CHAPTER SIX

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION

Possible, Probable, or Impossible?

After studying this chapter, you should be able to:

- Be familiar with major theories of motivation;
- Recognize how human resource management affects employee motivation;
- Understand the limits of *carrots and sticks;*
- Using a range of techniques for cultivating motivation and engagement; and
- Apply methods for dealing with difficult employee behaviors.

An employee's motivation is a direct result of the sum of interactions with his or her manager.

—Bob Nelson

Motivation is a key to employee productivity and performance, and therefore central to human resource management. **Motivation** can be defined as the drive or energy that compels people to act, with energy and persistence, toward some goal. To say that someone *has motivation* is to say that that person has substantial energy and drive in pursuit of something. Leaders, managers, and psychologists alike have long pondered how they can better harness and direct people's *psychic energy* toward work objectives. As many public organizations continue to face rising workloads and pressures for increased responsiveness and accountability, they need workers who are not only competent and able, but also well-motivated to contribute to organizational goals.

Employees are also concerned about motivation. Working with motivation often makes the work experience more enjoyable, attractive, and often more productive (Belle, 2013; Sulea et al., 2012). When people are motivated, they increase their engagement with what they are doing, often resulting in improved efforts and purpose, adding to feelings of well-being and success. Time goes faster, too, and when people enjoy what they are doing, they are often motivated to keep it so, too. Employees have an interest in having supervisors who create a positive workplace experience that brings out the best in them.

If HRM is about the development of policies for effective utilization of human resources in organizations, it is doubly concerned with motivation. We need managers whose leadership style creates motivating workplace conditions for employees, and policies and practices that support motivation. The field cannot ignore the impact of practices on employee motivation arising from recruitment, selection, appraisal, promotion, compensation, promotion, and training. HRM needs to support selecting managers and frontline supervisors

Scanned with CamScanner

who can create a positive workplace experience—and avoid those that do not. It needs to provide skills to managers for fostering effective working relationships with employees and workgroups, supporting employee efforts and development, and ensure that mangers are also skilled in mitigating conditions and behaviors that detract from positive workplace experiences.

While the topic of motivation can be as complex as humans themselves, at the end of the day managers need some practical perspectives and approaches for managing motivation. Our perspective is to avoid both undue simplicity and unworkable complexity. There are no magic bullets that increase motivation for all, nor one-size-fits-all adages that can help have managers in each and every situation. Yet, neither does it much good to say that every human being is different, when in fact there are commonalities. This chapter takes a middle approach, providing research-based insights into processes for bringing out what motivation and engagement employees have for their work. These processes include dialog about what type of workplace managers and employees are seeking to create, how they expect people to get along, what performance expectations are expected, what support employees can expect for achieving their performance and what the consequences, pro and con, of some behaviors and performance may be. In doing so, these processes create a space for addressing individual variations and organizational practices in such a way as can further motivation and contribute to productive workplace experiences.

The idea that one size does not fit all is borne out in practice and research. About 20 years ago, West and Berman (1997) found in cities with populations of more than 50,000 that 29.8 percent of city managers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "Employees are highly motivated to achieve goals," 48.8 percent only somewhat agreed with this statement, and 21.5 percent disagreed in different degrees with the statement. About 10 years ago, Schwartz (2010) reported that a survey of nearly 90,000 employees worldwide found that only 21 percent feel fully engaged at work and nearly 40 percent are disenchanted or disengaged. Building on these results, the heuristic **25–50–25 rule** states that 25 percent of employees are highly motivated, 50 percent are *fence-sitters*, and 25 percent are withdrawn or even cynical. This rule has not been rigorously validated, but many supervisors nevertheless find that it more or less accurately represents their experience. Everyone is not (un)motivated; managers are likely to have a mix of motivation among their employees; that's just how it is. A reasonable goal, in an imperfect world, is to transform 25–50–25 into, say, 45–45–10. This will involve some differentiated efforts to further and sustain motivation, discussed later.

As managers confront the topic of motivation, some may fall back on some faulty and harmful notions. There is much that can and does go wrong. For example, the paradox of democracy, which limits employee rights in the workplace, has sometimes been interpreted as expecting staff to shut up at their job. Some supervisors project an attitude that seems to say that if employees do not like it there, they can go elsewhere! Such orientations do little to further motivation and are rightly recognized as inappropriate and dated (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). Other managers use old-fashioned *carrot-and-stick* approaches that, when not tailored to the specific desires and conditions of individual employees, often become irrelevant or, at worst, fear-based management when the sticks outweigh the carrots. In yet other instances, management is seen as taking fun and motivation out of employees' work as they are asked only to comply with directives and policies—being a cog in the wheel. Yet, other supervisors are super friendly but lack skills in overcoming barriers that affect

Scanned with CamScanner

workers doing their jobs. Most people are likely to experience a range of such responses over their careers. The tools and strategies of this chapter are seen as increasingly more appropriate and effective for increasing motivation.

By and large, we believe that managerial skills fostering employee motivation may be very slowly improving, but it is hard to prove this and there is also long way to go, too. We think that some improvement has come from increased consideration for the needs of working families leading to individualized consideration and dialog. Dealing with a new generation of millennials has also changed preconceptions of what workplace experiences people are looking for. Another driver has come from a need to reduce worker turnover. A clear association exits between a lack of worker engagement and increased turnover, which some studies have estimated as high as $25,000 per worker resulting from a lost performance, recruitment, onboarding, and training costs (Chenkovich & Cates, 2016; Cowart, 2014). Thus, a range of sources are moving toward improvement—though quite obviously more is needed in the matter of worker motivation.

Improving employee motivation is a complex but not insurmountable challenge. No matter how the topic is approached, increasing motivation with work requires a broad tool kit and some one-on-one dialogue. First, this chapter examines some theories about the nature of employee motivation that shape out current thinking—up to a point. Second, we examine the broad impact of human resource management policies and strategies on the climate for motivation. Third, the chapter examines specific managerial strategies for managing and motivating individual employees. We need managers who can bring out motivation and engagement among employees.

PULL, PUSH, OR DRIVE?

Motivation is a much studied-subject, to say the least. The purpose in this brief space is not to summarize motivation theories—an entire book alone would scarcely do justice to such a rich topic. Rather, the goal in this section is to consider some dominant insights that lead to an appropriate appreciation of motivation for managers, and to extend this with insights about employee engagement. A basic insight is employees vary in their needs and that organizations and that their managers will need to offer a broad range of conditions if they are to motivate their employees.

Motivation theories differ according to what is emphasized. While there is general agreement that motivation is about the drive or energy (an inner state) that compels people to act with energy and persistence toward goals, the question is which factors affect this energy. Some theories focus on factors inherent to individuals, such as their basic needs for survival, achievement, appreciation/belonging, or development, as well as their energy level and mental state (e.g., their energy to pursue different tasks). This *needs perspective* of motivation is associated with the work of Abraham Maslow (1954), who developed a **hierarchy of needs** of basic drives around survival, safety, belonging, self-esteem, and self-actualization. Maslow' theory brings out inherent human characteristics of people and goes beyond perspectives that focus only on the economic transaction of providing labor for pay. Money matters, as it helps meet many needs (e.g., survival), but more is needed, too, such as people feeling safe and having interesting job experiences. Many civil servants are also motivated by a need to make a difference in their communities (see public service motivation, below). It should be noted that while the above needs

Scanned with CamScanner

are widely accepted, studies do not always replicate the specific order of needs (Hall & Nougaim, 1968; Lester, 2013).

In a modern world, each of the above categories usually refers to a range of needs. For example, *survival* needs include not only food and shelter (compensation), but also a need for transportation, health insurance and, looking ahead, retirement savings or benefits, too. Also, quite some people find self-actualization outside of their work (e.g., raising a family); not everyone experiences work as a vocation—sometimes, a job is just a job. The implication of managers is straightforward. As a practical and research-based matter, it is usually held that (1) money, (2) the prospect of career development/promotion, and (3) one or two other motivators (e.g., making a difference/public service motivation; job security, fun, or child care) is a reasonable list of most workers' top needs (Crewson, 1997; Itika, 2011). The job of HRM, then, is to ensure that organizations are able to provide these (compensation, benefits, positive work experiences, and career development) that, in exchange for effort, allow workers to satisfy a range of their needs. The job of the manager is to manage and negotiate the *exchange*, helping workers to realize their needs, as provided by the organization's resources and policies.

Other theories examine components relating to the *external factors* of their jobs and work, such as the effects of job goals, salary, work obstructions, supervision, and leadership, which also influence motivation. McGregor (1960) developed the above implications further for how managers can then motivate people. **Theory X** states that when people do not have much or adequate intrinsic motivations related to work (say, only working for financial motives), they will tend to do as little as possible (be lazy?), will need to be directed by specific performance expectations and external inducements—that is, *carrots and sticks*. External motivators are then appropriate and necessary to increase their motivation to work. **Theory Y** states that when people have adequate intrinsic motivations for work, then manager's job is to (also) help workers channel and support such drives in appropriate ways. An example of such intrinsic motivation are needs for achievement or making a difference through public service. McGregor believed that intrinsic drives increase performance in organizations, hence, leading to preferences for Theory Y.

McGregor believed that in the first half of the 20th century too much emphasis was placed on Theory X, leading to authoritarian management practices, including motivating people by external (or extrinsic) factors (such as money, rewards, threats, and other [dis]incentives). Such practices ignore intrinsic drives and demotivate workers with intrinsic motivations. Some authors relate intrinsic motivation to the upper realms of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In any event, intrinsic or otherwise, today employees are expected to bring adequate motivation to their jobs. As one manager comments in the context of selection, "If I need to motivate you, then you are not the right person for the job" (quoted in Pink, 2009, p. 32). Whether one is motivated by extrinsic or intrinsic rewards, or both (e.g., making money and impact), workers are expected to show up with motivation and energy that can be directed toward important objectives.

While the notion of managing by *carrots and sticks* has a poor connotation, carrots and sticks have their place in public management. Sticks are surely sometimes effective and needed when holding the line on questionable behavior and performance, including progressive discipline as discussed in Chapter 8. Carrots are ubiquitous as motivating incentives (extra money or resources, anyone?). Rather, the point is that managing by

Scanned with CamScanner

carrots and sticks only is inadequate to bring forth necessary motivation and performance. More is needed in helping to create a positive and motivating workplace experience, and in which workers feel supported in meeting their needs and bringing forth their contributions. Some discussion with workers is also needed about the availability of motivators and how these work for them and their job performance. Carrots, sticks, and process are all needed. In addition to research-based insights below, we also provide a specific strategy of psychological contracts, later.

By the way, you should know that while Maslow hierarchy of needs is highly popular, other theories of human needs also exist. For example, McClelland (1985) proposed a theory that people are driven by three different needs: the need for (1) achievement, (2) power, and (3) affiliation. Some people have a very strong need for power, as reflected in preferences pursuing assignments and network relationships that help them climb the career ladder. Others are more strongly guided by pleasures that come from solving problems or achieving an impact itself. Still others take pride in creating and maintaining social relationships, or getting identity from groups that that belong. For example, senior managers often have a high need for power, and low need for affiliation or achievement. Knowing these can help provide a bit more detail to Maslow's needs, such as anticipating the kinds of self-esteem or belonging that workers might be motivated by.

Implied in all of the above is a key **principle of motivation** is that people are motivated to pursue their goals and satisfy their needs. As President Dwight D. Eisenhower put it, "Motivation is the art of getting people to do what you want them to do because they want to do it." Vroom's **expectancy theory of motivation** (1964) makes the additional point that people pursue outcomes to the extent that they are valued and feasible. People show effort in the expectation that this will produce performance results, hence, efforts → performance → rewards → needs attainment. This basic causal chain of events is based in three key (and obvious) assumptions:

1. The more value a person places on an outcome, the more effort he or she will put forward (valence of outcomes).
2. The more someone believes that he or she has the ability to achieve an outcome, the more effort that person is likely to put forward (expectancy of efforts).
3. The more an individual believes that rewards will be forthcoming as a result of his or her performance, the more effort the individual will put forward (instrumentality of performance).

These assumptions provide useful levers for managing motivation in others. Vroom's theory points to the need for managers to ensure that employees are committed to certain outcomes and that workers feel confident that they can be successful given their abilities and existing conditions. Research findings generally validate Vroom's assumptions and also provide useful, overarching starting points for administrators. For example, the first assumption points to managers giving employees compelling reasons to be motivated to pursue certain outcomes, helping them to achieve high valence. A manager's job is to help employees reach understanding about what is valued and why. The second assumption points to supervisors providing encouraging, supportive and consistent feedback that helps

Scanned with CamScanner

employees to apply and develop themselves in pursuit of outcomes. Long ago, Skinner (1953) noted that the positive consequences reinforce behaviors, and that negative consequences diminish or arrest those behaviors. Support for behaviors reinforces, as do rewards that come as a consequences. All of this points to both a need for consistency in manager's messages, as well as some individualized dialog about goal expectations, efforts and support in achieving them.

People need a degree of autonomy to solve problems, achieve high performance, and realize their intrinsic motivations. Almost no one likes to be micro-managed, and some degree of freedom and latitude is needed. Accountability for work that has been done in one thing; excessive meddling while doing it is quite another. In an academic vein, path-goal theory suggests that the job of the manager is to lay out clear and doable goals and to provide a clear path with few obstacles for employees (House, 1971; Locke & Latham, 1990). This idea has made its way into various management strategies, including management by objectives (MBO) in the 1970s, which one author sums up using five precepts (Odiorne, 1976):

1. Tell me what is expected of me in advance.
2. Give me the resources to do the job.
3. Leave me alone as much as possible to do my job.
4. Let me know how well I am doing in my work.
5. Reward my accomplishments.

This idea continues to inspire. Theory X is typically associated with a *push* style of management, whereas Theory Y and the MBO version are associated with a *pull* style of management that is especially appropriate for people who have *drive*.

During the 1980s and 1990s, further progress was made on a number of fronts. Goal-Setting Theory (Locke & Latham, 1990) states that when people have high, specific, and accepted goals they perform better. Although they do not necessarily always reach their goal, that which is achieved can be significant. Goal-setting is also relevant to employee empowerment. Both Theory Y and MBO imply empowerment, which involves the delegation of decision making and other responsibilities to employees while holding them accountable for outcomes. Key steps in empowerment involves employee assessment (what is the person ready or able to accept?), standards by which success is measured, and motivational consequences of their performance. When employees are clear about their tasks, reasons for tasks, capacity and resources for success, and consequences of success, then empowerment is more readily embraced and accepted. Also, while empowerment obviously increases motivation among those who welcome increased decision-making and scope of action, the reality is that not everyone wants to be empowered and held accountable. Greater freedom is not always welcomed; quite some people prefer being told what to do, thereby limiting their responsibilities, stress and uncertainty. For such employees, managers will likely need to explain the *rules of the game*, linking these to their motivational needs and help workers meet these new realities.

Scanned with CamScanner

Considerable research validates the above propositions. In the mid-1990s and 2000s, the concept of Public Service Motivation (PSM) was academically developed and introduced, defined as a service ethic of civil servants that explains their intrinsic motivation to serve. While the idea of PSM is hardly new, research now offered a concrete, measurable construct. The four key dimensions of PSM are (1) attraction to policy making, (2) commitment to furthering the public interest, (3) commitment to social justice, commitment to civic duty, compassion about the welfare of others, and (4) commitment to self-sacrifice for public causes (Perry, 1996, 2000; Wright, Moynihan, & Pandey, 2012). The findings of many studies validate PSM, also in other countries with but modest variation (Kim et al., 2012). PSM is shown to be widely present among civil servants in many countries, and suggest to practitioners that PSM is a specific lever they can use to increase mission valance and performance, such as by encouraging participation in policy processes, appealing to employees' sense of social justice or interest in social welfare, and providing opportunities to further the public interest (also Belle, 2013). Of course, this is hardly news to practitioners, but it is now a scientific fact, as well. Employees vary in their PSM, and further research is still being conducted into factors that can increase PSM.

Finally, in the last decade, increased interest has emerged in the concept of engagement. If motivation is defined as the drive or energy that compels people to act, with energy and persistence, toward some goal, then **engagement** emphasizes individuals' being psychologically present and applying themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally when performing their organizational roles (e.g., Gruman & Saks, 2011; Saks 2006; Gallup 2006). The concept of employee engagement bridges internal states of motivation with observable behaviors in the workplace. An employee who is engaged can be characterized as enthusiastic, energetic, motivated, and passionate about his or her work, and engagement is strongly linked to job satisfaction. Academic studies typically assess aspects of vigor (e.g., "At work, I feel full of energy"), dedication (e.g., "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose"), and absorption ("I am immersed in my work") (Menguc, Auh, Fisher, & Haddad, 2013). The concept of engagement became popular when Gallup announced in 2013 that in a survey of 142 countries, only 13 percent of workers were found to be engaged (this figure was 29 percent for the United States and Canada). Clearly, motivation (and, hence, engagement) continues to be an important concern.

Recent studies point to eight drivers of employee engagement: (1) supervisory support and encouragement; (2) recognition, praise, and developmental feedback (e.g., "In the last seven days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work"); (3) role clarity and resource adequacy (e.g., "I know what is expected of me on the job," and having the resources to do it); (4) supportive coworkers who are (also) committed to doing high-quality work; (5) having the opportunity to do what one does best (e.g., "My talents are used well"); (6) having opportunities to learn and grow (e.g., "Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development"); (7) alignment, support, and belief in the mission or purpose of one's work; and (8) having a voice (e.g., "My opinion counts at work"). No single factor or magic bullet is the key to employee engagement. However, the actions of the supervisor do appear to be central, either directly or indirectly affecting almost all of these engagement conditions (being supportive, providing feedback and resources, encouraging development, aligning mission with employee valence). In short, organizations need to do well in appointing good supervisors and selecting the right people for particular jobs who have good intrinsic motivation (*drive*) for doing high-quality work.

Scanned with CamScanner

About Rewards and Money

While the trend is toward acknowledging a broad range of factors that drive employee motivation, such as those mentioned above, the role of rewards and incentives cannot be overlooked. Continuing interest in the use of rewards and incentives has inspired a vast stream of research. Rewards and incentives surely induce motivation—everyone needs to be rewarded in some manner—but research also shows some important limits, especially of extrinsic rewards. First, the effect of extrinsic rewards is often short lived. Yes, while prospects of a significant rewards increases motivation, once the reward has been attained, motivation soon returns to where it was before—or less. In experiments, people who have had previous rewards for performing a task taken away have been found to work less hard than those who were never given rewards in the first place. In modern vernacular, rewards need to be sustainable. Second, the ability of the public sector to give financial rewards is limited; studies of pay-for-performance in the public sector often fail to find much effect for lack of meaningful size (level) of such rewards. Instead, managers need to look for a broad range of alternative rewards that may involve acknowledgment, extra office support, certificates and vouchers, career enhancing job assignments, additional training, conference or other travel, new equipment, invitation to important meetings or events.

Third, while rewards can put fun into work for routine tasks, extrinsic rewards can also take the fun out of work that is intrinsically motivated. People who are creatively busy often enjoy their tasks and regard these as fun (Csikszentmihalyi, 2008). But when the goal is changed to maximizing extrinsic rewards (e.g., billable hours by lawyers), intrinsic motivations are quickly *crowded out*, and work becomes *just work* and is at risk of becoming dreary (Jacobsen & Jensen, 2017; Pink, 2009). Fourth, excessive or exclusive reliance on rewards is associated with adverse incentives, causing problems such as ethical lapses that have been well documented. In short, motivating by rewards (*carrots*) is not a substitute for ensuring a broader approach to increasing motivation such as ensuring supervisory support and encouragement, avoiding micro management, having supportive and able co-workers and ensuring that conditions meet workers' needs. Rewards are part of this broader mix.

Having said this, money matters. Jobs that do not bring enough salary to satisfy very basic needs fail to motivate (*why work?*), and employee turnover in low-paying jobs is indeed very high. However, once people are able to satisfy a broad range of their needs (basic comfort and security needs), money no longer motivates quite as much, and the significance of other rewards increase.[1] While prospects of a significant pay increase will again spark motivation (allowing for meeting previously unmet needs), once a higher pay level is reached, motivation soon returns to where it was before. The motivational boost of prospective money is only temporary. Of course, it is difficult to attract good workers with below-market pay rates, and it is difficult to keep good workers if one does not pay them at competitive rates and offer advancement opportunities that are competitive, as well. Good and competitive pay is needed, but more is needed, as well. Money is not enough to ensure motivation—what supervisors do matters, too.

Researchers note that autonomy and control should be contingent on tasks and people; some situations may in fact be suitable for a stronger emphasis on rewards. A special note should be made of extrinsic rewards in jobs that are really monotonous and repetitive, as do exist in the public sector, too. Then, rewards can turn boring work

Scanned with CamScanner

into a game-like activity (e.g., how to finish sooner) and thereby increase motivation. Offering people a little more autonomy also helps to motivate (e.g., flextime, relaxed dress code, one stop service centers), and help bind people to their jobs (how would you motivate people working in a call center?). In recent years, employers have recognized the importance of promoting an adequate level of autonomy and even creativity in jobs and performance that require it. Organizations continue to make good use of *quality circles* in which workers form a community of practice to address workplace matters. A little bit of empowerment, flexibility, and worker input can go a long way toward motivation and, hence, performance. Some of the most creative and successful companies (e.g., 3M) even give their workers self-directed hours in which their only task is to do something creative and different.

How do we make sense of all the above? While the research is broad, some bottom-lines and messages emerge. People are motivated to satisfy their needs, and while these vary across people, there are some commonalities such as money, making a difference, promotion, and more. The job of HRM is to ensure that organizations have adequate compensation, benefits, positive work experiences and career development to offer. As demands grow and jobs are more complex, greater autonomy and empowerment are emphasized. For managers, this means that managing by job duties, policy, incentives, and consequences/rewards (*these are your duties/rules; if you do/follow these well/poorly then . . .*); while these are still needed, so, too, are supportive efforts that help workers realize their job performance, encourage intrinsic motivation (where present), and help meet other needs/goals (such as for career development or raising a family) can be met ("Tell me what you need. I will help where possible."). Exhibit 6.1 considers the context of motivational differences across generations. The next section examines the broad HRM role, and then we examine specific supervisory tactics for furthering motivation.

Exhibit 6.1 Motivating the Millennial Generation

Do younger employees differ from older workers in their motivations? Many managers seem to think so, and an emerging literature agrees with them. In *Motivating the "What's in It for Me?" Workforce*, Cam Marston (2007) argues that earlier generations of workers (Baby Boomers and those Marston calls *Matures*) were motivated to work by making an income and having identity through their professions and employment by their organizations. They were willing to *pay their dues* and *wait their turn* in return for increasing growth opportunities. In contrast, Generation Xers and New Millennials, are motivated to make just enough money to enjoy the lifestyles they seek. Others see Millennials as enterprising workers who are energetically following their dreams on their own terms. In any event, they have loyalty to people who can help them but not to employers (organizations did not show loyalty to workers in their parents' generation, so why should they be loyal to organizations?). Millennials are likely to stay with their employers as long as the work is interesting, is educational, and serves their needs. Young employees are far more demanding of their employers than were their counterparts of past generations, and it is a greater challenge to HRM systems to keep the most talented ones.

Scanned with CamScanner

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND THE CLIMATE FOR MOTIVATION

HRM affects employee motivation largely through the strategies, policies, and programs that it provides for supervisors and employees, including the specific management and supervisory processes that it champions and supports. The workplace **climate for motivation** consists of programs and practices that are available to managers and employees to being motivated in their work. HRM is involved in shaping many of these, such as through compensation, job design, selection, and benefit programs (U.S. MSPB, 2012). An analogy is to view human resource management practices as a cafeteria or buffet in which each employee values the selections differently. People differ in their needs and goals and what they are willing to accommodate, and most employees, employers hope, will be satisfied by whatever selections they make of these (even if some are mandatory). This section looks at the *HRM menu*.

From the perspective of managers and their organizations, the elements listed below constitute a general climate for motivation. As stated, motivation is furthered when individuals have the opportunity to meet their needs. The discussion below builds on the preceding, and considers drivers of motivation, rewards, public service motivation, and more. In short, when all of the following efforts and conditions are present, employees, while drawn toward each to differing degrees, will likely find a combination that provides them with adequate motivation and opportunity for even deeper engagement:

- Competitive salaries and relevant benefits
- Meaningful rewards and recognition (that are fairly distributed)
- Friendly and cooperative workplace relations
- Assignments that allow workers to make meaningful contributions to society
- Feedback that provides recognition
- Opportunities for challenge and development
- Meaningful control over the work environment
- Minimization of the demotivating effect of rules and regulations that impede job performance and satisfaction
- Reduction of negative supervisory relationships
- Selection of the right people for the job

Readers can readily verify that an environment with these conditions is likely to be attractive, motivating, and engaging. Would you like to work in an organization in which these conditions are present? The factors listed above are associated with the previously mentioned groups of needs and are affected by human resource management policies and practices. These connections are shown below; many also are explored in other chapters of this book.

1. *Competitive salaries and relevant benefits.* At-market compensation helps employees meet their basic needs for physical security and more. By giving

Scanned with CamScanner

employees a sense that they are receiving a fair return for their efforts, employers also further retention, and some employers also try to give their excellent staff above-market wages. For all these reasons, it is important that remuneration is periodically adjusted to remain competitive. Beyond this, benefits assist workers to meet health care, retirement, education, and other needs. These benefits have become increasingly important for workers at all income levels. In the United States, fewer and fewer of these needs are subsidized through taxes, and employees depend on their employers to help them address these concerns. (By contrast, citizens in other developed countries can often count on government-subsidized benefits such as affordable, universal health care.) Employers offer cafeteria-style menus of benefits. Compensation and benefits are explored in Chapters 7 and 8, respectively.)

2. *Meaningful rewards and recognition (that are fairly distributed).* People need appreciation, not only that expressed by compensation but also appreciation shown through formal recognition and informal thank-yous. Appraisal systems (Chapter 10) should provide sufficient appreciation and recognition, but in practice they often fail to do so; more is needed. HRM can help to encourage alternative forms of rewards and recognition. In some organizations, workers can make instant, on-the-spot awards to others in the form of gift certificates, thus reducing delays and providing peer recognition. Workers also need to perceive that rewards are fairly distributed.
3. *Friendly and cooperative workplace relations.* Employees prefer congenial, positive work settings. While this may or may not be associated with increased motivation, an office that is perceived as hostile is a sure demotivator (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001). For this reason, most organizations make *people skills* a criterion in their hiring and promotion. According to Berman and West (2008), 71.5 percent of city managers in U.S. cities with populations over 50,000 agree or strongly agree that they focus on people skills when hiring or promoting managers. A subsequent section of this chapter offers suggestions for how managers can increase friendly and cooperative relations on the job.
4. *Assignments that allow workers to make meaningful contributions to society.* Most people who go to work for public and nonprofit organizations do so because they are motivated to make a difference in society (i.e., PSM). Needless to say, the task of human resource management is to design jobs that allow for having such impact, and the task of managers is to ensure that in fact they do. Some studies show that modern management practices and better agency performance increase employee motivation, presumably in part by fostering workers' needs for achievement and making a difference (Boardman & Sundquist, 2009).
5. *Feedback that provides recognition.* Feedback is not only part of formal performance appraisal (Chapter 10); the challenges of work require frequent assessment and adjustment. Feedback serves essential approval and improvement purposes, and giving it in a positive way (even when the message is not positive) is a part of the manager's job. This chapter considers how managers can do that and lies at the heart of the *one-minute manager* (Blanchard & Johnson, 1981) who provides frequent and concise feedback to employees.

Scanned with CamScanner