one moment

Based on your diagnosis, you've decided that you need to make some changes to improve motivation in your workplace. What changes will you make? What will happen when you make the changes? This chapter examines how to make the needed changes for each component of the model.

As we examine each connection, keep in mind that before the repair of a single component will have a positive effect on motivation, the rest of the connections must be good. For example, suppose your diagnosis indicates that there is a problem with the action-to-results connection. If you fix that problem, things should improve, but only if there are no major problems in the other connections. All the connections must be in good condition for motivation to be good.

Consider every component in the motivation process when making changes to a single component.

ACTION-TO-RESULTS CONNECTION IMPROVEMENTS

Recall that the first step in the diagnosis of the action-to-results connections was to check the amount of control people believe they have in producing their results. If there were problems with this connection, the next step was to diagnose the determinants. Table 10.1 summarizes the determinants for action-toresults connections and lists the possible problems that might need attention. These were discussed in chapter 6 and are shown in the left-hand column. The right-hand column identifies examples of what can be done to improve the connection.

Table 10.1 Optimizing Action-to-Results Connections

ATTACHMENTS

table10.1.jpg

CAPABILITY

The first determinant is capability. A person's action-to-results connections may be low because of permanent, general ability (1). The person does not have the ability to do the actions that will produce the desired results. Without the ability, improvement efforts such as training will have little

effect. One long-term solution is better selection. Try to ensure that in the future, people selected for that job do have the capability. For the immediate problem, consider reassigning that person to tasks he or she can do.

If the problem is lack of job-specific knowledge and skill (2), the problem is easier to deal with. Here, the focus should be on training. This can include providing instruction with assignments by the supervisor, on-the-job coaching by successful peers, formal training programs, or self-study, to name a few. This person could also be reassigned to other tasks.

However, remember that there is a difference between actual and perceived capabilities. People may have low action-to-results connections because they do not *believe* they have the capability to do the needed actions (3). The manager must make a judgment here. If the person in fact does not have the capability, it is problem 1 or 2. If the person actually does have the capability, what is needed is more experience combined with encouragement to do the actions and assurance that he or she can do them. With successful experience and positive feedback on that task the person will begin to see he or she actually does have the ability.

RESOURCES

If lack of resources (4) is the problem, the manager must work with subordinates and get very clear about what resources are needed. These resources could include time, staff, supplies, tools, or information. Once these are identified, the manager and subordinates work together to make sure these resources are available. This sometimes means setting up new work procedures within the group. It can also mean working with other units outside the manager's direct control to get the resources when they are needed.

AUTHORITY

The problem can be that the subordinates do not have the authority to do the needed actions (5). This becomes a judgment call for the manager. If you can, and feel it is appropriate, give them the needed authority. In some cases, the manager will need to get additional authority as well.

WORK STRATEGIES

The next determinant is work strategies. If you feel one or more people in your unit are not using good strategies to do the work (6), a number of solutions are possible. If the problem is with an isolated person or two, good options are discussing better strategies with them and having them coached by someone who uses a better strategy. If many of your subordinates have poor work strategies, a better solution may be to discuss strategies as a group. In such a meeting, have experienced people with good strategies share their effective practices. In some work settings, it is important that everyone uses the same work strategy (7), whereas in other settings different people

using different strategies is not a problem. If everyone needs to use the same strategy, use the same solutions as for 6—coaching or group discussions.

It is also critical that subordinates be given the opportunity to develop and test new work strategies (8). This is the way to continually improve strategies and thus continually improve action-to-results connections. The manager is responsible for providing this opportunity. This typically means face-to-face meetings held on a regular basis where the subordinates and the manager can discuss work strategies. In such meetings, ideas for better ways of doing the job can be suggested and discussed. Both the manager and the subordinates must be able to *evaluate* whether the new strategies improve things. This information enables the individual or group to develop better strategies. More considerations about feedback systems are provided later in this chapter.

RESULTS-TO-EVALUATION CONNECTION IMPROVEMENTS

The possible problems and example solutions for results-to-evaluation connections are summarized in Table 10.2.

KNOWING VALUED RESULTS

If your diagnosis indicates that subordinates are not clear on what are the important results (1), the solution is to discuss this with them. Review a prioritized list of major results together. If there is disagreement in what you each see as important, explain *why* you each think some results are more important than others. You may be surprised and revise some of your own ideas on importance. In any event, these discussions should result in better agreement on what are the more important and less important results.

CONSISTENCY WITH BROADER ORGANIZATION

The first part of consistency is whether results are consistent with the objectives of the broader organization (2). Ask yourself: If your unit did a good job on the result, exactly as it is measured, how would the organization benefit? Talk this over with subordinates so they can understand your reasoning, especially if this analysis results in changes in measures or priorities.

4 hours ago

ATTACHMENTS

table10.2.jpg

The other aspect of consistency with the broader organization is matching the evaluation system to what is valuable to the organization (3). If your diagnosis indicates a mismatch here, it will usually be

between what your subordinates see as *your* evaluation and what is valuable to the organization. Discussion with them can clarify misperceptions, but it is sometimes difficult to get subordinates to talk if they think it means criticizing you and facing possible negative consequences from you.

Reassure them that you want to know and try not to become defensive. Such a discussion must be followed by making sure your evaluations in the future are consistent with value to the organization. If you yourself have concerns about the organization's values, your options are trying to change the organization's values, leaving the organization, or living with the mismatch.

4 hours ago

shellyt
you dont have the chapter in pdf ??

4 hours ago

done seen 4 hours ago

ewaldson

No sorry they only have it online through the University

AGREEMENT AMONG EVALUATORS

If subordinates are not clear on who the relevant evaluators are (4), this is usually a fairly easy fix. Lack of clarity about evaluators comes about most often when individuals don't see the connection between their work and their internal or external customers. Discussion with subordinates about who these evaluators are and why their evaluations are important will usually clear this up.

Getting agreement among evaluators (5) on the results-to-evaluation connections can be difficult. Different evaluators are going to value different things. In your diagnosis, one step was to identify the important evaluators. Clearly, you as the manager are an important evaluator and each person in your unit is an important evaluator. If the mismatch occurs here, the discussions we have been describing above are the way to resolve it. If the mismatch is with customers of your unit, you or members of the unit can meet with the internal or external customers and to clarify where these differences are. This will lead to discussions to try to better align these evaluation systems. Sometimes, having these discussions is all that is needed. In other cases, there is no reconciliation possible. If this is the case, openly acknowledging differences in priorities will be better than not dealing with them at all.

Remember that getting perfect agreement among the evaluators, especially evaluators outside the organization, will not be possible. This is especially true for your and your subordinates' own families. What your family wants from you is probably going to be quite different from what the organization wants. The goal is not to make them identical, but to reconcile them enough to be successful with both.

As you attempt to get the results-to-evaluation connections of different evaluators into alignment, your conversation could include what results are relevant and their relative importance, what level of output is expected in each result, and how different levels of results translate into evaluations.

The last determinant of results-to-evaluation connections is the quality of the feedback system. We explained the characteristics of a good feedback system in chapter 7 and they were summarized in Table 7.2. Good feedback systems are challenging to create, but incredibly important. If your feedback system seems to be the problem, it is worth the effort to try to fix it. Improving the feedback system in most workplaces will lead to significant improvements in motivation and performance.

We will go through each necessary feature of feedback and discuss how to fix it.

Group versus individual. If the work is done interdependently, base the measures and feedback on group output, not individual output. In a few cases where people work largely independently, such as some sales or maintenance jobs, individual measures can be used. However, these jobs are rare and in many cases the person must still coordinate with others to get the work done right. It is also possible to have both individual- and group-level measures in the feedback system. Be sure to talk with your subordinates to obtain their input before making final decisions on this.

If group-level feedback is to be used, the size of the group is an issue. The size will be determined by how many people work together to accomplish the same objectives. This will normally be groups of 5 to 50 people.

Based on quantitative results and all results. The feedback system needs to be based on the actual results, that is, the output of the unit. It should also be based primarily on quantitative information, and it should measure all important results. This means it must be tied directly to the results/outputs you are trying to produce. Developing good measures of these results is a very difficult task. What most organizations do is use the measures that are readily available or easy to collect. This almost always produces a feedback system that does not cover all the important results. Quantity is measured, but not quality. Speed is measured but not how well the customers' needs are met. So, go through each of the important results and do an analysis of whether that result is being measured well. Remember that most results will require more than one measure.

Measuring only some of the important results sends the message that those not measured are not important.

Start with the three to eight major results that were identified in the diagnosis. Think of these as objectives for the unit. Then come up with 8 to 15 measures of these results/objectives. In our

experience, it is fairly easy to come up with the major results, but it takes about 15 to 25 hours of discussion with your subordinates to come up with really good measures for all of the results.

Control over measures. As part of this analysis, make sure that the measures used are ones your subordinates have control over. Frequently, the easily available measures are not ones that the people doing the work can control. This is deadly to action-to-results connections. So go through each measure with the people in your unit, and focus on controllability. This will almost always mean changing some of the measures. It will usually not be possible to have all measures completely under subordinates' control, but try to develop measures that maximize this control as much as possible.

*Everyone understands the system, relative importance is captured, and feedback is valid.*Understanding the feedback system means everyone knows what the important results are, they know and understand how each measure is derived, they know the relative importance of the different measures, and they know how the feedback information will be used. In evaluating your feedback system, go through each of the measures carefully. Make sure you *and your subordinates* know exactly where the data are coming from and how the measure

ATTACHMENTS

table10.3.jpg

CONSEQUENCES OF GOOD AND POOR PERFORMANCE

If people do not know the consequences of good and poor performance (2), this means they do not have accurate evaluation-to-outcome connections. In one sense, this is an easy problem to fix. Sit down with your subordinates and discuss what they see as consequences, then talk about what you see as consequences. There may be many more consequences than they realized. In preparing for such a discussion, give some thought to what you use as consequences of your evaluations. The difficult situation is when the consequences for good and poor performance are largely the same. Then you are back to dealing with the more difficult issue discussed in (1), finding more powerful outcomes.

CONSISTENCY ACROSS PEOPLE AND TIME

Both consistency across people (3) and consistency across time (4) are aspects of fairness. If your reward system is seen as unfair, it reduces the evaluation-tooutcome connections because people cannot correctly anticipate what outcomes will occur following high or low performance.

Let's start with consistency across people. Clarify whether the problem is a *perceived* lack of consistency or a *real* lack of consistency. If the problem is due to incorrect perceptions, it can often be corrected by adding information. It may be that some subordinates do not know why someone received an outcome such as a special assignment or a better office. If these are attractive outcomes to them and they feel their work is just as good, they are going to believe the reward system is unfair. If there was a good reason for providing these outcomes, explain what that reason was. If you don't see their performance as being as good as the person who received the outcome, tell them and tell them why. While this is usually an unpleasant task, the negative feedback will have positive effects on the evaluation-to-outcome connections if it serves to help them to perceive the evaluation as fair.

If different people actually do receive different outcomes for the same performance, this is going to reduce evaluation-to-outcome connections and thereby reduce motivation. The first step is to acknowledge that there is a problem and that you want to fix it. Then work with subordinates and your own management to try to make the reward system more consistent. However, don't assume you can find a solution that will make everyone happy. It usually cannot be done. There will almost always be some residual feelings that the system is unfair. The best you can hope for is to keep these feelings to a minimum.

It is impossible to create a reward system that everyone thinks is fair.

For consistency across time, the needed improvements are essentially the same. First, try to determine whether the problem is real or a result of misperceptions. If it is due to misperceptions, explain why what seems to be an inconsistency is actually not. If the problem is real, explain why the change was made. If there is not a good reason, work on the reward system to make it more consistent over time. In the future, if a change needs to be made, be very clear to your subordinates what the change will be, why it is being made, and how it affects their own reward system.

OUTCOME-TO-NEED SATISFACTION CONNECTION IMPROVEMENTS

The last connection is the outcome-to-need satisfaction connection. Table 10.4 shows possible problems and example solutions.

CURRENT NEED STATE

The first possibility is that the available outcomes are not valuable to the person (1). In your analysis and action plan, it is important to distinguish outcomes that are tied to evaluations of performance from those that are not. If there are not enough important outcomes tied to evaluations, there is little

motivation for high performance. Outcomes not tied to performance also produce need satisfaction even though they do not add to motivation to perform *well*. Such outcomes make it valuable for the person to continue working for the organization. So, if keeping good people in your organization is an issue, look at outcomes that are tied to performance *and* outcomes that are not. Pay special attention to negative outcomes people believe happen to them such as lack of recognition, not being treated with respect, and having no clear career development path.

ATTACHMENTS

table10.4.jpg

In either case, the manager and unit team members must try to identify other valuable outcomes. Great managers take an interest in learning what outcomes are most satisfying to different individuals. A manager holding a sales promotion may tell one staff member to make 10 telephone calls and then he can go home, while telling another, "Let's see how many calls you can complete in an hour." In one case, the outcome emphasis is on minimizing time at work; in the other case, it is on maximizing achievement. The work assignment is roughly identical, but the manager knows her staff well enough to provide equivalent but different outcomes.

Keep in mind that the need-satisfying power of outcomes varies greatly from person to person and for the same person over time. The current need state changes over time so that a need that was satisfied at one point in time will become unsatisfied over time and require more outcomes. Thus, outcomes must be provided on a regular basis to keep needs satisfied.

NUMBER OF NEEDS SATISFIED

We have talked about attaching outcomes to as many needs as possible (2). In diagnosis, you looked at the major outcomes to see if the satisfaction of other needs might be feasible. This will be the easiest for outcomes related to recognition and achievement. For example, when someone, a subgroup, or the whole unit does an especially good job, make sure they know it, and if appropriate, that others know it too. When someone gets an infrequent major outcome such as a promotion, a special award, or special recognition from customers, making that public is also a way to tie the outcome to more recognition and achievement needs.

FAIRNESS OF THE REWARD SYSTEM

We talked about fairness of the reward system (3) in the section on evaluation-to-outcome connections, but it is relevant here too. In addition to reducing evaluation-to-outcome connections, a reward system that is seen as unfair lowers outcome-to-need satisfaction connections. Receiving a raise based on performance satisfies needs related to money. However, if the reward system is seen as being fair, that same raise will *also* satisfy needs for achievement and recognition.

If the system is fair, the raise accurately indicates that the person did a good job. If the reward system is not fair, getting that raise will not satisfy these additional needs. So a fair reward system helps tie additional needs to the same outcomes. The ways to ensure fairness were discussed above and the same techniques described to maximize fairness could be used here.

EXPECTATIONS

As a manager, consider that the same level of outcomes could be made more satisfying by having more realistic (i.e., lower) expectations or by having better information when subordinates make comparisons. If your diagnosis indicates that people have unrealistic expectations of outcomes (4), this is something that can be discussed with them. Telling people their expectations of raises, promotions, or other outcomes are unrealistically high is not a pleasant thing to do. However, in the long run it is worth the effort because these unrealistic expectations will lead to disappointments and can substantially reduce the satisfaction when the outcome is actually received.

Managers should also be very careful about raising expectations. To tell people you expect they will get a large raise or be promoted will increase their expectations. Even if they do get the outcome, there will be less satisfaction than if they had not been given the expectation. If they do not get the outcome, this will result in much higher *dissatisfaction* than would have occurred without the expectation being raised.

This is not to say you should *never* tell people that you believe a positive outcome such as a large raise, a promotion, or an award is coming. There are clearly situations where this is appropriate. However, bear in mind that there is a downside to raising expectations and weigh that into the decision to tell people.

COMPARISON

The last determinant of outcome-to-need satisfaction connections is comparison. If your diagnosis indicates people are using inappropriate comparisons (5), this needs to be addressed. What happens most frequently is that people compare with others that they believe are getting more outcomes for the same level of performance, or are getting the same outcomes for lower levels of performance. The outcomes could be higher pay, lower workload, better working conditions, and so forth. The reaction is: "My work is just as good as theirs, why don't I get what they get?"

As with the other perception determinants, the first step is to see how accurate their perceptions are. If they are right, it is an example of an unfair reward system and it should be addressed using the same techniques for improving fairness discussed above. Often, however, the problem is that the comparison is not an appropriate one. It could be the performance of the person or people they compare with is actually higher and this accounts for the difference in outcomes.

Another possibility is that while other people do get more positive outcomes, they also get more negative ones. For example, they get higher salaries because of the higher cost of living in another city or because they have to travel more. You may not be able to completely satisfy someone with inaccurate perceptions, but explaining the rationale for differences can help reduce perceived unfairness.

As a final point, good reward systems are a large investment by the organization. What should be clear by now is that organizations lose a great deal of the value of these systems if fairness, expectations, and comparisons are not managed well. In many cases, it is far more cost-effective for the organization to put resources into improving these factors, especially fairness, rather than spending more to increase the level of outcomes.

It is often more cost-effective to improve the fairness of the reward system than to add costly outcomes.

Extended Case: Conclusion

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 9 A.M. COFFEE WITH PAT

"So thirty days in, what's your diagnosis?" Pat asked Jessica.

"Well,"said Jessica, "I thought you'd ask, so here's a summary" (Table 10.5).

"Way to go, Jessica. It sounds like you're making some great changes."

"Yes," she said, "Let's hope so. It feels good to have some concrete improvements to announce at the National Sales Conference."

THROUGHOUT THE YEAR

Shortly after Jessica and her team added the new trip incentives, a stronger high-end incentive plan and regular feedback to the 6-week scheduling strategy, sales began to increase. After 3 months, they were no longer falling behind on their annual goals. The profitability analysis was even more eye-opening. Marketing and Accounting's 6-week analysis turned into a 6-month project. When they were done, it was clear that by changing the sales force's customer emphasis, far more profitability was possible.

As new priorities came along, Jessica worked to maintain the feedback system and continue her distinctive recognition program even when company priorities changed. She took time to make sure that people understood the many benefits of working for their large organization so that valuable individual motivators weren't overlooked. There was generally a perception among the sales force that their goals were tough, but the evaluations and rewards were fair. Retention of talent and customers was good.

It wasn't surprising to her that Marius and Jose had just been asked to move into other functions in the organization with the hope that they could infuse those groups with the same kind of focus on improvement. With new regional managers, Jessica would begin the diagnosis process again, looking for new ways to improve.

MAY 10, 8 P.M. ONE YEAR LATER ONE HOUR AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE NATIONAL SALES CONFERENCE

"Wow," said Luke Stiles, division president, "What great energy—20% growth in profitability and 40% growth in sales ... as I said in there earlier, they and you should be so proud."

"Yes," said Jessica. "It's amazing what you can do with a little motivation."

4 hours ago

ATTACHMENTS

table10.5.jpg

ok done

4 hours ago

Thank you