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Focus on past to present:

Instinct – rfmt – soc psy – content (needs) – cognitive (VIE/equity) – soc cog (self eff)

1. What are the implications for practitioners for answers to the questions posed regarding the future of motivational theories?

Answers to the posed questions will determine if we stagnate or advance (new theories or modify existing), and hence how what theory/models we’ll use to motivate workers.
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* What is the future of work motivation theories?
* What are the critical questions that must be addressed if progress in the field is to be made?
* What is the future research agenda?
* How can we extend or modify current models of work motivation so they continue to be relevant in the future? And
* where are entirely new models of motivation needed to further our understanding of employee behavior and job performance in contemporary organizations?

2. What was Vroom’s criticism of theorists’ use of hedonism that caused it to be abandoned as a viable approach to understanding motivation?
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As Vroom explains, hedonism

no clear-cut specification of the type of events that were pleasurable or painful, or even how these events could be determined for a particular individual; nor did it make clear how persons acquired their conceptions of ways of attaining pleasure or pain, or how the source of pleasure or pain might be modified by experience. In short, the hedonistic assumption has no empirical content and was untestable (1964: 10)

3. What *do you think* were the limitations of instinct theory(James, Freud, McDougall) that caused it to give way to drive theory? (thought question).

Nominalistic error”, not testable, not lend themselves to testing. Too many, any identifiable trait could be called an instinct.

McDougall as “an inherited or innate psychological predisposition which determined its possessor to perceive,

or pay attention to, objects of a certain class, to experience an emotional excitement of a particular

quality upon perceiving such an object, and to act in regard to it in a particular manner

(1908: 4).

James identified a list of such instincts that included locomotion, curiosity, sociability, fear,

jealousy, and sympathy.

4. How much of influence did Skinner’s behaviorist approach on Taylor’s ideas of pay for performance?

None. But there are a lot of similarities.

Taylor 1911, Skinner, 1953. None

6 What did Taylor’s, Herzberg’s and Mayo et al. theories have in common that separates them from Instinct or hedonism theory?

 Both assumed that **situational (environmental) factors influenced** motivation. Work design.

5. What made McClelland’s need (content) theory, superior to Maslow’s for understanding work behavior?

Murray (1938) but more fully developed by McClelland (1961, 1971), ignored the concept of a hierarchy and focused instead on the motivational potency of an array of distinct and clearly defined needs, including achievement, affiliation, power, and autonomy. **McClelland argued that, at any given time, individuals possess several often competing needs that serve to motivate behavior when activated**.

6. What are relative advantages and disadvantages of content and process theories to understand work motivation?

Content: forces us to consider what is common (norms) and individual differences within individuals (p) while

Process focuses on how thoughts (reasoning: rational/irrational influence behavior and how thinking is influenced by situational (e) and indiv diff variables (p)
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**Process theorists** view work motivation from a **dynamic perspective** and look for **causal relationships**

across time and events as they relate to human behavior in the workplace.

7. What are some advancements made by Porter, Lawler and others to extend expectancy’s usefulness after Vroom’s original formulation?

* Role of Individual differences
* Relationship between **performance** and subsequent **satisfaction**
* **Feedback** to recognize learning, i.e. how behavior changes…is directed

Expanded to other types of wok beh. Abseentism, turnover OCB

Linked group expectations and social influences to individual work motivation decisions

8. What more broad they “acquired” equity theory (Adams)? What makes it a special case of the broader theory?

Justice and fairness theory

9. How does self-efficacy (Stajkovic & Luthans) incorporate p \* e considerations of motivation?

Individuals differ in self-efficacy as *f* of e variables.

Stajkovic and Luthans (1998, 2003) found considerable support for the role of self-efficacy in determining work related performance, particularly as **moderated by task complexity and locus of control.**

 Recent developments

10. What evidence is there to conclude whether or not interest in the development of motivational theory has increased or declined? What has caused this?

Decline in articles published in past decades, texts still show most of same theories.

However, by the 1990s, intellectual interest in work motivation *theory*—at least as measured

by journal publications—seemed to decline precipitously. As evidence of this, consider the number of theoretical (as opposed to empirical) articles published in leading behavioral

science journals over the past decade (e.g., see Ambrose & Kulik, 1999, or Mitchell &

Daniels, 2002). You will find few articles that focus on genuine theoretical developments in

this area. Instead, you will see minor extensions, empirical tests, or applications of existing

theories. At the same time, a review of the most recent editions of textbooks in the

field of management and organizational behavior reveals that most of the theories discussed

date from the 1960s and 1970s, with only fleeting references to more recent work.

(It is also curious that some early motivation theories that have subsequently been widely

discredited continue to permeate such texts.)

why?

work has changed, diversity, teams focus, redefining hierarchy notions, globalization makes it more variable.

Road ahead

11. what focal points are recommened by the authors of the six AMR papers?

1).Locke and Latham – metatheories, focus on practitioners use

2) Fried, Slowik – how time factors influence GS processes and perf

3) Myeong-Gu Seo, Barrett, Bartunek – neurobiological theories dealing with affect, cognition

4) Kanfer and Ackerman – life-span, aging on motivation.

5) Ellemers, de Gilder, Haslam – self-categorization theory and social id processes, complexity in interaction of teams

 6). Kehr – synthesizes explicit and implicit motives and perceived abilities on motivation using a compensatory model.

12 How would you briefly describe to practitioners (HR or manager) what I/O psychologists know about how to motivate workers?

**Latham & Pinder (2005)**

Intro

1. Why did the authors decide to place special emphasis on “contextual effects and mediating mechanisms” in reporting the status of motivational theories?

We selectively review theory and research, emphasizing work published in the past decade, 1993–2003, with special emphasis given to research on contextual effects and mediating mechanisms. This is because scholars (e.g., Pinder 1998) have pointed to the **power of context to moderate opportunities for, and constraints against, organizational behavior.** In addressing this issue, the chapter concludes with an assessment of the degree to which progress has been made to predict, understand, and influence motivation in the workplace

2. what are the three primary areas of focus for this review?

**National culture, job design, and p-e fit.**

3. Compare and contrast needs, traits, values, affect, and relate them to the three primary area of focus (q 2).

**An individual-difference variable rooted in needs is (*c*) values.**

 Needs and values affect (*g*) cognition, particularly goals. Cognition plays an integral role in each of these concepts.

 Although (*h*) affective reactions need not depend on cognition (Bandura 1997), the two usually are reciprocally related (Lord & Kanfer 2002). Moreover, emotion focused coping encompasses both cognitive and behavioral strategies (Kanfer & Kantrowitz 2002). Finally, affect is influenced by culture as well as by organizational norms (Lord & Harvey 2002).

NEEDS

4. What has happened to Maslow’s theory?

“.. is **the resurgence** of interest in Maslow’s (1943) hierarchical need theory.

Wicker et al. (1993) showed that

**between-goal correlations and partial correlations across four samples of college students supported Maslow’s theory when intentions to act were rated rather than measures of importance. Ronen (2001),** using multidimensional scaling of employee data collected in 15 countries rather than factor

analysis, found **support for the taxonomic element** of Maslow’s theory. Kluger &

Tikochinsky (2001) advocated ongoing efforts to find ways to **operationalize the theory’s** validly.

5. Is there any evidence that our needs for acceptance, status, control, predictability and order are rooted in biology?

Yes, argues Hogan & Warrenfeltz, (2002)getting along and ahead.

6. what are some shortcomings of need-based theories?
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Don’t explain why specific actions are taken

Don’t account for individual differences

TRAITS

7. Why it there so much focus on personality and motivation (since 2000)?

Schmitt et al. (2003) personality is the **primary predictor of elements of motivation.** In fact, research now **shows that traits predict and/or influence job search and choice of job, as well as job performance and satisfaction**.

These traits:

**extroversion,**

**conscientiousness,**

**self-regulatory**

**self-monitoring strategies,**

**tenacity,**

**Core self-evaluations**

**GO goal orientation**

8. What explains why self-monitoring is an important trait that predicts success at work?

Day et al. (2002) - a robust positive relationship with **job performance**,with **advancement into leadership positions.**

self-monitors are motivated to **meet the expectations of others**, which in turn **enhances**

**their likeability.** Likeability is a key to job progression (Hogan et al. 1994).

Day & Schleischer (2004) concluded that self-monitors outperform those who are low on needs in getting along and getting ahead.

 9. What effect does a “weak” or “strong” work situation have on how well traits predict work behavior? Use conscientiousness and level of job autonomy to illustrate your point.
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**Tett & Burnett (2003)** presented a person-situation interactionist model of job

performance that lays the groundwork for specifying the conditions under which

particular personality traits predict and explain performance in specific jobs.

Their model proposes that **employees seek out and are satisfied with tasks, people, and**

**job characteristics that allow them opportunities for expressing an array of personality**

**traits**.

Variance in trait-expressive behavior is maximized in “weak” situations. In “strong” situations, extrinsic rewards overpower individual differences in intrinsic rewards associated with trait expression.

Mount & Barrick ’95 consci is particularly important with jobs that allow autonomy (weak situation)

 10. How and why do social skills moderate the relationship between conscientiousness and performance (Witt & Ferris, 2003)?

 Witt & Ferris (2003) found that the relationship between conscientiousness and job performance that requires interpersonal effectiveness is **moderated by social skill**. Among **workers low in social skill**, the relationship **between conscientiousness and performance was either irrelevant or negative.**

Hogan & Shelton (1998) argued that social skill, a **learned ability, is necessary for motivation to lead to success.**

11. How does an individual’s Goal Orientation, i.e. LGO & PGO, influence what motivates them and how they choose goals (Dweck, 1999)?

 Dweck (1999) Learning or performance goal orientation.

**Incrementalists (LGO)** focus on the **acquisition of knowledge and the perfecting of competence**. Hence **they choose tasks that are challenging for them. Errors are viewed as allowing opportunities to learn** from mistakes.

**Entitists (PGO) view their ability as fixed.**

 choose tasks that **allow them to easily demonstrate proficiency** at the expense of learning something new.

**PGO disposition correlates negatively with self-efficacy** (Phillips & Gully 1997).

**LGO is positively related to openness to new experiences and optimism** (Vande-

Walle 1996), internal locus of control (Button et al. 1996), desire for hard work

(VandeWalle 1997), and effort (VandeWalle et al. 1999). VandeWalle et al. (1999)

“There is considerable evidence of goal orientation existing as a stable individual difference” (p. 250).

**VALUES**

12. How do values differ from needs?

Values (trans-situational goals) are acquired, needs in born

A step closer to actions.

Note: Malka and Chatman (2003). Found that b-school grads with external work orientation were more satisfied and higher subjective well being than those with intrinsic orientation.

….was it the population? Characteristics of b-school are in it for the money?

…are those in it for intrinsic motivation frustrated?

13. Describe how two of your values affect your goal choices.

**CONTEXT**

14. Why are values receiving more attention as the workplace becomes more global?

Globalization: values in context of person’s culture, job and p-e fit.

**National Culture**

**Three key sets of distal sources:**

* **self concept**
* **norms (work ethic, tolerance for ambiguity, “achievement” motive, LOC**
* **environmental factors: education, socialization, eco prosperity, political sys.**

15. How would you implement a pay system and a communication system differently for a global organization in two countries with different cultural values for individualism-collectivism, and power distance?

16. How does self-efficacy affect one’s effectiveness in cross-cultural interpersonal interactions?
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Earley (2002) three-level construct of “cultural intelligence,” in which a person’s self-efficacy vis-`a-vis social discourse in cross-cultural settings **plays a key role in the effectiveness of such interactions**. High self-efficacy resulted in the individual **initiating cross-cultural interactions, persisting in the face of early failures, and engaging in problem solving as a way of mastering the necessary skills.”**

 **Job Design Characteristics**

17. Describe a specific job that has high autonomy and one with low autonomy on Cordery’s (1977) three dimensions of autonomy.

**a. method control, b. timing control, c. discretion in setting performance goals.**

Perceived control (participation esp with Lean Process) enhances self-efficacy (Parker and Wall, 1998).

18. Is autonomy important for all jobs? If not, what kinds don’t need it?

**Routine ones with high predictability.**

19. Compared to the strength of the situation, little research has addressed “strong” and “weak” personalities on job design and choice, and how the employee shapes the job. Give an example you know about where a strong personality shaped a job.

**PERSON-CONTEXT FIT**

20. How would you assess an applicant’s three types of fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002) to maximize the likelihood s/he would work out well as an employee?

Cable & DeRue (2002), through a confirmatory factor analysis, found that employees

(*a*) person-environment fit - organizational outcomes such as **org identification and turnover** decisions);

Ask them?

(*b*) “needs-supplies” - **career-related outcomes such as employee satisfaction**) and

What their needs are…common to the org objectives

 (*c*) job demands– **employee abilities fit. Test them**

**Kristof-Brown et al. (2002) showed that three varieties** have positive effects on **job satisfaction.**

21. How would you address the problem (at the individual employee level) that p-e fit is dynamic and not stable?

Periodically address the issues

**COGNITION**

**Goal-Setting Theory (most dominant)**

22. In the Latham et al. (1994) study, why do you think the PDM (team) condition resulted in higher performance? What are the implications for this regarding the use of teams?
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Latham et al. (1994) investigated assigned versus participative goal setting in which people worked in a group (participative decision making; PDM) or alone on a complex task. **No main effect was found for goal setting as the two conditions were yoked.** But there was a main effect for **decision making** with performance significantly higher in the PDM than in the individual decision making condition.

->The main effect of PDM on performance, however, was mediated by **self-efficacy and task strategy**.

**Contextual Conditions**

23. What are some things you can do to control for contextual variables that will minimize problems with goal setting? (P. 497-498)

a. **avoid** group and individual **goal incompatibility**

b. make sure they **understand the task and strategy** to do it.

c. **reduce environmental uncertainty** (when information, environment changes)

d. use more **proximal goals** to **increase error management (reduce error)**

e. for complex tasks, make **distal learning goals** rather than PG (with High self-efficacy)

f. use **detailed job analysis** to id the behaviors necessary to reach goals

**Implementation Intentions and Auto-Motive Goals (make it automatic)**

24. If automatic or unconscious goals produce the same outcomes as conscious ones (Bargh & Ferguson, 2000), why bother to make them explicit?

To the extent that environmental features become associated with the goal, the importance of conscious choice is removed entirely.

**Feedback (moderator of goal effectiveness)**

25. What are the implications for the use of feedback depending upon whether or not Learning Goals are treated as dispositional or a state?

LGO – negative feedback is useful esp with high self-efficacy. (Dweck – believes it’s domain specific.

**Self regulation**

26. Do you agree with Gollwitzer (1999) or Lord and Levy (1994) that self-regulation **requires a lot of attention or is automatic and does not?** What are the implications?

Effects of intention on behavior (self reg mediates)

**Intentions (self regulation-> behavior**

Phases of self-regulation:

“Predecisional, preactional, actional, post actional”.

The level of complexity in Gollwitzer’s work on self-regulation is in strong contrast with theory and research by industrial/organizational psychologists in North America

 Lord & Levy (1994) suggested that self-regulation was an automatic data-driven process.

**De Shon et al. (1996)** obtained empirical support for this assertion.They reported that **self-regulation does not require a significant amount of attentional resources.**

**Expectancy Theory**

27. How can ProMes (based on NPI theory) be used to incorporate the most important assumptions of Expectancy theory?

VIE: e-p-v (PROMes identifies objectives …outcomes required (performance), measures how well they are met (assesses success of effort), provides feedback (to guide effort/perf). I.e. efficiency for using resources.

**Social Cognitive Theory**

28. What are the implications for treating self-efficacy as a general trait (Chen et al., 2004) rather than task specific (Bandura, 203) for developing an employee development program?

 SCT rejects the trait approach to human behavior. Perceived **self-efficacy and outcome expectancies are not context-less global dispositions assessed by an omnibus test** (Bandura 2002). Nevertheless, Chen et al. (2004) have validated a measure of general rather than task-specific self-efficacy. They found that self-efficacy is distinct from self-esteem in predicting important outcomes in organizational settings. Eden (2001) showed that this measure, namely a person’s belief in the efficacy of the tool

**AFFECT/EMOTION**

29. Why would negative mood be more highly correlated with creativity than positive mood (George & Zhou, 2002)?

 **Negative moods signal that the status quo is problematic**; hence employees exert effort to generate useful ideas rather than stop because of their satisfaction with the status quo. The mediator is a meta-mood process, namely clarity of one’s feelings. **The moderating contextual variable is an organizational culture in which recognition and rewards are given for creativity**. When clarity as to one’s feelings as well as rewards are absent, negative mood appears to have little association with creativity.

30. How important is it for a leader to act and appear to act fairly? What are some of the most important outcomes, favorable and unfavorable that can result from treating employees fairly or unfairly?

Affect -> behaviors: effort, performance, OCB,

Absenitsm sabotage, revenge, decrease in helping behavior.

Does retribution feel good?

**CONCLUSIONS**

31. Which of the theories, GS, cognitive, organizational justice appeal to you? Why?

32. Why do you think that there has been an increase in interest on affect as a dependent variable, given the earlier work that found that (satisfaction) showed little relationship to performance?

Disgust, anger, euphoria?

 [Locke & Latham (2004) What should we do about motivation theory? Six Recommendations for the 21st century. Acad Mgt Rev.](http://home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Locke%20%26%20latham%20What%20should%20Aca%20M%20rev%2004.pdf)

**We present six recommendations for building theories of work motivation that are**

**more valid, more complete, broader in scope, and more useful to practitioners than**

**existing theories.**

 **(1) Integrate extant theories by using existing meta-analyses to**

**build a megatheory of work motivation.**

**(2) Create a boundaryless science of work motivation.**

**(3) Study the various types of relationships that could hold between general (trait) and situationally specific motivation.**

**(4) Study subconscious as well as conscious motivation.**

**(5) Use introspection explicitly in theory building.**

**(6) Acknowledge the role of volition in human action when formulating theories.**

1. Why do we even need theories? What value do they provide to the researcher and practitioners? (thought question).

2. Using a computer model, i.e. input – process (cognitive) – outputs, classify each of Locke’s numbered elements in his integrated model (fig. 1) as to whether they are I-P-O.

3. Most hypothetical models are typically speculative in nature. Is Locke’s as well?

This is not a speculative model. Every connection but one—namely, the link from needs to values—is based on empirical research.

4. How does Locke suggest the model could be strengthened by adding strengths of the relationships (coefficients) to the paths identified?

 This could be done by combining the results of all known **meta-analyses relevant** to each path in the model and would **include calculating known mediation effects, as well as known moderator effects**. It would also entail **adding pathways based on theories** for which there is some empirical evidence but which are not, as yet, included in the model

5. How does Locke recommend that I/O psychologists use Welch’s notion to create a “boundary-less science of work motivation?

First, work motivation theory needs to be extended into and further developed within areas other than isolated task performance settings. Second, motivation theorists should consider using concepts developed

in fields outside OB and I/O psychology. into the realm of teams -such issues as **conflicts among personalities, values, and/or goals** that are not yet a part of extant work motivation theories.

Social loafing

Decision making: Durham, and Locke (2001) how goal affect the risk taking making

decisions. Personality . For example, those high in **extroversion may assess risk quite differently from those high in neuroticism.**

extent to which **certain traits are stable** aspects of the person versus readily manipulable motivational states.

Dweck and her colleagues (e.g.,Dweck & Elliott, 1983) have argued that goal

orientation is a relatively stable disposition. Yet there is a paucity of studies that have assessed

its test-retest reliability.

better incorporated into macrotheories, particularly **organization theory**. For example, there is little doubt that degree of **centralization and decentralization** has motivational consequences, as appears to be the case with span of control (Donaldson, 2000).

how **value differences actually operate**.

Motivational issues are also important for **strategic management**. For example, strategic

management frequently involves change, and the phenomenon of **resistance to change** is well

known (Beer, 2000).

non-I/O scholars in clinical psychology must not be overlooked e.g.

e.g.

Beck and his colleagues (Beck, 1967; Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979) focused on the relationship

between **depression and “automatic thoughts**,” by which they mean thoughts held in the subconscious that affect emotional responses. These researchers examined what they call **“dysfunctional thinking**” with respect to both content and process.

Irrational beliefs, seligman’s **optimism ASQ (attributional styles q)**

6. In recommendation 3 (what mediates and moderates general variables such as personality), does Locke favor the general or specific action approach?

we recognize that there is no such thing as action in general; every action is task and situationally specific. **Specific measures**, if chosen properly, **always predict action better** virtually than general measures. However, **general measures predict more widely** than do specific 394

7. How might strength of personality traits be important in understanding the extent to which situational variables may moderate behaviors? Give an example.

Strong v. weak personality. Dominance in all situations, v. malleable.

8. Locke (recommendation 4) argues that we need to consider the sub-conscious. Does this mean we need to revisit Freud?

This assertion does not require the positing of an unconscious that is made up of primitive instincts devoid of any access to, or contact with, the conscious mind, as Freud asserted. Nor does acknowledging the

subconscious require a leap to the unwarranted conclusion that all actions are governed by unconscious

forces (Wegner & Wheatley,

9. Is there any evidence that sub-conscious goals influence goal achievement?

2002)—not to mention other motivation theories. Yet, over a century ago, the Wurzburg school in Germany showed that **goals that are assigned to people can affect their subsequent behavior,** without their being aware of it. In this century, Wegge and Dibblett (2000) have shown that high goals **automatically increase the speed with which information is cognitively processe**d. Locke (2000b) has argued that goals may arouse task-relevant knowledge automatically, but almost nothing is known

about how and when this occurs.

10. Do you think projective tests are tapping into the same “sub-conscious” that is assumed with automatic (conscious unawareness) goals?

Eg. TAT and automated. Self-report measures of achievement motivation

are typically uncorrelated with projective measures, even though both types of measures

are significantly associated with entrepreneurial action (Collins, Hanges, & Locke, in press).

Need for achievement, measured projectively, also appears to be unrelated to conscious performance

Goals.

11. What are some of the things that introspection could be used for to improve our understanding motives for work behavior?

(1) Better *Understand traits and motives.*

2) *Increase accuracy of* self-reports of psychological states

*3 Understanding the effects of attitudes on behavior*

*4 Understanding self-motivation.*

*5. Understanding the relationship between motivation and knowledge.*

6. how knowledge affects motivation

On introspection:

Titchner, an influential psychologist in the early twentieth century, but it was subsequently rejected by his followers because they found his view of psychology to be unduly narrow. Freud and his followers also rejected introspection because they believed that motivational dynamics were in the unconscious, *not* the subconscious—or, as they called it, the “preconscious”— and, thus, inaccessible to direct awareness or observation. Drive reductionists, such as Hull and Spence, agreed with this inaccessibility argument because they believed that motivation was strictly physiological. The behaviorists, especially Watson and Skinner, rejected introspection because they believed the subject matter—consciousness—was irrelevant to understanding human behavior. Nevertheless, it is self-evident that motivational states exist in consciousness; thus, **introspection *must* be used to study it.**

TRAITS: We can only learn about the nature of these motives by having people with varying levels of trait scores engage in introspection. WhaT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TRAITS AND BEHAVIOR?

Motive “constructs” (i.e., concepts) in OB are often defined statistically, as a conglomeration

of measures or of items. They are seldom defined experientially. This is especially true of

**so-called high-order constructs, which may have little or no psychological reality**. For example,

the Big Five personality dimensions are statistical conglomerations of a number of related

subdimensions. But little is known about how people with high scores on traits such as extraversion

actually experience themselves and the world.

12. How do the authors view the determinism v. free-will issue? What do you think?

**Free will is an axiom**; it consists of the choice to think or not to think, to raise one’s level of focus to the conceptual level or let it drift passively at the level of sensory perception (Binswanger, 1991).

Thus, it is important not to view the causes of action as fully determined by circumstances or by predetermined ways of processing. In his expectancy theory, Vroom (1964), for example, argued

that people will multiply expectancy by instrumentality by valence (Force \_ E*x*I*x*V)when choosing among alternatives. This theory implies determinism.

13. The authors conclude by arguing that *“work motivation needs to be studied from new perspectives.”* What are some? Which would you most like to study?

**time perspective**—how employees, managers, and leaders consider and integrate

short- versus long-term considerations or outcomes—

how people and organizational leaders **prioritize their goals** and values and the consequences of different types of priorities.

work motivation is that **of definitions**. Locke (2003) has noted elsewhere that researchers tend to be careless about how—and whether—they define their terms.

**Review: (Note: article summary not needed)**
         [Ryan & Deci (2000) Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of](http://home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%22%20%5Co%20%22http%3A//home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%20Self-Determination%20Theory%20and%20the%20Facilitation%20of%20Intrinsic%20Motivation%2C%20Social%20Development%2C%20and%20Well-Being.) ***[Intrinsic](http://home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%22%20%5Co%20%22http%3A//home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%20Self-Determination%20Theory%20and%20the%20Facilitation%20of%20Intrinsic%20Motivation%2C%20Social%20Development%2C%20and%20Well-Being.)******[Motivation](http://home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%22%20%5Co%20%22http%3A//home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%20Self-Determination%20Theory%20and%20the%20Facilitation%20of%20Intrinsic%20Motivation%2C%20Social%20Development%2C%20and%20Well-Being.)***[, Social Development, and Well-Being.](http://home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%22%20%5Co%20%22http%3A//home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%20Self-Determination%20Theory%20and%20the%20Facilitation%20of%20Intrinsic%20Motivation%2C%20Social%20Development%2C%20and%20Well-Being.)*[Am Psy.  Vol. 55](http://home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%22%20%5Co%20%22http%3A//home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%20Self-Determination%20Theory%20and%20the%20Facilitation%20of%20Intrinsic%20Motivation%2C%20Social%20Development%2C%20and%20Well-Being.)* [I](http://home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%22%20%5Co%20%22http%3A//home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/Articles%20syllabus/Ryan%20Self%20det%20theory%202000%20AmPys.pdf%20Self-Determination%20Theory%20and%20the%20Facilitation%20of%20Intrinsic%20Motivation%2C%20Social%20Development%2C%20and%20Well-Being.)

Existing

:

1. If, as Ryan and Deci insist, intrinsic motivation is inherent in everyone, why do individuals differ so much on the General Causality Scale?

Developmentalists acknowledge that from the timeof birth, children, in their healthiest states, are active,

inquisitive, curious, and playful, even in the absence of specific rewards (e.g., Harter, 1978).

Yet, despite the fact that humans are liberally endowed with intrinsic motivational tendencies, the evidence

is now clear that **the maintenance and enhancement of this inherent propensity requires supportive conditions, as it can be fairly readily disrupted by various nonsupportive conditions**. Thus, our theory of intrinsic motivation does not concern what causes intrinsic motivation (which we view as an evolved propensity; Ryan et al., 1997); rather, it examines the conditions that elicit and sustain, versus subdue and diminish, this innate propensity.

2. What was CET designed to explain?

Cognitive evaluation theory (CET)/ a subtheory within SDT **to specify factors that explain variability in**

**intrinsic motivation.** CET is framed in terms of social and environmental factors that facilitate versus undermine intrinsic motivation, using language that reflects the assumption that intrinsic motivation, being inherent, will be catalyzed when individuals are in conditions that conduce toward its expression.

It will flourish when conditions permit.

3. According to CET, what are some factors that facilitate intrinsic motivation?

4. Although Ryan and Deci argue forcefully that rewards undermine IM, is there any real evidence?

Although the issue of reward effects has been hotly debated, a recent, **comprehensive meta-analysis (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999) confirmed,** in spite of claims to the contrary by Eisenberger and Cameron (1996), that **all expected tangible rewards made contingent on task performance do reliably undermine intrinsic motivation.**

Not only tangible rewards but also threats, deadlines, directives, pressured evaluations, and imposed goals diminish intrinsic motivation because, like tangible rewards, they conduce toward an external perceived locus of causality.

5. What was OIT intended to explain?

Within SDT, Deci and Ryan (1985) introduced a second subtheory, called organismic integration theory (OIT), to detail the different forms of extrinsic motivation and the contextual factors that either promote or hinder internalization and integration of the regulation for these behaviors. See Figure

6. What is the difference between the three forms of extrinsic motivation: introjected regulation, identification and integrated regulation?

 ***introjected regulation****.* Introjection involves taking in a regulation but not fully accepting it as one's own. Behaviors are performed to avoid guilt or anxiety or to attain ego enhancements such as pride. regulation by contingent self- . A classic form of introjection is **ego involvement**  -motivated to demonstrate ability (or avoid failure) in order to maintain feelings of worth.

 **- *regulation through identification****. -* conscious valuing of a behavioral

goal or regulation, such that the action is accepted or owned as **personally important**.

***integrated regulation****.* identified regulations are fully assimilated to the self, which means they have been evaluated and **brought into congruence with one's other values and needs**.

7. What is the essential difference between extrinsic forms of regulation and intrinsic regulation?

Behavior done simply for **interest, enjoyment, inherent satisfaction**. Describe one of yours

8. How is intrinsic motivation linked to relatedness?

Those who feel secure and valued are more likely to feel comfortable following their own interests

 9. As a leader of an organization, what is the optimal environment you can create to maximize motivation and well being of your employees?

=================================
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1.  In the first paragraph of the article, by implication, what do the authors suggest might be a problem with reinforcement effects?

**Reinforcements  won’t sustain the behavior in extinction**. “When rewards were terminated, the likelihood that the behavior would be emitted eventually returned to the prereward baseline.” Need to specify the conditions (attribution / behavior or cog behavioral

2. How does CET help the researcher to better understand when and how reinforcement, intrinsic rewards affect behavior?

628

Specifically, the recipients' interpretations of the rewards in relation to their own feelings of self-determination (i.e., autonomy) and competence were theorized to be the most important considerations. On the basis of the hypotheses and data from the Deci (1971) study and several that followed, Deci and Ryan (1980, 1985) made a formal statement of cognitive evaluation theory (CET).

CET asserts that underlying intrinsic motivation are the psychological needs for autonomy and competence, so the effects of an event such as a reward depend on”**how it affects perceived self determination and perceived competence.”**

3. What are the differences between rewards that are:

(1) task *non*contingent,

(2) task contingent,

(3) performance-contingent,

(4) completion-contingent,

(5) engagement-contingent, and

(6) free-choice (no rewards)

628

*(1). task-****non****contingent -* something **other than engaging in the target activity**,

(such as simply participating) – not expected to be informational or controlling

-**not expected to affect IM**

(2).  *task-contingent -* for **doing or completing the target activity**;

**controlling**

*(3). performance-contingent -* which are given specifically for **performing the activity well,** matching some standard of excellence,

 **– very controlling**

(4). *completion-contingent rewards –* for **completing** task.

-(**controlling but** some competence –informational – implicit infor could offset some “controlling”

(5)*. engagement-contingent-* engaging in but **do not require completing** it - **will undermine IM** (controlling) –because no competence information, nothing to counteract the effects of “controlling.”

(Separated completion and engagement contingent for meta-analysis)

(6). free choice (not rewards)

(not controlling…but informational and provides competence if requiring skill).

4. Why is the distinction between rewards that are controlling or informational important to CET?

interpersonal context within which rewards are administered, the most important issue is the extent to which the ambience is controlling versus non-controlling, in other words, the extent to which people within the context **feel pressured to think, feel, or behave in particular ways.**

5. What is the role of “cue value” influence in determining if rewards will undermine intrinsic motivation?

629

Cue value **sensitizes individuals to the competence information** in a situation and thus highlights the competence affirmation contained within performance-contingent rewards that are given for having done well.

6. What is the expected effect of verbal rewards?

629 either controlling (‘should”) or informational -positive feedback (no praise).

7. How does “discounting” work in Bems’ attributional explanation?

8. How does CET go beyond Bem’s theory?

“More differentiated account of when and how the competence component is likely to operate.” (630 bottom), i.e**. interpersonal context**, that influences person’s experience of control or informational.

9. What are the basic criticisms of pervious meta-analytical studies?

631

Little attention to moderator variables

Combining studies that shouldn’t be

Omitting studies (dissertations)

Choice of DVs (Eisenberger and Cameron, ’96) –not differentiating them.

Including boring tasks

Inappropriate control groups

10. How do we handle “boring tasks” at work if they are not intrinsically motivating?

(Reward contingent) Pay them for it, and control quality/quantity;

(Selection) find people (retarded) skilled enough who are challenged

(i.e pin tagging Goodwill).

(job design) Distribute boring tasks across workers, make it only a part of their job

11. What were the DVs for intrinsic motivation?

Free choice (time or #trials) and Self report interest (single item or multiple)

Results

12. For free choice and self-report, did the effect of verbal rewards on intrinsic motivation differ for children and college students?

For both DVs, verbal rewards enhanced for college students, not for children (Table 1)

13. Which type of reward is most like that used in applied settings and what was the principal finding for effects on intrinsic motivation for free choice and self-report? What are the implications for performance contingent rewards in the work setting?

Performance contingent rewards (how well one does cf to others, e.g.) – pay for performance. “Most detrimental”p 644. esp so for negative feedback (similar to forced choice) – on free choice

But not for self-report! What are the implications?

14. What do you make of Figures 1 and 2?

“For free choice, sig undermining for all rewards. Only positive feedback showed enhancement”

Tangible rewards more detrimental for children. Verbal rewards enhanced for college, not children.

Self-reported generally the same results.

15. What were the findings for unpublished studies, dull v. interesting tasks, and most important informational v. controlling feedback?

As expected!

16. What are the implications for work behavior given the findings that performance contingent rewards undermined free-choice behavior, but not for self-report?

17 Why do Deci, Ryan and Koestner feel that free choice is a better measure of IM than self-report?

656

* Unobtrusive, reduce demand characteristics. .
* Tangible rewards can be terminated.

Self report may be unreliable, express enjoyment of reward rather than IM

18. How would you incorporate the authors’ suggestions for use of tangible rewards in the real world 656) of managers?

1. use unexpected rewards
2. use task-noncontingent for getting them to work (salary)
3. make the rewards “informational” feedback
4. acknowledge good performance “but not using rewards to try to strengthen or control the behavior”
5. provide choice (autonomy)
6. emphasize the interesting aspects of work
7. **be very careful in using zero sum (forced distribution) rewards…will lead to perceived negative feedback for most.** (Pritchard, et al. (1977) showed large undermining for those getting less than maximum reward.

19. How do expected and unexpected verbal rewards affect IM?

657 expected undermine when told they would be evaluations (PA?) …controlling?

Unexpected can enhance (indicate competence).

20. What are the authors’ conclusions regarding the effects of using rewards for gaining short term control of behavior?

659

They “forestall” self-regulation, and reduce responsibility, increase competition, require greater surveillance, evaluation.

Exam: Explain how to management how to set up an effective motivational system (include specifically the compensation and PA).

**Building a Practically Useful Theory of Goal Setting and Task Motivation**

***A 35-Year Odyssey*** Edwin A. Locke *University of Maryland* Gary P. Latham *University of Toronto*

* *core findings of the theory,*
* *mechanisms by which goals operate,*
* *moderators of goal effects,*
* *goals and satisfaction,*
* *goals as mediators of incentives.*
* *external validity and practical significance of goal-setting*
* *new directions in goal-setting research*
* *goal setting & other theories .*

Core findings:

1. What relationship did McClelland find for goal difficulty(probability of success) and effort, and how did this differ from what Locke and Latham found for difficulty, effort and performance?

706 Atkinson: task difficulty to performance was related to performance in **a curvilinear, inverse function**. Atkinson did not measure personal performance goals or goal difficulty. Moreover, his task-difficulty findings have not been replicated when task performance was measured.

We found a positive, linear function in that the highest or most difficult goals produced the highest levels of effort and performance.

2. Why is performance better with assigned difficulty goals than “do your best” goals?

when people are **asked to do their best, they do not do so**. **..no external referent** and thus are defined idiosyncratically. This allows for a wide range of acceptable performance levels, which is not the case when a goal level is specified.

**Goal Mechanisms**

3. What are the four mechanisms by which goals affect performance?

Goals affect performance through **four** mechanisms.

1. directive function; t**hey direct attention and effort toward goal-relevant activities** (both cognitively and behaviorally).

2. energizing function. (greater effort than low goals).

3. goals affect persistence.

4. goals **affect action indirectly** - arousal, discovery, use of task-relevant knowledge and strategies

Re: self set 707

4. *“When people are confronted with a task that is complex for them,* ***urging them to do their best sometimes leads to better strategies*** *(Earley, Connolly, & Ekegren, 1989) than setting a specific difficult performance goal*.” (Latham & Locke, 2002). Why is this so?

This is because a performance goal can make people so anxious to succeed that they scramble to **discover strategies in an unsystematic way and fail to learn what is effective**. This can create **evaluative pressure** and performance anxiety. The antidote is to **set specific challenging learning goals**, such as to discover a certain number of different strategies to master the task (Seijts & G. P. Latham, 2001; Winters & Latham, 1996).

**Moderators:**

5. How do the moderators that alter the relationship between goal setting and performance (commitment, Feedback, Task complexity) influence performance?

Commitment (importance, and self-efficacy)

Feedback (control theory)

Task complexity (effect size on complex tasks is lower than for easy tasks because fewer people have the ability (variance in ability).

Re: air traffic controllers: They found that when a **specific difficult learning goal** rather than a performance goal was set, consistent with goal-setting theory, high goals led to significantly higher performance on a complex task than did the general goal of urging people do their best.

709

**Personal Goals as Mediators of External Incentives**

6. Why does assigning a challenging goal alone raise self-efficacy?

assigning a challenging goal alone **raises self-efficacy because** this is an implicit **expression of confidence**

**by a leader** that the employee can attain the goal. The correlation between self-set goals and self-efficacy is higher when no goals are assigned

**Figure 1**

*Relationships Among Assigned Goals, Self-Set Goals, Self-Efficacy, and Performance*

*Note.* Adapted from *A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance* (p. 72),

by E. A. Locke and G. P. Latham, 1990, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

709

**Satisfaction**

7. What function does a goal play in leading to satisfaction?

709 bottom right

Thus, goals serve as **the inflection point or reference standard** for satisfaction versus dissatisfaction (Mento, Locke, & Klein, 1992).

8. Explain the paradox, that those who accomplish higher goals are less satisfied.

IM? Setting specific challenging goals is also a means of enhancing task interest (Locke & Bryan, 1967) and of helping people to discover the pleasurable aspects of an activity

9. With regard to the practical applications, what effect does setting high goals have on productivity and self-regulation?

Increases all of them

Top of Form

New Directions in Goal-Setting Theory: Locke, E. A., & Latham (2006)

Bottom of Form

1. How can managers apply knowledge gained from research in goal-setting theory to motivate employees? What are some key moderators of goal setting that they should keep in mind?

2. How is goal-setting theory similar to expectancy theory? How does it relate to the competence, autonomy and relatedness components of intrinsic motivation theory?

3. In what situations are learning goals more effective than goals that focus on achieving specific performance outcomes?

4. How is goal setting important to personal (individual) and organizational growth?

**Judge, T. & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance: Motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 797-807**

1. What explains the previous inconsistency in attempts to “…empirically link personality characteristics with motivation variables…” (Gellatly, ’96)?

Ans: One possible explanation is a **lack of theoretical progress and conceptual clarity** in the motivational area itself. P797.

Another: **disparity in trait definition**…multifaceted, “thousands of …measures in the published lit.” (Hogan and Roberts, ’01). Conceptual disarray.

**Another: Absence of theoretical framework.**

2. Why did the authors choose to use the three theories, GS, expectancy, and self-efficacy as the motivational criteria with the FFM as predictors?

Ans: all have been related to job performance and have an underlying cognitive theoretical orientation. P798

3. What assurance did the authors have to show that the personality measures were classified properly?

Ans: used expert judges and coding procedures developed by Barrick and Mount (’91).

4. Why do you think the true score correlations (rho) were higher than the average correlations (*r*) in Table 1?

Ans: Using the meta-analytic methods of Hunter and Schmidt (1990), correlations from individual samples were first corrected for measurement error in both the predictor and the criterion. We performed no correction for range restriction or dichotomization. Finally, we estimated a true score.

5. Which three traits showed the weakest relationships with the three criteria?

Ans: extraversion, openness and agreeableness.

6. Do you think the authors should have used the FFM or some other? Why?

7. Through what different mechanisms do you think N and C operate to influence performance?

Ans: N through motivation, C through “orderliness and decisive” (Saucier & Otendorf, ’99) p 803.

8. Do you agree with the authors that even though the correlations were small that personality traits do predict motivational level?

*Judge, Bono,  Erez, & E. Locke* (2005**). Core Self-Evaluations and Job and Life Satisfaction : The Role of Self-Concordance and Goal Attainment *JAP 90*,**

1. What psychological mechanism do the authors suggest that links core self-evaluations to job satisfaction?

Ans: p 257: How we choose goals. Those with positive self image choose **Self concordant goals**: One psychological mechanism that may link core self-evaluations to job satisfaction is the **way in which people choose goals.** A growing body of research suggests that people who choose goals that are concordant with their ideals, interests, and values are happier than those who pursue goals for other (e.g., extrinsic or defensive) reasons (see Sheldon & Elliot, 1998).

2. What evidence is there to support the authors’ claim that the four traits capture well the construct of core-self evaluation? (p258)

Ans:

Erez, Bono, and Thoresen (2002) found that an **overall core self-evaluations factor could be extracted from the correlations among the four traits,** and that this common factor was an important positive predictor of life satisfaction and a negative predictor of stress, strain, and depression.

Moreover, Judge, Erez, et al. found that the individual core traits were highly related, displayed quite similar patterns of correlations with other variables, and failed to add incremental validity beyond the common core factor. That the **individual core traits fail to add incremental validity beyond** the common core factor provides support for the validity of the core self-evaluations concept,

3. How could the dispositional construct of intrinsic motivation (GOCS) fit into the authors’ hypothesized model illustrated in figure 1 (p 259)?

ANs: P 258:

“…link was mediated by perceptions of intrinsic job characteristics. For example, individuals with a **positive self-regard were more likely to perceive their jobs as interesting, significant, and autonomous than individuals with negative self regard**. Expanding on this explanation, Judge et al. (2000) demonstrated that individuals with positive self-regard, measured in early childhood, not only **perceived their job as more intrinsically satisfying, but also were more likely to hold more complex jobs.**

“Self concordance theory, derived from Deci and Ryan’s (1985) self determination theory, predicts that individuals are happiest when stated goals match enduring interests and values.”

 **“**We define goals as self-concordant based on the degree to which they are pursued for autonomous (intrinsic and identified) reasons and the absence of their pursuit for controlled (extrinsic and introjected) reasons.” P260 top

4. In conducting self-concordance research, how can one’s motivation for pursuing a goal be measured?

**Ans: only by asking since “…two individuals may pursue the same goal for different reasons.” P259**

5. In study 1, what is predicted to partially mediate the relationship between self-concordant goals and job/life satisfaction?

ANS: Goal attainment. No. Hyp 3.

6. What was the primary finding for study 1?

Ans: “That self-concordance partly mediated the relationship between core self-evaluations and life satisfaction.”

7. What was the primary finding for study 2?

Ans: That core-evaluations are related to goal self –concordance which in turn relates to job satisfaction and goal attainment.” P264.

8. How do the findings from this research contribute to what we know about the relationship work and life satisfaction?

People who feel good about themselves and who choose goals they themselves want will be happier at home and work.

==========================

**Yardi & Weiner (1996) Misbehavior in Organizations: A motivational framework. *Organizational Science***

1. Why was Peter Frost, the editor, so excited about publishing this manuscript?

**ANS: it addressed an area that was “…long overdue for conceptual clarification, theoretical development and empirical research.” And hoped it would stimulate research in the area.**

OMB-Self, Org, Damage

2. What were the three objectives of the research?

**Ans:**

1. **define the new construct of OMB discuss theoretical implications**
2. **ID different type of OMB**
3. **Develop a theoretical framework to allow inclusion of OMB in motivation theory**

3. In defining OMB, what theoretical position did the authors take on the (a) criterion for identifying OMB, (b) agent or agents who decide what it is, and (c) consequences?

**Ans:**

**a). values and norms (of individual and org)**

**b). society and organizations (what does this assume about the causal chain?)**

**c). not in definition, but as the DV**

4. How is OMB defined?

**Ans:**

**“Any actions that defy or violate shared org norms and expectations or (b) core societal values, mores, standards of conduct.” P153.**

5. In their “broadness of scope” of OMB, would a CIA operative engaged in whistle blowing be considered OMB?

**P154**

**ANS: yes. “Similarly, member behavior that is consistent with societal values but violates organizational expectations would be classified as OMB as well (e.g., whistle-blowing**

**in an organization that does not sanction such a behavior).”**

6. Why is the “intention” (i.e. Fishbein & Ajsen, 1975) provision so important in classifying OMB types?

**ANS: to determine the “predominate” motivation when several motives may be operating.**

7. How does the normative-instrumental model in Figure 1 differ from the original one (Weiner & Varki, 1990).

**Ans: revised one doesn’t assume OBM is some function of the two predictors, but can be either one or both. P156.**

8. Give an example (yours own or invented) of each of the three levels of POVC

**ANs:**

**identification (personal values congruent with org)**

**detachment (personal values unrelated or neutral to social unit)**

**alienation (personal values in conflict with social unit).**

9. What organizational concept that we have studied encompasses both POVC and PNS

**Ans; P-E or P-O fit.**

10. What proposition(s) best explain the OMB that occurred at Enron?

**ANs: propositions 5, 11**

11. How would you conduct an empirical study to test one or more of the 12 propositions derived from this OMB model?

**Mount et al. (2006) Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *P psych***

1. What evidence is provided to indicate that CPB-I and CPB-O are not the same construct?

Ans: Bennett and Robinson (2000) conducted a comprehensive review of the literature, and used an extensive development and refinement process involving multiple samples, to develop a self-report instrument that assesses the extent to which individuals engaged in counterproductive behavior.

And: Indeed, a recent meta-analysis (Dalal, 2005) examining voluntary behaviors at work found a moderately high correlation between these two factors (*ρ*ˆ = .52); however, the magnitude of this value is not as high as to suggest that the two factors are indistinguishable from one another.

2. Which FFM traits most consistently predict CPBs?

Most reviews of personality–CPBs relationships have concluded that **Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Agreeableness** are the strongest predictors (e.g., Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 2003), with Conscientiousness being the most consistent predictor

(Sackett & DeVore, 2001).

3. Which traits were expected to correlate negatively with CPB-O and CPB-I and which one primarily only with CPB-I. Why?

Conscientiousness and ES with both, Agreeableness with only I Of the two dimensions, however, Conscientiousness has the stronger relationship with task-based criteria. Thus, when criteria are under volitional control, both Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability have been found to be generalizable predictors of both task-based and interpersonally based criteria and for behaviors that promote the attainment of organizational goals as well as behaviors that hinder the attainment of organizational goals. Therefore, **based on deductive reasoning**, we expect that Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability will correlate negatively with both CPB-O and CPB-I

Taken together, we expect that Agreeableness will

be negatively related to CPBs that are directed toward the organization

(CPB-O).

4. Through what mechanism (mediator) are personality traits predicted to influence CPBs? Why?

Job satisfaction which is more proximal to the behavior, cf to personality, more distal. P599

5. What are the conditions that indicate partial mediation should be tested (Baron and Kenny, 1986), and when is partial mediation indicatd? (top p 600)

(a) the IV (**personality traits**, in our study) should be related to the DV **(CPBs**)

 (b) IV should be related to the **mediator (job satisfaction),** and

(c) the mediator should be related to the DV (CPBs)

 Partial mediation is shown when the IV (personality traits) and mediator (job satisfaction) **each significantly predict** CPBs.

6 .Why do you think that the self-rated CPBs had higher correlations with traits than the boss rated CPBs (Table 1)?

7. What conclusions can be drawn from the relationships among the variables in fig 1 (p608)?

Ag has direct rel with CPB-I for both boss and self and but is also partially mediated by job sat.

ES is mediated by Sat on both CPBs (weak)

Con direct and partial with CPB-O

8. Why do bosses and subordinates seem to agree more on the frequency of CPB-I than for CPB-O behaviors?

Ans: 614 “…behaviors associated with interpersonal deviance such as playing mean pranks, being rude to others, cursing, and so forth are more observable than behaviors associated with organizational

deviance such as shirking, theft, and abusing break times.”

9. What are the implications and applications for the findings that showed that traits had both direct and indirect (through satisfaction) on CPBs.

McBriarty (1988) Performance appraisal: Some unintended consequences. *Pub Pers Mgt*

1. What was the new element in the appraisal process that caused the greatest problems?

Section V requiring overall potential of rate on capability, RELATIVE TO PEERS, to assume in assume increased responsibilities (for promo)…Forced distribution.

Despite L Cummings about potential errors in doing so. (not independent obs now)
22% highest; 28% next highest, and 50% remaiing

2. What were its effects on morale and teamwork?

Morale plummeted, and on supervisory relations, eroded quality of relationships, undermining capability to function effectively. (many had limited contact with subordinates). Created need for “visibility”…syndrome. To make sure everyone got face time. Supervisors took credit. Teamwork: zero sum game. Competition.

3. What were its effects on task performance, and which tasks actually got done?

high visibility tasks, noticeable ones.

4. What are McBriarty's objections to the use of the job descriptions in the task performance appraisal?

Forced competition, restricted OCB,

5. What was the one measure that McBriarty found the most dysfunctional, and why?

forced choice X .

6. What were the effects of supervisors having to endorse ratings of people they may never even have seen?

lack of validity, reliability

7. How do you think this system would have affected military operations during wartime? (In 1974 the Vietnam war was already winding down and almost over).

Rogelberg, S. G. (2007). ***Job satisfaction & job satisfaction measurement.* Encyclopedia of  I & O Psych, p. 410-413**

Statement of purpose: To review different aspects of job satisfaction and the measurement of job satisfaction.

Findings:
• The definition of job satisfaction should align with the measurement of job satisfaction.
• There are three well-recognized general causes of job satisfaction: the situation, the person, and the interaction between the situation and the person.
• JCM looks at : Task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy, and feedback.
• Personal causes of job satisfaction:
o Some individuals will be dissatisfied with their jobs no matter what the nature of their work.
o PA and NA
• Person x situation causes – Cornell model, which proposes that job satisfaction is highest when individuals receive a high level of outputs from their job (pay, status) relative to their inputs into the work role (time, effort).
• Job satisfaction has a moderately strong positive correlation with one’s overall life satisfaction. One’s broader life satisfaction can affect job satisfaction. Clear links between job satisfaction and mental health, such as depression and burnout.
• Dissatisfied employees are more likely to engage in counterproductive organizational behavior.
• Job satisfaction can be changed, even though our job satisfaction is in part a product of who we are, regardless of our job or work situation, our job satisfaction is also significantly affected by the work situation.
What makes a good measure:
• Reliable, valid, discriminating (high to low levels), comparable (compare scores across groups). Developing a good measure requires significant expertise and resources.
• Make sure the measure is appropriate for your purpose.
• Scales include: Faces scale, MSQ, JDS, JSS, JDI.

Questions:

1. How can a job satisfaction measure be multifaceted and show internal consistency reliability at the same time?

ANS: each facet has its own alpha and the facets show low to moderate relationships among them.

2. What is the principal difference between the JDS and the JDI and JSS?

Ans: the JDS estimates the nature of the job characteristics and ones GNS while the other two, workers’ attitudes toward the job and job-related opinions.

3. Describe a situation in which you would use the JDS and one where you would use the JDI.

Ans: JDS to estimate the job for redesign and the JDI to assess workers’ opinions of the broader organizational climate, satisfaction with a broad range of jobs.

**Judge, Heller, Mount (2002). Personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis JAP**

335 rs from 163 samples. -.29 for N; .29 for E, l26 for C

Student name: Cooper, Rochelle

Outline of Summary:
1. Statement of purpose/problem addressed
a. To investigate the relationship between the five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction.

2. Research question
a. Does the relationship vary according to cross-sectional compared to longitudinal research designs?
b. Does the personality-job satisfaction correlation very depending on whether a direct or indirect measure of personality is used?
c. What is the magnitude of the personality-job satisfaction correlation by job satisfaction measure?

3. Method and procedure
a. Meta-analysis, 334 correlations and 163 independent samples

4. Results/findings:
a. Neuroticism strongest correlation to satisfaction; negatively correlated
b. Conscientiousness and Extraversion positively correlated with satisfaction
c. Conscientiousness and Agreeableness with job satisfaction do not generalize across studies
d. Openness to experience had a weak correlation with job satisfaction
e. Personality-job satisfaction correlations did not differ much by cross-sectional compared to longitudinal research designs; Agreeableness was significantly different
f. Direct and indirect personality measures did not differ much in their relation with job satisfaction; slightly higher correlations of satisfaction with indirect measures
g. Personality-job satisfaction correlations were higher in most measures, especially the Brayfield and Rothe (1951) measure

Questions:

1. Given the correlation of N with job satisfaction, what would be needed to justify using N to screen applicants for a job?

Ans: show it’s not a psychological malady (use PA/NA perhaps) and show that satisfaction is integral to the job success (performance), e.g. where in a weak situation, satisfaction is related strongly to performance initiative.

2. Would the core self-evaluation concept (Judge et al. ’98) be of more or less value in understanding how personality may predict job satisfaction?

Ans: p 535. It’s possibly more specific in terms of the facets relating to job behavirs, e.g.

Self-esteem, self-efficacy, LOC, low on N.

3. If applicants can fake well to cover their neuroticism, how else could you accurately assess traits that may predict job satisfaction?

Core self evaluations may be less susceptible, references, in depth interviews.

-------------------------------------------------------

**Frese, Dring, Soose, Zempel (1996). Personal initiative at work: Differences between east and west germany Academy of Mgt J. 39, 37-53**

1. What personality trait(s) do you think would be common to OCB, organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, ’92) and personal initiative?

Personal initiative:

1. Behavior syndrome resulting in taking an active an self-starting approach to work and going beyond what is formally required in a given job.

2. What motivational theory or theories could best explain how personal initiative varies as a function of the individual (disposition) and /or the situation?

3. What advice would you give to the CEO of a global manufacturer interested in establishing plants in East and West Germany regarding how to motivate workers in each there?