Motivation is one of the key areas that Organizational Behavior focuses one. It is one of the most frequently researched topics, and that for a good reason. A recent Gallup poll shows one of the main reasons – 54% of the U.S. employees are not actively engaged, while 17% are actively disengaged. There are other studies that show that an employee usually wastes around 2 hours per day on surfing the Internet or talking with co-workers. Therefore, it is clear that motivation is a subject of paramount importance, which should be treated in-depth and analyzed, since affects the amount and quality of work produced by the employees. There is no clear definition of motivation, but we can consider it as the processes that accounts for an individual’s intensity, direction and persistence of effort toward attaining a goal. Thus, we can say that motivation is a person’s choice to perform a specific action that requires greater effort than other competing activities (Bloisi et al, 2006:196; Mullins, 2007:250). To tackle this controversial topic I will be referring to Kehr’s Compensatory Model (2004), which defines implicit and explicit motives, as well as perceived abilities. Alongside this model I will be using the Goal Setting Theory (E.A Latham&Locke 1990; 2002) to discuss how managers can set the right goals for their employees. While discussing goals, I will touch on the key role that the employee has in providing feedback to his manager in order to make future goals more in line with implicit motives, as well as choosing the right difficulty for it. Taking into account Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (1959; Smerek&Peterson, 2007), I will **analyze the factors that contribute to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of employees,** as well as how can organizations make sure that the jobs are designed in such way that they cover important motivation areas, making it easier for the employee to stay focused and motivated. Furthermore, I will look how to create **reward systems** that attract, motivate and retain employees.

The compensatory model talks about **implicit motives**, **explicit motives** and **perceived abilities**. **Implicit motives** have been conceptualized as associative networks connecting situation cues with basic affective reactions and implicit behavioral tendencies. Implicit motives are related to unconscious needs (Maslow, 1943) and basic and organismic needs (Deci & Ryan 2000). Implicit motives are not consciously accessible, but they lead to affective preferences (McClelland 1985), but they lead to spontaneous, expressive and often pleasurable behavior (McClelland et al, 1989). **Explicit motives** are the reasons people self-attribute for their actions (McCelland, 1995). For example, people that are hard-working usually consider themselves to be accomplishment-driven or goal-acheivers. Explicit motives are influential in determining cognitive choices- choosing a specific task (Spangler, 1992). Combining **explicit motives** and **perceived abilities** leads to the formation of *intentions* (Gollwitzer, 1993; Tubbs&Ekerberg, 1991), which are known to have motivational significance (Latham&Locke, 1991). White introduced the concept of competence: “an organism’s capacity to interact efficiently with its environment”(1959), but more recent approaches focus on perceived abilities rather than actual abilities (Ajzen, 1991, Wright et al, 1995). **Perceived ability** is the amount of control a person can exert over the environment. **Problem solving** compensates for insufficient abilities and overcomes environmental (extrapersonal) difficulties, whereas **volition** compensates for insufficient motivational support and resolves intrapersonal conflicts from competing behavioral impulses originating in implicit/explicit motive discrepancies (Sokolowski, 1993; Muraven & Baumeister 2000). When a task requires both problem solving and volition, the chances of someone completing that specific task decrease significantly because of the limitations of attentional capacity.

Most people think goal attainment should lead to satisfaction and well-being (Locke&Latham 1990), however Brunstein et al. (1998) showed that goal attainment only leads to well-being if goals are congruent with a person’s **implicit motives**, and a goal that is incongruent with those needs will decrease well-being. This is an important reason for managers to get to know their staff and understand their inner motives, so that the tasks that the person has to achieve are more likely to complain with their motives so chance of success is increased. Also taking into account the ***Goal Setting Theory*** (E.A. Locke&Latham, 1990; 2002) managers have to be sure that the goals are clear and everyone understands them. It is also important to notice that **easy goals** are unlikely to motivate the employee, while **difficult goals** (Mulling, 2007) are more likely to be tackled and end up being solved. However, it proves that the best types of goals are **“stretch goals”** (Gratton, 2000:135), which are not SMART, since we are unable to predict the outcome that might be achieved, but they can be directional (‘improving’ or ‘maximizing’). It is important to note that stretch goals are based entirely on the person’s ability to attain the goal, by creating a psychological priming effect in which the rewards are influenced by the person’s thoughts. All these findings stand in line with McClelland’s ***Theory of Needs*** McClelland(1974,1986) – in particular the need for achievement. **High achievers** perform at their best when their chance of achieving the task is equal to the chance of them failing it. They dislike winning too easily since that provides no challenge to their skills. Also, they rarely take on tasks that have a low chance of success, because they get no satisfaction from success that comes by pure chance. Another important aspect when it comes to goals is to remember that **successful performance** leads the person to believe that similar actions will be successful as well (Bandura, 1977). As well as that, following occurrences of the activity will come with the perception of ease of performing as well as requiring less volition (Azjen, 1991). Taking these factors into account, we can say that it is up to the manager to **set goals that increase gradually in difficulty**, therefore increasing the likelihood of completion, while also keeping in line with the employee’s inner motives. Whilst it is of great importance for the managers to understand his employees, they also play a key role because they can **provide feedback** and discuss with the manager their goals, and tailor them so they **best fit both parties** (Renn, 2004). Therefore, communication is an incredibly valuable aspect that should be used both by managers and employees to increase the level of satisfaction and dedications, thus motivating them even more (Gill, 2008). It is important for the organization to provide its employees with a system that encourages them to talk with their managers and cooperate towards understating each other’s strengths and weaknesses and find ways to balance them, thus being able to work together more efficiently. Cherry (2007) emphasizes the significance of communication and how it creates a sense of belonging to the workplace.

Herzberg’s ***2-factor theory*** (1959, Smerek&Peterson 2007) talks about the factors that contribute to the employee’s satisfaction and dissatisfaction. It is important to mention that in Herzberg’s theory the two concepts are completely unrelated and they can coexist. This is a key piece of information, since most managers are only worried if their employees are satisfied with their current job, not if dissatisfaction is not present. The theory also assumes that happy and satisfied worker produce more, but *Judge et al* (2001) has shown that that is not always the case. Using the model this theory proposes (motivation and hygiene factors) I will continue to talk about job design, which is one of the main ingredients that account for employee motivation (Lawler 1969, Latham 2007,2011). Whilst designing jobs the organizations seeks balance amongst two main features: how efficient and effective a job will be. It may seem that job descriptions present flexible roles and define the responsibilities one will have in the given position. This is due to the importance of flexibility nowadays and it facilitates easier job rotation that motivates employees. Job rotation can mean from switching one or two tasks to completely changing your team, which has come to such extent that nowadays we have virtual teams, which given the amazing rate of progress in computer technology have higher performance than traditional teams (Martins et al, 2004). DeWitte (2004) talks about a concept called “flexicurity” – which the security that flexible working is providing to people. Matrix organizations (Kuprenas, 2003) provide managers with the possibility of experts from different teams for a while to help them on a particular task, which can save a lot of time and also provides the person with a change that is appreciated. A simple model that describes how a job can be motivating involves the variety of skills used, how well the employee identifies with task, as well as how significant the task is. This is directly proportional to the amount of autonomy and feedback the employee gets from his or her manager.

As mentioned before, the feedback one gets and sends is a core concept that is entailed in how well an employee performs, as well as how motivated he is (London, 2003).

As well as making sure that all jobs fulfill these simple requirements, another method of keeping employees engaged and motivated can be achieved by job rotation and by job enlargement and enrichment (need to find better refs). Alongside well thought job design an organization needs a reward system that motivates their employees to strive forward and achieve their goals. (**Expectancy theory)** A factor of paramount importance is that this reward system needs to be specifically for each person so that it matches with his or her implicit motives. A mistake that is common made is thinking that employees are motivated by money alone, fact that has been proven wrong by Berry (2006). Defining a reward system is a troublesome task and while it may work for some of the employees, others might feel under rewarded, and thus a whole new range of problems appears.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I think that managers are in a difficult position when it comes to motivating employees. This is given to the fact of the complexity of the problem, which is generated by how different people are and by the number of factors one needs to take into account when trying to motivate a person. However, we can still draw some simple conclusions: communication has a key role in managers understanding their employees and using the knowledge gained in this way the right goals can be set. From the organization’s point we view the main issue is being able to design jobs and reward system that engage with the core values of employees. We are going towards a virtual workplace, therefore the organization will need to adapt to this and be able to juggle employees between teams and at the same time make sure they will end up in the right team for them.

* Talk about the person’s role in this. How they need to use volition and problem solving
  + There should be a place where they can go for help.
* Talk about the organization’s job in designing the right job. (have slides)
  + Use the Herzberg’s 2-factor theory
  + Make sure they have a reward system that motives the person (**implicit motives**)
    - Bring in expectancy theory.
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