MOTIVATION AND LEADERSHIP
IN YOUR BUSINESS

by William J. Bartley

The literature concerning motivation and leadership is both confusing and conflicting. Nevertheless, I will make an attempt to present an overview of these concepts and how they are interrelated. The focus will be on those theories that seem to be logical on an intuitive basis and have generally been accepted as having common sense validity.

Motivation can be viewed as an inner-state of an individual which causes him to make an effort to attain a desired goal. The individual has reasons for his behavior and these reasons make sense to him. The reasons of behavior are unsatisfied needs and the end result is need satisfaction, with behavior being the means by which needs are satisfied.

Three theories of motivation that are widely accepted are:

1. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs theory.
2. Herzberg’s Motivation-Maintenance theory.
3. Vroom’s Expectancy theory.

Maslow has suggested that man has five levels of needs arranged in a hierarchy of importance. Behavior is determined by the complete set of needs. As the needs at one level become reasonably well satisfied, the unsatisfied nature of the higher level needs begins to be felt. However, the major determinants of behavior are the needs at the lowest level in the hierarchy that are not presently substantially satisfied.

The hierarchy of needs is:

Physiological: thirst, shelter, hunger and other basic bodily needs.
Safety: security, protection from physical and emotional harm, avoidance of the unexpected.

Social: affection, companionship and acceptance by others.
Esteem: awareness of importance to others, deserving of importance by others.
Self actualization: personal growth, self-fulfillment, desire to fully realize potential.

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory

The physiological, safety and social needs are classified as lower order needs; esteem and self-actualization are classified as higher order needs. Lower order needs are satisfied externally to the individual, as for example, by compensation and working conditions. The higher order needs, on the other hand, are satisfied internally to the individual; they are concerned with his mental well being. In periods of individual economic prosperity, behavior is primarily determined by the unsatisfied high order needs and thus, at that time, a manager’s success in motivation of his employees depends upon his ability to establish work situations which contribute to the satisfaction of his employees higher order needs.

Herzberg has challenged the belief that the opposite of job satisfaction is job dissatisfaction. He suggests that the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction and the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction. Herzberg’s theory is that certain aspects of the work
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1. Presented at the annual conference of The International Society of Arboriculture in St. Louis, Missouri in August 1976.
situation are related to job satisfaction while other aspects are related to job dissatisfaction, and these job aspects are different and unique to each. Job aspects, which are related to the dissatisfying nature of the work situation, are labeled maintenance factors and include company policy, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions and compensation. The factors of achievement, recognition, responsibility, growth, advancement and the work itself are related to the satisfying aspects of the work situation and are labeled motivational factors.

**Herzberg’s Motivation-Maintenance Theory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance Factors</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>No Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Factors</td>
<td>No Satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Herzberg concludes that many managers mistakenly attempt to motivate their employees by committing resources to the maintenance aspects of work. While this is beneficial to the employees, it only succeeds in reducing job dissatisfaction, resulting in employees that are not dissatisfied but also not motivated. According to Herzberg, the key to motivation lies in providing the employee with a meaningful work experience, one which fully utilizes the skills and abilities of the individual and provides a feeling of accomplishment and self-worth. To motivate an employee, the manager needs to increase the employee’s autonomy and allow for a significant degree of self-management.

Vroom’s theory is based upon the belief that there is no universal method for the motivation of people. A person’s motivation to produce depends on his personal goals and his belief that performance of a task is a means of attaining these goals. Productivity is the means of goal attainment; if the employee believes high productivity is a means to achieving his personal goals, he will tend to be a highly productive worker.

According to Vroom, the manager’s task is to create a linkage between effort and performance, between performance and organizational rewards, and between organizational rewards and individual-goal attainment. In order to establish this linkage, the manager must first determine what goals each employee is seeking to satisfy, for rewards need to be individualized.

From the brief review of these theories of motivation, it becomes clear that there is no simple solution to motivational problems. Motivation is tied to the individual’s being able to satisfy his own goals. The motivation of an individual to be a productive worker depends upon what he has already attained and what he is seeking to attain. In order for an individual to be motivated, his assigned task must fully utilize his skills and abilities and provide a feeling of accomplishment. The effort put forth by the individual toward the accomplishment of the organization’s goals depends upon his belief that the resulting organizational rewards will satisfy his personal goals.

Leadership is the process whereby one individual exerts his influence over others to cause them to willingly act in a desired manner. The manager’s task is to provide leadership for his subordinates so that their efforts are directed towards the successful attainment of organizational goals.

Leadership style refers to the manner in which a manager relates to his subordinates. Many different labels have been used to categorize leadership styles. However, most classification schemes fall into two categories: employee-centered and job-centered.

The employee-centered leadership style is associated with actions directed toward maintaining good interpersonal relationships between
the manager and his subordinates. The manager-
subordinate relationship is characterized by
mutual trust, a high regard for subordinate’s
feelings and respect for their ideas. The job-
centered leadership style is that whereby the
manager’s actions are concerned primarily with
task accomplishment. This type of leader struc-
tures the jobs of his subordinates, closely super-
vises to see that assigned tasks are performed in
the prescribed manner and relies heavily on his
authority to get the job done.

Job-centered leaders can produce impressive
short-run results in terms of output, but un-
fortunately, they also tend to produce high rates
of absenteeism, grievances and turnover. On the
other hand, employee-centered leaders tend to
have highly satisfied subordinates with lower
rates of absenteeism, grievances, and turnover
which may or may not result in greater produc-
tivity. Of the two styles, job-centeredness is
more clearly associated with higher quality out-
put.

A median position between employee-centered
and job-centered seems to more closely ap-
proach an ideal. I will label this middle position as
team orientation.

The team orientation manager has a high con-
cern for both production and people. His em-
phasis is on building effective work groups with
high performance goals. In team leadership, the
manager’s responsibility is to see that sound
decisions are made, not necessarily to make
them himself. Concerning work methods, the
manager gives his subordinates some freedom in
deciding how best to accomplish their assigned
tasks. The work need not be done in a specified
manner solely because that’s the way it has
always been done. As much as is possible, the
subordinates assigned tasks are designed to
provide them a meaningful work experience. In
response, the subordinates are expected to use
safe and efficient work methods and direct their
efforts toward the accomplishment of the
organizations goals.

A major difficulty with a team oriented leader-
ship style is that there is no prescribed best way
to guide the manager in exercising his managerial
duties. For instance, when the manager is faced
with a particular decision, should he make the
decision himself or delegate the authority to
make the decision to his subordinates? The
evidence to date does not indicate that one alter-
native is always superior to the other. One im-
portant consideration is the expectations of the
subordinates themselves. If the manager’s subor-
dinates expect and desire to be involved in a
decision, the manager who goes ahead and
makes the decision himself will most likely
damage the morale of his subordinates. Future
cooperation may also become more difficult. But
employee participation is not always best or ad-
visable. Time-pressure may not allow for subor-
dinate participation in the decision; at times they
may lack the knowledge necessary if their par-
ticipation is to produce a sound decision. Hence,
at times the manager will have to make the
decision even though his subordinates desire to
be involved.

Koontz and O’Donnell have expressed a basic
principle of leadership which I believe comes
closest to indicating how a team-oriented leader
should manage. This principle is: “Since people
tend to follow those in whom they see a means
of satisfying their own personal goals, the more
managers understand what motivates their par-
ticular subordinates, how these motivations
operate, and the more they reflect this un-
derstanding in carrying out their managerial ac-
tions, the more effective leaders they are likely to
be.”

The basic principle of leadership combines
motivational considerations with managerial ac-
tion. It points out that the responsibility for
motivation falls to the manager. If the manager
relies strictly upon his authority to obtain subor-
dinate effort, his subordinates will very likely work
at about 60% to 70% of their capacity. If, on the
other hand, the manager adheres to the basic
principle of leadership, he will create an op-
portunity for a 100% effort by making it possible
for his subordinates to be motivated in their work.
Regardless of the particular situation, the
manager has created an environment in which his
subordinates are more able to satisfy their own
needs while at the same time working toward the
accomplishment of the goals of the organization.
I hope this brief overview of selected theories of motivation and leadership has provided you with some insights that will be useful in the day to day operations of your business.
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ABSTRACTS


Decline and death of cherry trees resulted in an estimated loss of 22 percent of all sweet cherry trees in San Joaquin County during 1973-75. In 1975 some orchards were almost 100 percent affected with crown and root rots. Such occurrences of cherry tree decline in the past have been variously attributed to "wet feet," "soursap," or occasionally root-infecting fungi, but evidence for a clear-cut cause has often been lacking. The water mold fungus *Phytophthora* frequently has been suspected but never directly proved as a causal agent of cherry tree decline. Our field observations and results from the greenhouse tests strongly indicated that the water regime in orchard soil infested with *Phytophthora* and the type of rootstock are very important factors that determine severity and incidence of *Phytophthora* root and crown rot in commercial orchards. In the light of this new information, further research is now necessary to develop better management practices.


Spectacular biological control of crown gall was achieved last year in an experiment carried out on young almond, peach, plum, and apricot trees in a California nursery. Crown gall is a bacterial (*Agrobacterium tumefaciens*) disease of worldwide importance on many woody plants; it can be especially serious in deciduous fruit nurseries. An Australian researcher, Dr. Allen Kerr, recently reported on the effectiveness of a non-disease-producing form of the crown gall bacterium for protecting seeds and seedlings against the gall-forming strain. Kerr found that, by dipping seeds or seedlings in a suspension of this biological agent before planting, healthy trees could be grown, even in crown-gall-infested soil. Dr. Larry Moore of Oregon State University tested this approach in the field and obtained spectacular control for a number of plant varieties. Control achieved with the biological treatment was excellent, especially considering the drastic nature of the test conditions. Further tests are in progress to test the biological control agent with other plant species such as walnut, cherry, and grape.