

HUMAN INTERRELATIONSHIPS AND ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Daniel Katz

University of Michigan

The approach to the study of organizational functioning through human relations is a healthy development in the field of public and business administration. It represents a corrective to the overemphasis upon the machine theory of organization; it takes into account a neglected phase of organizational objectives, the satisfactions of its members; and it opens new vistas into the whole area of group structure and group process. Nevertheless, the problems with which older theories of organizational structure were concerned are not automatically solved by an emphasis upon the psychology of inter-personal relations. The apparent conflict between the machine theory approach and the human relations, or psychological, approach must be faced in concrete terms of all the consequences for organizational functioning of the practices dictated by each theory. We must start, then, with some understanding

of the development of these two types of theory as they have been elaborated to deal with problems of effective organizational functioning.

Traditional Organizational Theory

The older theory of organizations recognized the fact that bureaucracy was one of the greatest social inventions of the modern western world. Organizational structure is, of course, as old as the human race, but its conscious and systematic exploitation for dealing with all areas of life is coincidental with the development of industrial capitalistic society. Max Weber has given us the classical analysis of the ways in which organized patterns can be divorced from feudal and personal encumbrances and employed for rational purposes. (21) The application of the rational model of organizations to industry was stimulated by the work of Taylor on scientific management and its application (19) to governmental organizations by the writings of Luther Gulick (6).

The organizational or machine model is a blue print which specifies the necessary activities for efficiently meeting organizational requirements. These necessary behaviors are assigned as duties to incumbents of positions in the organization. The organizational positions and their attendant functions are described without reference to the personality characteristics or the needs or the wishes of the human beings in the organization. What is set up is a system of inter-locking roles from which standardized behavior will emerge regardless of the particular personnel in the organization at any one point of time. Whatever seems to

be a requirement of the organization can be handled by role specification, whether the demand is for odious tasks such as those of the executioner or whether the demand is for self-destruction as in the case of suicide missions for the armed services. To insure that the organization functions in terms of its role specifications, it is necessary to introduce mechanisms of control and coordination. The control mechanism provides rewards for proper role performance and sanctions to prevent failures in role performance as well as feedback to the top of the organization about the functioning of its various parts. Coordination is necessary to assure efficient operation through the proper allocation of duties and the timing of their execution. The rational model gives major consideration to two factors. (1) The most efficient patterning of standardized activities for meeting organizational requirements. (2) The control devices to insure in fact that the organization will function according to this pattern.

Many principles and procedures have been developed in the interest of efficiency of operation and of control. The principle of unity of command is translated into centralization of decision making at the top level of the organization. A logical control device for unity of command is man to man responsibility down the line. A limited span of control, i.e. the number of role incumbents reporting to a superior, is a further device in the interest of control and coordination. Coordination and control are also implemented by devices over which most role incumbents have no power, such as the speed of the assembly line. Efficiency of performance is attained through complete standardization of the most effective pattern

of activity. For example, there is an optimum way of assembling a gun and the soldier must master its assembly according to the standardized operating procedure.

Standardization applies, moreover, to all the functions in the organization including communication between offices. For example, interoffice memos may be restricted to a page in length and must follow protocol specifying order of presentation. Moreover, all communication should follow the interoffice memo pattern to meet the old railroad dictum "Don't say it, write it -- you can't file a conversation." Another basic procedure for achieving efficiency is specialization and job fractionation. Any human activity can be broken down into its component parts and these parts can be assigned as duties or specific roles. Such fractionation makes the training of role incumbents easier and makes for more complete control of what goes on in the organization. A role incumbent responsible for a complex set of tasks cannot be coordinated and checked on as readily as a role incumbent with a limited set of responsibilities. Through specialization and standardization, errors can be avoided. For example, the halfback playing defense must follow the standardized prescription of never allowing a pass receiver to get between him and the goal line. An efficient organization, moreover, is one in which there is little duplication of function. For example, according to this theory it would be wasteful to maintain separate files in all offices of the organization when there can be a centralized filing system for each large unit. A related principle has to do with standards of uniformity. Standardization

of work procedures means a uniformity in performance and people in the same roles. Uniformity is also applied to other aspects of the functioning of the organization so that rewards, penalties and all personnel practices are applied in a uniform manner.

The development of the rational or machine model, to use J. Worthy's term (22), has contributed heavily to the productivity of industrial organizations. The assembly line and mass production embodying the principles of rational bureaucracy have paid rich dividends. Yet the total picture is more complicated than the older scientific management school would have predicted. Perhaps the most extreme embodiments of the bureaucratic model are to be found in the armed services and in the railroads. In both these types of organization we have maximum emphasis upon the principle of unity of command and of standard operating procedures. The facts, however, are that the railroads do not measure up to some other industrial concerns in total efficiency of operation and that armies traditionally are better prepared for the past rather than the present war. Apparently there are limitations to the simple translation of machine theory into operational procedures.

The Psychological Approach

It is remarkable that in spite of the continuing success story of the bureaucratic model, there are so many people who have become articulate in their opposition to it. The early idealistic revolt against machine theory took the form of protest against the stunting of personality through

depriving people of the satisfactions of craftsmanship and self expression in their jobs. A more potent opposition developed from research which showed the self-defeating nature of some of the very mechanisms for achieving effectiveness of operation. Elton Mayo and his co-workers documented the theory that organizational functioning de facto is not the same as organizational functioning de jure (14). Their findings about the importance of informal standards in work groups for productivity have been substantiated in subsequent research. The Human Relations program of the Michigan Survey Research Center has pinpointed some of the weaknesses of the bureaucratic machine model by studies which demonstrated (1) that man to man accountability down the line is often not as effective as a looser pattern of control, (2) that job fractionation and narrow role prescription can lead to lower rather than higher productivity and (3) that the rule-oriented or institutional supervisor concerned primarily with the observance of the role prescriptions of the organization is a weaker leader in attaining organizational objectives than the supervisor more oriented toward people (7, 9, 10). The work of Trist and his colleagues at the Tavistock Institute has suggested that increases in productivity and decreases in turnover and absenteeism can be accomplished in the British coal mines by introducing job enlargement and giving groups rather than individuals responsibility for job performance. (20) The most recent summary of the behavioral science findings related to organizational functioning, the work of B. Bass, furnishes additional documentation to the above findings (4).

It should also be noted that sociological theorists, as March and Simon point out, are concerned with the unanticipated dysfunctional consequences of bureaucratic organization (13). For example, the model of Gouldner calls attention to the fact that while the need for control leads to general impersonal rules and a resulting definition of unacceptable behavior, there is the unanticipated consequence of increasing knowledge about minimum acceptable behavior (5). And D. McGregor points out that management is still inhibited in new and creative solutions of its problems by the inadequacy of conventional organization theory (15).

The opposition to the bureaucratic model thus stems from the research and theories of psychologists and sociologists whose main criticism is that the model takes little account of the motivations which attract people to an organization, hold them in it, and energize them to perform their tasks at an optimum level. The modern reformulation of old bureaucratic theory is to recognize two sets of organizational and group functions: the task functions and the socio-emotional functions. The latter have to do with the psychological processes for maintaining morale. F. Bales and his colleagues have demonstrated the different requirements of task and socio-emotional roles in small groups (2) and Barnard's earlier formulation of organizational requirements stressed both the achievement of organizational purposes and the satisfaction of the immediate needs of its members (3). N. Morse, in a penetrating analysis of the problem, has described these functions as the binding-between and the binding-in, -- the binding-between functions are those emphasized in the older machine theory

and are concerned with the most efficient blue print which can be devised for organizational structures and role systems for the direct accomplishment of organizational tasks (16). They would include the devices already referred to in discussing unity of command, job standardization and specialization, uniformity of procedures and practices and coordination and control. The binding-in functions would include the processes by which people are induced to enter and stay in the organization and the rewards, penalties and satisfactions which determine the quality and quantity of their performance.

The discovery of the importance of binding-in or socio-emotional functions led some writers to a neglect of the importance of the bureaucratic structure in its contributions to organizational products or outcomes. The Mayo tradition is guilty to some degree of the neglect of formal structure in its emphasis upon informal structure. The human relations approach, in the hands of some students and practitioners, has also overlooked the significance of organizational structures concerned with the efficient attainment of organizational objectives. When this approach is carried to an extreme it assumes that if superiors and supervisors are considerate and decent in their dealings with those below them, as well as with their colleagues, organizational functioning will be greatly improved. And similarly, the group dynamics approach with its emphasis upon small group democracy neglects the organizational structure within which the small groups operate -- the organizational structure developed to bind together many sub-structures for the coordination of many people toward a common effort.

Solutions to the Conflict Between the Traditional and
Psychological Approaches

In other words, the recognition of the necessity for dealing with the socio-emotional functions in organizations does not solve the problem of how such functions relate to the more traditional and still vital task functions of the organization. The solution of neglecting the traditional bureaucratic structure is no solution. Another related solution is to recognize the nature of existing organizational structure and to abolish it not by closing one's eyes to its existence but by doing so in fact. Since men are moral and social institutions are immoral, let us do away with social institutions. This Rousseau-like doctrine was argued very forcibly by Floyd H. Allport in his Institutional Behavior some thirty years ago and it has always had some support from individualistic liberalism (1).

The most common solution, however, to the inadequacies of institutional functioning is the creation of more institutional machinery. A failure of coordination between two sub-parts of the organization is met by setting up a group of coordinators and finally a coordinator to coordinate the coordinators. A failure of communication up the line is countered by a suggestion system tied to incentives for the division sending in the most suggestions to the department head. Yet such a device may by-pass the line of command and depress the essential functions of certain supervisory levels. But the real tour de force comes when an attempt is made to incorporate the socio-emotional functions within the

organizational structure as if they were identical with the binding-between functions. If group decision increases the motivation of the group then it should be institutionalized as any other technical device for increasing productivity. The fact that group decision can only be effective, if other changes are made in organizational structure to give it freedom to operate, is ignored. Or supervisors are given a human relations course and the proper ways of dealing with their employees are institutionalized without recognition of the fact that institutionalization of such practices may be self-defeating. In other words this type of solution attempts to deal with the basic inadequacies of institutional functioning by creating more institutional machinery. A related but essentially different procedure for correcting organizational weaknesses is to set up new and competing organizational structures within the same institutional structure. In wartime the United States government has resorted to this procedure by the creation of war agencies which to some extent duplicate the old line agencies. Lacking the traditionalism of the old organization and its many protective devices, the new agency can operate with vigor before it too accumulates protocol, red tape, and ritualism. The genius of Franklin D. Roosevelt resided in part in his insight into bureaucratic structure. During World War II he revealed not only in the creation of new agencies which overlapped in part with the traditional departments of government, but in the setting up of even newer war agencies to compete with yesterday's creation. For emergency situations this type of solution has demonstrated its merit, for it prevented the president from becoming a captive of bureaucratic structure, it raised motivation because of the competition between

agencies and it resulted in organizations concerned primarily with their task or mission and not with their maintenance. It was still a relatively inefficient way of getting the job done and is less applicable to normal peacetime operations.

The basic solution to the dilemma is not abolition of democratic practices, nor the abolition of organizations, nor operation bootstrap of more and more institutionalization. The solution is one of reducing the amount and type of institutionalization, of decentralizing all but the most critical functions, of downward delegation, of consultative management, of group rather than individual responsibility in many areas of the organization, of broad rather than narrow definition of the goals and sub-goals of the organization, and of perceiving organizational procedures such as standard operating procedures as a means to an end rather than as a sacred end in themselves. In other words, we have been trapped by the concept of the tight organization which can be neatly fitted into an organization chart and which follows all the rules of machine theory. We need rather to be able to tolerate the ambiguity of a loose organization with wide margins of tolerance with respect to meeting role requirements. We need to define the managerial and and supervisory roles less in terms of the particular way of reaching a goal and more in terms of the goal itself. Our criterion in most organizations should not be the absolutistic one of trying to prevent every possible error but a probablistic one of the relative likelihood of error. The attempt to guard against every possible contingency is unrealistic and the organization should function more on the

law of averages than of potential error. The criterion for the location of decision making should always be: Can the decision be made effectively at lower levels? Many types of decisions can be delegated downward because they can be made as effectively and often more effectively at lower levels and because this frees top management for more adequate consideration of the truly important decisions.

Organizational Requirements

Before this type of solution can be applied to organizations, however, it is necessary to become more specific about how organizations really operate to achieve their goals. What types of behaviors are required from the various role incumbents and how are these behaviors motivated? In a sense these behaviors are our dependent variables and we need to know what independent and intervening variables will maximize their occurrence. For the rank-and-file of any organization five types of requirements can be specified:

1. People must remain in the organization for some optimum period. An organization with a very high turnover will spend a disproportionate amount of energy in recruiting and training its personnel. Sometimes too low turnover may be a problem in decreasing promotional opportunities within the organization. But the major point here is that people must be attracted to the institution and must remain within it for some considerable period.

2. A related requirement is that people must be reliable and regular in their attendance at their jobs. High absenteeism can be costly to the organization.

3. The quantity of work turned out must be close to the role requirements and sometimes in excess of the explicit or implicit norm of 100 set by the organization. The investment of energy must be such that no matter what the role, whether it be a line or staff position, there is a productive outcome.

4. The quality of work must again meet or exceed the standard role requirements. Different organizations may have low or high standards of tolerance for the quality of the job done, but there is always a limit to the amount of error and of defective products permitted by the organization.

5. In addition, most employees must on occasion go beyond the demands of the role, not in quantity and quality of the work produced, but in engaging in additional activities that will advance the goals of the organization. A worker may come to the aid of his fellow workers whose machine has run amuck. It may not be part of his job to study for a more responsible position in the organization. It may not be part of his responsibility to join his fellows and take group responsibility for the operation when the foreman is called away, nor is he required to help the organization recruit for additional employees. But most organizations function effectively because a fair number of their employees will do some things which go beyond their specific responsibilities -- beyond the call of organizational duty.

Now these five types of behavior though related are not necessarily motivated by the same drives and needs. The motivational pattern that will attract and hold people to an organization are not necessarily the same as those which will lead to higher productivity. Hence when we speak about organizational practices and policies which will further the attainment of organizational goals we need to specify which type of behavior we are attempting to influence. All of these behaviors are the product of motivational forces and organizational devices. Sometimes the organizational devices affect motivation directly and thus have immediate effects upon a given type of behavior. For example, a very generous piece rate may speed up production and an extreme type of job fractionation may on the other hand be very destructive of motivation to meet production standards. But on the other hand, the organizational device may assume the form of by-passing individual motivation and control production directly by controlling the speed of the assembly line. In this latter case the only motivational factor that needs to be taken into account is the acceptance by the workers of the rate at which the line moves. And this has probably been a matter of negotiation between union and management representatives. We shall refer to these direct effects upon the necessary behaviors to reach goals as organizational paths and to the direct motivational effects as motivational paths. An organization, then, may employ one of two paths to achieve a given sub-goal and it may use the organizational path for one sub-goal and a motivational path for another. Its freedom to attract and hold members in a free society, however, can rarely be an organizational means save for the armed services or for companies

who control all the jobs in a company owned town. Similarly, work beyond the line of duty is reached through motivational paths rather than through organizational controls. The quantity and quality of work, however, are attainable by either path.

Motivational Patterns

Let us examine then the motivational patterns that are necessary for the behaviors which make up these five sub-goals of the organization. The ready recruitment of people into a system and the low turnover of those in it are the direct reflection of the attraction of the system as a system. This system attractiveness may have little to do with the person's commitment to the purposes of an organization. Individuals with a commitment to organizational goals may only stay within the system if there are no competing organizations. The teacher dedicated to the purpose of education may move from one school to another, as he sees the possibilities of making greater contributions toward his commitment to education in one school rather than another. On the other hand, a person with no commitment to the purposes of an organization may stay in it because it is a pleasant place to work, because there are benefits which accrue through membership in the system and especially through seniority in it, or because his friends work there. It should be noted that only the system benefits based upon seniority in the system are critical. If he can find congenial colleagues in another establishment and if pleasant working conditions also obtain there, he may leave. Generally, however, the attachment to the system based

upon any set of factors takes on the reinforcement of psychological security for most people. They like the security of working where they have an accepted place in a familiar environment which has some attractive features. People, then, who show high attachment to the system as a system are going to help keep down organizational costs with respect to turnover and absenteeism. But they are not necessarily going to be high producers, nor quality producers, nor are they necessarily going to lift a single finger to help the organization attain its goals beyond the minimal role performance prescribed for them.

The motivational pathway to high productivity and to high quality production is a matter of intrinsic job satisfaction. The man who finds the type of work he delights in doing is the man who will not worry about the fact that the role requires a given amount of production of a certain quality. His gratifications accrue from accomplishment, from the expression of his own abilities, from the exercise of his own decisions. Craftsmanship was the old term to refer to the skilled performer who was high in intrinsic job satisfaction. This type of performer is not the clock watcher, nor the shoddy performer. On the other hand such a person is not necessarily tied to a given organization. As a good carpenter or a good mechanic it may matter little to him where he does work, provided that he is given ample opportunity to do the kind of job he is interested in doing. He may, moreover, contribute little to organizational goals beyond his specific role.

The basic motivational path toward actions beyond the line of duty is provided by internalization of organizational goals especially the specific objectives of a particular organization. Internalization then refers both to the incorporation of the major purpose of an organization such as education or making automobiles, and to the values and purposes of the particular organization of which the person is a member. It generally is confined to the officer personnel and to the higher echelons. In voluntary organizations it can extend into the rank and file and, in fact, any voluntary organization needs a hard core of dedicated people who are generally known as the dedicated damn fools. Many organizations deliberately set forth clear models of the type of person who represents the image of the organization as for example, the Marine Corps, the Rainbow Division, the Air Corps, the F.B.I., etc. Resistance to attempts by companies to create such an image are common among rank-and-file employees who contemptuously refer to the eager beavers in the organization as "company men." The great advantage of such internalization of organizational goals is that it meets all five types of behavioral requirements: low turnover, low absenteeism, high productivity, quality production and additional effort beyond role prescriptions.

Two other types of motivational syndromes are found within organizations in addition to attachment to the system, attachment to the job and attachment to the goals of the organization, namely, attachment to the work group and identification with the supervisor or other officer of the organization. Where there is high identification on the part of all

members with the work group, we have group solidarity, or group cohesiveness, which can be a powerful force within an organization. The direction such group identification and group cohesion takes, however, is not necessarily toward the accomplishment of organizational goals. The direction may in fact be in opposition to such goals. The direction will be determined by the substance or content of the group standards and may protect the group members against company time standards and other demands. Some industrial leaders have been afraid of group dynamics because they fear that the resulting group cohesion may not be controlled in the company's interest. The facts are, however, that such cohesive groups develop naturally in a company with their own standards for their members. S. Seashore studied work groups in a large manufacturing concern and found that the cohesive groups tended to have either higher or lower rates of productivity than the company as a whole. (18) The groups, lacking cohesion, tended to be widely distributed around the company norm. Group cohesion thus does not guarantee higher production, nor better quality work, nor work beyond the call of duty. It does, however, lead to lower absenteeism and lower turnover because the social satisfaction the men obtain from their own grouping holds them in the system.

R. Likert has utilized the findings from group experiments and industrial research to urge the replacement of the concept of man to man responsibility down the line by group responsibility (11). Each person in an organization should be a member of one or more well knit groups; for example, the first level supervisor should be involved with some of

his co-ordinate supervisors and their boss in one team as well as being a member of a group involving his own subordinates. In this manner, group standards may develop which will support rather than oppose organizational goals.

Finally, organizational members may be attached to their supervisor, or some other leader of the organization, and this also tends to hold them in the organization. It may or may not help to motivate them to become good producers or to work for organizational goals. The outcome of such identification with leaders depends upon the nature of the relationship. People may be dependent for some emotional satisfactions upon their boss and he in turn may need their emotional dependence to satisfy his own needs. This emotional interdependence may operate independently or even contrary to organizational goals. The boss may be satisfied to perform a nurturant function which feeds his ego without attempting to direct his followers toward more energetic performance toward organizational objectives. In fact, part of his father role may be to protect them from the tough requirements of the company. On the other hand, the leader may embody the ideal image of the organization and be yet so close to his immediate employees that they identify with him and seek to be like him. Or he may be such a fair and persuasive representative of their legitimate interests with higher management that they enjoy his leadership and accept his directions with respect to organizational purposes. In fact the patterns of leadership are many and varied and frequently have different effects upon the attainment of organizational effectiveness.

Conditions Productive of Various Types of Motivational Patterns

If we are to follow the motivational rather than the organizational path to achieve these five types of objectives, we need to examine further the conditions productive of the specific motivational patterns just described. If extrinsic job satisfaction or identification with the work itself is to be aroused and maximized, then the job itself must provide sufficient variety, sufficient complexity, sufficient challenge, sufficient skill to engage the abilities of the worker. If there is one confirmed finding in all the studies of worker morale and satisfaction, it is the correlation between the variety and challenge of the job and the gratifications which accrue to workers. There are of course cases of people who do not want more responsibility and of people who become demoralized by being placed in jobs which are too difficult for them. These are, however, the exceptions. By and large people seek more responsibility, more skill-demanding jobs than they hold and, as they are able to attain these more demanding jobs they become happier and better adjusted. Obviously the condition for securing higher motivation to produce and to produce quality work necessitates changes in organizational structure -- specifically job enlargement rather than job fractionation. And yet the tendency in large scale organizations is toward increasing specialization and routinization of jobs. Workers would be better motivated toward higher individual production and toward better quality work if we discarded the assembly line and moved toward the craftsmanlike operations of the old Rolls Royce type of production. Industry has demonstrated,

however, that it is more efficient to produce via assembly line methods with lowered motivation and job satisfaction than with highly motivated craftsman with a large area of responsibility in turning out their part of the total product. The preferred path to the attainment of production goals in turning out cars or other mass physical products is then the path of organizational controls and not the path of motivation. The quality of production may suffer somewhat but it is still cheaper to buy several mass-produced cars, allowing for programming for obsolescence, than it is to buy a single quality product like the Rolls Royce.

While organizational control and coordination may be the preferred path to productivity there are still some general qualifications that must be made about its use in preference to the motivational path. In the production of physical objects intended for mass consumption, the assembly line may furnish the best model. This may also apply to service operations in which the process can be sufficiently simplified to provide service to masses of consumers. When, however, we move to organizations which have the modifications of human beings as their product as in educational institutions, or when we deal with treating basic problems of human beings as in hospitals, clinics and remedial institutions, we do not want to rely solely upon an organizational control to guarantee minimum effort of employees. We want employees with high motivation and high identification with their jobs. Jobs cannot profitably be fractionated very far and standardized and coordinated to a rigorous time schedule in a research laboratory, in a medical clinic, in an educational institution or in a hospital. An educational system which routinizes learning so that throughout

an entire state all fourth grade students will be memorizing the same paragraph from page 146 of the standard text in American History is simply not an educational system. Hospital administration which modeled itself after the machine theory of organization is beginning to move to a more appropriate managerial practice with emphasis upon "open" hospitals permitting greater freedom to both patients and hospital personnel. The ideal is no longer to wake up every patient with a wet wash cloth at five-thirty in the morning.

In addition to the recognition of the inapplicability of organizational devices of the factory and the army to all organizations, it is also true that not all factory operations can be left to institutional controls without regard to the motivations of employees. It frequently happens that job fractionation can be pushed to the point of diminishing returns even in industry. The success of the Tavistock workers in raising productivity in the British coal mines through job enlargement was due to the fact that the specialization of American long-wall methods of coal mining did not yield adequate returns when applied to the difficult and variable conditions under which British miners had to operate. The question of whether to move toward greater specialization and standardization in an industrial operation or whether to move in the opposite direction is generally an empirical one to be answered by research. One rule of thumb can be applied, however. If the job can be so simplified and standardized that it is readily convertible to automated machines, then the direction to take is that of further institutionalization until automation is

possible. If, however, the over-all performance requires complex judgment, the differential weighing of factors which are not markedly identifiable, or of creativity, then the human mind is a far superior instrument to the most elaborate electronic brain.

The paradox is that where automation is feasible it can actually increase the motivational potential among the employees who are left on the job after the change over. F. Mann and R. Hoffman conclude from their study of automation in an electric power plant that the remaining jobs for workers can be more interesting, that there can be freer association among colleagues, and that the elimination of supervisory levels brings the top and bottom of the organization closer together (12).

The conditions productive of attachment to the organization as a system have already been alluded to -- namely the rewards which membership in the system provide. They include pleasant working conditions, recreational facilities, a congenial institutional atmosphere, and good fringe benefits. The prestige of an organization is also a factor in attracting and holding people. In some communities there is a prestige attached to working for a big public utility rather than for a relatively small and unknown firm. For maximum effect to keep people tied to an organization the system rewards should be based upon seniority in the system. Since they are not geared to productivity and hence will not greatly affect it, they should be tied to the major variable with which they are concerned -- staying in the system.

The rewards for making a system attractive for recruitment and for holding people are, of course, relative to competing systems. The fresh

Ph.D. in physics who has his choice between a university, an industrial concern or a government agency, all of whom offer opportunities for research, will balance the prestige, social and intellectual climate of the university against the attractive salary scale of industry against the resources of the government laboratory. In general, an organization to be attractive in such a competitive situation must meet minimal requirements in a number of areas and then maximize the rewards in the area in which it has the greatest strength. Thus, industry will try to meet minimal standards of a free climate for research but will have to play to its strength by a vastly superior salary scale. The university, on the other hand, must raise its salaries to certain minimal levels and then rely upon the intellectual climate it can provide. In this particular instance the government has difficulty in selecting its strongest appeal for purposes of maximizing its attractiveness.

The conditions for creating internalization of organizational goals have been suggested in our discussion of this pattern of motivation. The basic factor is the linkage of the organizational goal either with the individual's self concept or with some value system which is close to his self concept. In some cases this comes about through self-selection of the individual for a particular organization. A Catholic girl committed to the ideals of the nursing profession may see herself as a nurse in some Catholic hospital of her choice long before she has received her nursing degree. Or a youngster growing up in the tradition of one of the military services may have always thought of himself as an Air Force officer. But generally, the early socialization process does not

result in such clear-cut institutional images. People internalize the goals of groups more often as a result of their adult socialization into those groups.

Internationalization of group goals comes about in three ways. In the first place, the individual may participate in decisions about group policies. He becomes ego involved as the result of his participation. In the second place, he may make other contributions to the group functioning which are sufficiently expressive of his own talents and abilities and sufficiently significant as contributions to the group that he identifies with the organization. Since he has helped to make it, it is his. Generally these two avenues are open to the top officer personnel and very few people in the lower echelons have such opportunities. In the third place, an organization can induce some internalization of its purposes by continued emphasis upon a clear cut model of its ideals. An image of what the organization stands for is thus created and is made attractive because of its moral, heroic or otherwise socially desirable characteristics. The attractiveness is reinforced by the social support of group members. People can thus tie their self image or their ego ideal into the image of the organization (8). Behavior consistent with this model is the first virtue in the eyes of the institution.

The image of the organization is aided appreciably by personalization; i.e., by casting the model in the form of present leaders -- or of past heroes. General Patton of the Third Army with his military posture, his silver pistols, his standards of discipline presented such a personal

model for his troops. Political parties glorify their past warriors and institutions constantly attempt to create charisma about their leaders. The identification which occurs with such personal models may produce only partial internalization of organizational purposes. People may identify with the great figure in order to participate in a compensatory manner in his greatness. Nonetheless some of the virtues he represents become their own ideals.

An organization that has a task of emotional significance enjoys an advantage in the creation of an attractive image. If the task is attended by hazard as in the tracking down of criminals by the F.B.I. or of adventure as in the early days of flying or of high service to humanity as in the case of a cancer clinic, it is not difficult to develop a model of the institution's purpose.

The imaginative leader can also help in the development of an attractive picture of the organization by some new concept of the agency's mission. The police force entrusted with the routine and dirty business of law enforcement carried out by dumb cops and "flatfeet" can be energized by seeing themselves as a corps of professional officers devoted to the highest form of public service. Reality factors limit the innovative use of symbols for the glorification of organizations. Occupational groups, however, constantly strive to achieve a more attractive picture of themselves as in the instance of press agents who have become public relations specialists or undertakers who have become morticians.

The conditions productive of supervisory patterns that maximize the five types of behavior necessary for effective organizational functioning are not as well known as might be expected from our long concern with the problem of leadership. Promotion to supervisory and officer position often goes to personnel who have demonstrated their competence as industrious workers and as technical experts in the tasks of the organization but who have had no training in administration and who may have no aptitude for it. Many industrial organizations are staffed with engineers at their top levels because these are the people most expert in the technical aspects of production.

In many organizations the function of keeping people happy in the organizational setting so they will not quit is handled primarily by officers who can play the role of socio-emotional leaders, the yea sayers. The function of turning out high quality production is carried out by a different set of supervisors who play the role of the tough task masters, the nay sayers. This is essentially a compromise solution and though fairly effective may produce conflict and unanticipated undesirable consequences. A more ideal type of supervisory pattern, which is also more difficult of achievement, is the integration of these two functions in one boss. This may require a man capable of getting the approval of his group on major directions of policy and of being firm about the specific administration of that policy. The involvement of the group in acceptance of policy will satisfy the socio-emotional function and the firm execution of the policy will meet the demands of the task function.

Research results indicate that supervisors who devote themselves exclusively to production matters and to the observance of routine institutional duties are not the heads of high-producing groups nor of groups with high morale. Those supervisors, however, who give considerable time to the problems of the management of people are much more likely to be the leaders of groups with high morale and high productivity. The following items of supervisory practice were found to be much more characteristic of the leaders of high morale groups than of low morale groups in a large public utility (17):

<u>Per Cent of Employees making</u> <u>Evaluation of Supervisor</u>	<u>High Morale</u> <u>Group</u>	<u>Low Morale</u> <u>Group</u>	<u>Difference</u>
1. He thinks of employees as human beings, not just as people to get the work done	97%	33%	64%
2. He will go to bat or stand up for me	87%	30%	57%
3. He is fair in dealing with people I work with	81%	23%	58%
4. He knows the job well and can give right answers	94%	44%	50%
5. He gives help when I really need it	92%	46%	46%
6. He likes to get our ideas and tries to do something about them	100%	60%	40%

7. He is quick to praise people rather than criticize	83%	30%	53%
8. He keeps me well informed about what goes on in company	84%	33%	51%
9. He keeps men posted on how well they are doing	47%	12%	35%
10. He hears complaints and grievances	65%	32%	33%

Nine of the above items which differentiate very well the high and low morale groups are manifestations of the socio-emotional aspects of leadership. The one exception relates to technical competence (Item 4) or task orientation. In contrast the following three items show no appreciable differences between the high and low morale groups:

<u>Perception of supervisor</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Difference</u>
	<u>Morale</u>	<u>Morale</u>	
11. He arranges the work and makes work assignments	67%	69%	- 2%
12. He enforces the rules	54%	54%	0
13. He keeps the men supplied with materials and tools	36%	41%	- 5%

These three items refer to the institutional task-oriented practices of the organizations and bear no relationship to employee morale.

In discussing the motivational paths to quantity and quality of production as well as to extra-role effort we have devoted our attention mostly to intrinsic factors such as the nature of the job, group responsibility in the making of decisions and the internalization of organizational goals. Another set of motivational devices consists of external rewards and penalties such as pay, promotions, praise and awards, on the one hand, and demotion, demerits and censure on the other. The use of external rewards and penalties as summed up in the candy-and-the-stick philosophy has the force of tradition behind it and with substantial reason. The difficulties of employing these methods effectively in large organizations have also been widely recognized. Money as an incentive has its primary advantage in attracting people into an organization rather than in energizing them toward organizational goals once they are in the system.¹ If the pay incentive is to yield greater productivity it has to be a differential reward geared to differential effort and be sufficiently sizeable to counteract the unfavorable norms against the rate buster. If the employee gets the same wage by virtue of his classification then there is no incentive for him to produce more than the next man in his classification. In large scale organizations it may not be efficient to work out a differential pay scale based upon individual effort partly because there is no easy way of timing jobs and equating effort units,

¹ Take for example the behavior of the pilot shot down on his surveillance mission over Russia whose salary apparently did not insure the expected role performance.

partly because the work may depend more upon cooperative effort than individual performance, partly because it is difficult to make clearly visible to workers the different standards of performance commensurate with different rewards, partly because workers fear such devices as exploitative. Hence, it is the exception rather than the rule to find large organizations in which the piece rate system is effectively employed to increase the quantity and quality of production.

Promotion and upgrading are perhaps the most potent of the external rewards available to management. Promotion generally not only means an increase in pay but also an increase in status, in privileges and in job responsibility. Again, if the opportunities for promotion are to motivate employees to greater productive effort, promotions have to be clearly perceived as being bestowed upon those who are the most deserving in terms of the quality and quantity of their performance. And again large organizations, with standardization of role performance and with limited promotional possibilities for the great mass of their employees, have special problems in utilizing the potential of this form of reward.

Negative sanctions are even more difficult to gear into the productive system of a large scale enterprise in a democratic society in a period of a tight labor market. They can be used to preserve minimum standards of performance rather than to elicit maximum accomplishment. In a more authoritarian setting, where the top echelons can command more implicit obedience of group members, negative sanctions are much more part of the natural system of control. In general, however, penalties function to

produce avoidance of undesirable behavior; and the minimum of acceptable performance soon becomes the maximum norm for the members of the system.

The general conclusion, then, with respect to the utilization of motivational rather than control devices for meeting organizational requirements is that the external sanctions of reward and punishment are much more appropriate for keeping people in an organization and setting minimum standards of performance than they are for activating people toward maximum accomplishment of organizational goals. The latter type of objective calls for more internalized motivation which ties into organizational functioning in operations in a more functional way -- i.e., the rewards flow naturally from the activities engaged in.

Summary

The frame of reference of this paper is that the psychological approach to interpersonal relations cannot assume a social vacuum in which principles of human relations are divorced from an organizational context. Organizational members no matter where they stand in the hierarchy are playing roles with respect to the accomplishment of group goals. No matter how much good will they bear one another, no matter how kind, sympathetic and understanding they may want to be, they are still limited by the roles in which they find themselves. Hence genuine efforts in organizations to increase the motivation of its members, and the gratifications they derive, must be related to changes in the organizational structure.

Two paths to organizational goals can be distinguished, the motivational path and the control path. It may be more efficient for organizations producing material goods, or rendering routine services, to give greater emphasis to the control means for achieving certain purposes as in the case of controlling the rate of the assembly line in producing automobiles. It may be more efficient, however, for organizations concerned with modifying human behavior, creating new ideas and techniques, or taking care of the health and welfare of human beings to utilize the motivational path for achieving most of its objectives. Finally, in the use of motivational means it is important to distinguish between the many and differing requirements of the organization. Organizations must meet the requirements of attracting and holding personnel, of obtaining some minimum level of quantitative and qualitative performance in their role assignments and finally of obtaining some degree of performance toward the accomplishment of group goals beyond that of the role specifications. The devices that may attract and hold members in an organization may not insure high quality of performance. The factors that maximize good role performance may not facilitate extra-role behavior. If we are to increase organizational effectiveness through energizing its members more fully, three questions must be answered: (1) What specific target are we aiming at in terms of the behavior of people, (2) What motivational pattern needs to be aroused to produce the desired behavior and (3) What are the determinants of this pattern, both personal and organizational?

References

- (1) Floyd H. Allport. Institutional Behavior, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1933.
- (2) Freed Bales. Interaction Process Analysis, Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1949.
- (3) Chester Barnard. The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- (4) Bernard Bass. Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior, New York: Harper & Bro., 1960.
- (5) Alvin W. Gouldner. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1954.
- (6) Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (eds.) Papers on the Science of Administration, New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.
- (7) Robert L. Kahn and Daniel Katz. Leadership Practices in Relation to Productivity and Morale, pp. 612-628 (chap. 41) in Group Dynamics, eds. Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1953.
- (8) Daniel Katz. The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes, Public Opinion Quarterly, 24, 1960, 163-204.
- (9) Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn. Some Recent Findings in Human Relations Research, pp. 650-665 in Readings in Social Psychology, eds. Guy E. Swanson, Theodore Newcomb, and Eugene Hartley, 2nd edition, New York: Henry Holt, 1952.
- (10) Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn. Human Organization and Worker Motivation, pp. 146-171 in Industrial Productivity. Industrial Relations Research Association, 1952.
- (11) Rensis Likert. A Motivational Approach to a Modified Theory of Organization and Management, Chap. 7, pp. 184-217 in Modern Organization Theory, ed. Mason Haire, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.
- (12) Floyd Mann and Richard Hoffman. Automation and the Worker, New York: Henry Holt, 1960.

- (13) James G. March, Herbert A. Simon and Harold Guetzkow, Organizations, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.
- (14) Elton Mayo. The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization, Boston: Harvard Business School, 1945.
- (15) Douglas McGregor. The Human Side of Enterprise, New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
- (16) Nancy C. Morse and Everett Reimer. Experimental Change of a Major Organizational Variable, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52, 1955, 120-129.
- (17) Donald Pelz. A Comparison of High and Low Morale Employees, mimeographed report of Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1949.
- (18) Stanley E. Seashore. Group Cohesiveness in the Industrial Work Group, Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1955.
- (19) Frederic W. Taylor. The Principles of Scientific Management, New York: Harper and Bro., 1947.
- (20) Eric Trist and K. W. Bamforth. Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Long wall Method of Coal-Getting, Human Relations, 4, 1951, 3-38.
- (21) Max Weber. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, Glencoe, Ill.: 1947.
- (22) James Worthy. Factors Influencing Employee Morale, Harvard Business Review, 28, 1950, 61-73.