom line is that no matter how great management thinks a reward or program is, it is only as great as the perception of the recipient(s). If the employee(s) don't feel the reward or program is valuable, then it is going to do more harm than good.

As originally hypothesized and subsequently proven, employee motivation is extremely complex. No one program or one approach will work for all employees. Each employee has to be evaluated and treated as an individual. Managers need to stop projecting their opinions of what they think their employees want and start asking them. Where one employee might value time off as a reward for a job well done, another may be more motivated by a cash bonus or an award. The trick to motivating one's employees is knowing *what* motivates *them*. Managers should never assume that what he or she finds motivating will motivate their employees. As with any relationship, communication is the key to success.

Limitations

The limitations of intrinsic motivation research must be noted. The most commonly used definition of intrinsic motivation is that a person is intrinsically motivated if he or she performs an activity for no apparent reward except the activity itself. This definition led to the widely used free-time operationalization of intrinsic motivation, in which a subject's intrinsic motivation is measured by the amount of time spent engaging in a task for which he was previously rewarded and now has other options. However, there is reason for some concern about measuring behavior during a free-choice period as opposed to measuring task performance during the experimental session.

A key concern is the degree to which the subject knows that his or her behavior is being recorded. The free-time measure is less obtrusive than the performance measure. Another concern is the issue of choice. Task performance measures have no element of choice. Whereas, task behavior during a free-time period has choice. Although, it is conceivable that more attractive alternatives could have changed the results of studies using free-time measures. A third concern is the external validity of the free-time measure. If a laboratory session is magnified and compared to a day's work, then the free-time period would correspond to analyzing work behavior during a break or at the end of the day when work was over.

Another problem with the research stems from the fact that the theoretical definition of intrinsic motivation is that intrinsic motivation occurs when an activity is performed for no apparent reward except the activity itself. In a work environment one cannot be sure that behavior performed in the absence of immediate extrinsic rewards is intrinsically motivated. It may be that the individual behaves in a certain manner without immediate rewards because he or she expects to receive some kind of extrinsic reward in the future (i.e. paycheck, bonus, promotion or perk). Additionally, there is a contract of labor in exchange for money in a business setting. An employee may fail to receive a pay increase, but his or her extrinsic monetary reward will never be entirely withdrawn. Thus, it cannot be determined that extrinsic rewards decrease intrinsic motivation; it can only be concluded that withdrawing a previously administered extrinsic reward may decrease intrinsic motivation.

The second most widely used measure for intrinsic motivation is task performance. Task performance measures, like task behavior measures, can be misleading. Task performance measures do not take into account different skill levels. Therefore, the speed at which a subject completes the task may not be an accurate indicator of his or her motivation level. One subject may be highly motivated, yet have low productivity due to the lack of knowledge or skill needed for the task at hand. Another subject may have little motivation, but perform well. It is like comparing apples to oranges. Researchers need to factor in differences in ability if they want task performance measures to be meaningful.

Another limitation is the fine line between intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. These two constructs are sometimes difficult to differentiate and there is much debate as to when extrinsic motivators take over intrinsic motivators. For example, a person takes a job they don't like because it pays well. Some would say that the person is externally motivated to do the job because of the money. However, the money enables the person to travel and see the world. Something the person loves to do, and receives much pleasure and satisfaction from doing. In order to travel, they need money. Therefore, they take a less desirable job. While at the job, the person is productive, does a good job, and seems generally happy. Their manager would never know that they only took the job for the money. They appear to be a motivated employee. Is this person intrinsically or extrinsically motivated, or both? Does it matter? Should it matter? Maybe researchers shouldn't focus on the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Their time might be better spent helping managers improve their communication skills (both speaking and listening), and encouraging flexibility and creativity. Corporate America has had more than enough advice on how to motivate its employees and improve productivity. Business managers need to learn the art of being *people* managers. For if you take care of the people, the people will take care of the business, and you won't have a motivation or productivity problem anymore.

Suggestions For Future Research

Subsequent employee motivation research should focus on real world corporate environments. Laboratory studies, although helpful in understanding human nature, do not provide managers with tried and true methods. Business professionals tend to want examples of solutions that worked for other companies. Therefore, managers would benefit more from studies involving other corporations. Researchers should study companies of all sizes and give an in-depth analysis of both the successful and unsuccessful employee motivation programs.

Works Cited

Amar, A.D. "Motivating Employees in 1990's: Reward and Recognition". Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business 30 (June 1994): 129-132.

Bain, David. The Productivity Prescription. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1982.

Brown, Tom. "The Truth About 'Gottas' and 'Wannas'". Industry Week 242 (Nov. 15, 1993): 32.

Buhler, Patricia. "Motivating the Employee of the 90's." Supervision 55 (July 1994): 8-10.

Campbell, Andrew, and Laura L. Nash. A Sense of Mission. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1992.

Conroy, William J. "Motivating Workers to Follow Leaders." New Steel 10 (November 1994): 50-51.

Deci, Edward L. Why We Do What We Do. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1995.

Dessler, Gary. Improving Productivity At Work. Virginia: Reston Publishing Company, 1983.

---. Winning Commitment. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc, 1993.

"Developing a Healthy Dissatisfaction with the Status Quo." Supervisory Management 39 (September 1994): 3.

Dorgan, William J. III. "One More Time: What Motivates People?" Modern Machine Shop 65 (May 1993): 114.

Fair III, Emile M., and Lynette Silvestri. "Effects of Rewards, Competition and Outcome on Intrinsic Motivation." Journal of Instructional Psychology. 19 (March 1992): 3-9.

Farnham, Alan. "Mary Kay's Lessons in Leadership". Fortune 128 (Sept. 20, 1993): 68-75.

Field, Anne. "Get the Most From Your Employees." Money 24 (November 1994): 104-112.

Fierman, Jaclyn. "The Perilous New World of Fair Pay." Fortune 129 (June 13, 1994): 57-62.

Filson, Brent. "The New Leadership." Hospitals & Health Networks (September 1994): 76.

Fletcher, Jerry L. Patterns of High Performance. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 1993.

Gaines, Harry. "Employees Get Satisfaction, But Only When Properly Motivated." Industrial Management 36 (Sept-Oct 1994): 2-3.

Gellerman, Saul W. Motivation In The Real World. New York: The Penguin Group, 1992.

Gibson, Virginia. "Organizations Must Adapt to Employees' Changing Needs." HR Focus 71 (March 1994): 7.

Goodman, Carla. "Boosting Morale." Small Business Opportunities (March 1995): 18 & 114.

Goren, Steven A. Productive Management. Massachusetts: Brick House Publishing Company, 1990.

Gransbury, Pat. "Motivation of the Older Worker". Supervision 56 (February 1995): 17-20.

Harari, Oren. "Working Smart." Small Business Reports 19 (September 1994): 55-57.

Harrison, Raymond. "Employee Development: Challenge Should Be Linked to Performance." HR Focus 70 (October 93): 9.

Hinrichs, John R. Practical Management for Productivity. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1978.

"Improving Productivity Through Motivation." Managers Magazine 68 (November 1993): 29.

Jaffe, Dennis T., Cynthia D. Scott, and Glenn R. Tobe. Rekindling Commitment. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publishers, 1994.

Kauss, James C., and Lyndy Nierman. "Why the Annual Review Is Dead; Getting Maximum Performance From Your Employees Means Ongoing Appraisals." Food Processing 55 (August 1994): 82-83.

Kennish, John W. "Motivating With A Positive Participatory Policy." Security Management 38 (August 1994): 22-23.

Kohn, Alfie. Punished by Rewards. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1993.

Kolbe, Kathy. Pure Instinct. New York: Random House, 1993.

Lane, Byron. Managing Peole. Oregon: The Oasis Press, 1990.

Lefton, Robert E., V.R. Buzzotta, Manuel Sherberg, and Dean L. Karraker. Effective Motivation Through Performance Appraisal. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

"Linking Employee and Enterprise Performance." Chief Executive (June 1994): 44-55.

Maccoby, Michael. Why Work: Leading The New Generation. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988.

Magjuka, Richard J., Timothy T. Baldwin, and Brian T. Loher. "The Combined Effects of Three Pretraining Strategies on Motivation and Performance." Journal of Managerial Issues 6 (Fall 1994): 282-297.

Markowich, M. Michael. "Does Money Motivate?" HR Focus 70 (August 1993): 1-4.

Markowich, M. Michael. "Use Compensation As A Strategic Weapon". HR Focus 71 (August 1994): 12-14.

Maslow, Abraham H. Toward A Psychology Of Being. 2nd ed. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1968.

Matejka, Ken. Why This Horse Won't Drink. New York: American Management Association, 1991.

Meyer, Peter. "Can You Give Good, Inexpensive Rewards?" Business Horizons 37 (Nov-Dec 1994): 84-85.

Minter, Stephen G. "A Safe Approach to Incentives". Occupational Hazards 57 (January 1995): 171-172.

Nierman, Lyndy. "The Art of Delegation; Make Sure Employees Have Something to Gain From Taking on Your Work." Food Processing 55 (April 1994): 31.

Norton, Rob. "New Thinking on the Causes and Costs of Yes Men and Women." Fortune 130 (Nov 28, 1994): 31.

Ormand, Catherine. "Revamp Benefits for the 'What Does It Mean To Me' Decade." Dallas Business Journal 17 (June 3, 1994): B4.

Overskeid, Geir. "Effect of Reward on Subjective Autonomy and Interest When Initial Interest Is Low." Psychological Record. 46 (Spring 1996): 319-333.

Pacetta, Frank. Don't Fire Them, Fire Them Up. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

Pascarella, Perry. The New Achievers. New York: The Free Press, 1984.

Pearlman, Lawrence. "Training, Equity and Power." Corporate Board 16 (Jan-Feb 1995): 1-5.

"Put Your Skills to the Test". Sales & Marketing Management 146 (September 1994): 132-135.

Quick, Thomas L. The Quick Motivation Method. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Richer, Sylvie F., and Robert J. Vallerand. "Supervisors' Interactional Styles and Subordinates' Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation." Journal of Social Psychology. (December 1995).

Rodgers, Buck. Getting The Best Out Of Yourself And Others. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.

Smith, Bob. "Guidelines for Effective Programs." HR Focus 71 (November 1994): 17.

Stambaugh-Cannon, Sandie. "Are You Planting the Seeds of Productivity In Your Employees?" Aftermarket Business 104 (May 1, 1994): 4.

Stanton, Erwin S. Reality-Centered People Management. New York: American Management Association, 1982.

Taft, Emmett. "You Cannot Be A Good Employee If Your Only Activity Is Work!" Manage 45 (July 1993): IFC.

Timpe, Dale A., ed. Motivation of Personnel. New York: Facts On File Publications, 1986.

Tarkenton, Fran. How To Motivate People. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1986.

Vogl, A.J. "Carrots, Sticks, and Self-Deception." Across the Board 31 (January 1994): 39-45.

Weinstein, Matt. Managing To Have Fun. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.

Wendover, Robert W. 2 Minute Motivation. Illinois: Sourcebooks Inc., 1995.