

PN-ABS-961

74727

I.H.A.

Indonesia Hoteliers Association

IAPINDO

Ikatan Ahli Perhotelan Indonesia

**THE ESSENCE OF EDUCATION
&
TRAINING IN THE HOTEL INDUSTRY :**

**A MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE ON ACADEMIC THEORY
AND
PRACTICAL APPROACH**

Presented by

Armand J. Nasution, M.Sc. (Hotel Management), C.H.A.

at

ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCE WITH THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INDONESIA HOTELIERS ASSOCIATION

Jakarta, January 10th, 1991

Table of Content

Preface	page 1
Reward	page 2 – 5
Leadership	page 6 – 8
Job Design	page 9 – 10
In Search of Excellence/Conclusion	page 11 – 12
Foot Note	page 13

P R E F A C E

THE ESSENCE OF EDUCATION & TRAINING IN THE HOTEL INDUSTRY : A MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

It is my sincere belief that before training can confer any synergistic benefits on the entire **ORGANIZATION**, that is, meeting the outline objectives and goals, there must first be a meeting of the mind amongst all concerned parties, the organization, its diverse publics, and most of its internal resources, with the **HUMAN ELEMENT** being the most important. It is because of this "meeting" that the organization will reach any and/all of its objectives. In other words, I am simply saying, that for the organization to grow and survive into the future it must maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of each and every individual within the parameter of the firm's organizational structure. If we do not help our people be better tomorrow than today, we are ensuring our own demise. It is through the process of **EDUCATION** and **TRAINING**, which is announced in this paper, that all concerned parties will be optimistic for what the future has to offer us all. To facilitate these ends, I have arranged the different means of this paper into four sections which are entitled, **REWARDS**, **LEADERSHIP**, **JOB DESIGN**, and **IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE**. In section 1, **REWARDS**, I will discuss the two different categories of rewards, **INTRINSIC** and **EXTRINSIC**. I will then proceed to give examples of each, and relate them to both **EQUITY** and **EXPECTANCY** Theories. In the **LEADERSHIP** section, we will look at different leadership theories along with their characteristics. These will include **TRAIT**, **BEHAVIORAL**, and **SITUATIONAL**. I will show their progression over the years and relate them to **SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES** of today. The third section, **JOB DESIGN**, will show the different methods by which jobs are either enriched (vertical loading) or enlarged (horizontal loading). Again, these will be tied into a scientific approach. Section 4 will show a correlation between the first three sections of this paper and the book **IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE**. It will attempt to show, that these theories are actually being implemented and followed up on in the successful companies mentioned in the book.

REWARDS

This is an important topic because of how near and dear it is to all parties concerned, be they groups, management, organization, or most of all, the individual. This is the output we receive for performing our inputs (work). The subject area comprising rewards is varied and touches all levels of the organization. I will now discuss how it does this.

The purpose for rewards from the organization's standpoint is as a drawing device from which to select labor from the available labor pool, especially if it pays higher wages than the competition. Also if the organization is paying well, it will be in a stronger position to hold onto present productive employees.¹ The reason being, not many people relish the idea of going to work for someone else at a lower rate of pay. A major factor is, the role rewards plays in reducing tardiness, absenteeism and turnover. This can save the organization quite a bit because production does not suffer from constant changing of employees. You do not have to constantly train new people, so the help becomes more proficient in their respective jobs. This can be simply stated as, more production due to less hiring, training and re-training, down time, etc., all which leads to a better quality product for the consumer. This is especially true when you implement a device such as a **LEARNING CURVE**, which is a quantifiable way of directly measuring production increases against decreases in turnover. As you spend less on these people, their actual utility value increases in sort of an economics of scale principle, only in reverse. Rewards to the individual means a way of fulfilling his needs, both immediately and in the long run. Each person due to his individual personality has needs which must be satisfied in order for the employee to be productive. These needs can be in terms of money, or the things that money can buy. These needs are created over time and start out low in number, general in nature, until they develop into larger numbers and become more specific. This is especially the case where education has been introduced, for now our wants tend to become more sophisticated in nature. Rewards can either be intrinsic in nature. By intrinsic I mean the rewards more or less come from the job itself. These would be the equivalent to the Herzberg motivators, (pride, recognition, work importance - especially if this person has the product from the beginning to the end). One of the reasons for job enlargement and job enrichment is to instill the positive feelings of these intrinsics into the employee. (More on this will be discussed in the **JOB DESIGN** section of the paper later on). Extrinsic rewards are found outside of the job, it is what the organization has to offer the employee. These tangibles take the form of fringe benefits, promotion, profit sharing, and of course pay. Management has a great amount of control over the extrinsics because they are usually directed by some Company Policy. Whereas intrinsics leave a great deal up to uncertainty. It is much easier to quantify dollars, than it is what someone might be feeling and thinking inside themselves, especially when it is job related. These are various bases for allocating rewards throughout the organization i.e.:

1. Equality – whereby everyone shares the same.
2. Power – the stronger get more.
3. Need – the greater the need the more you get.
4. Distributive Justice – you get back what you put in.²

The key in any reward system is that the reward must be based upon performance. As rewards tend to reinforce previous conduct. The rationale for this is, that reward systems are based upon both expectancy and equity theories. It is the expectancy theory tied in with performance that causes people to act or not to act in the performance of their jobs. If people see a correlation between what they put in as to what they get back, they will go ahead and act, otherwise they would not. What they put in is effort and what they get back is reward. You can say that expectancy is the valence, and the different outcomes are the instrumentalities, or secondary outcomes.³ These expectancy relationships exist from the first day when we decide to join an organization or not. One good thing to note here, is people will try to maximize the good and stay away from the bad. (Sounds like a form of Hedonism in a varied sort of way). The equity theory comes in when the employee feels he/she is getting a commensurate amount of rewards in relation to some reference person. This reference person may be performing the same function or not. They might not necessarily even be employed by the same organization. More on this when we deal with money as a reward later on. Now we move into the area of financial rewards, of which the most studied has been money.

“Psychologists long ago proved to their own satisfaction that money does not motivate, yet employers continue to do fairly well on the assumption that it does.”⁴

The above quote would be the philosophy of a manager who believes the best way to motivate employees, or get even with slow or nonproductive people is to hit them in the wallet. While on the other hand, there are others who would say money does not motivate, so look to other areas, be they social or intrinsic. The following quote bears out their ideas,

“It is obvious to commonsense and proved by research that men are interested in more things than money and if they are to be satisfied, all these interests must be met. Also, they say, men want stability of earnings, security of job and pay, and continuously satisfying relationships with their fellow men”.⁵

One of the problems between the two groups is the lack of agreement on the research done. It seems to me that most of the research would be short term in nature and not very realistic. I am assuming that most of the people used as subjects really did not need money to survive on, as they would have if they were working. This turned out to be for them a sort of extra income versus living wages. Also in many of these studies the outcome is already decided and they fit the data to justify the conclusions. I am not saying this is the case all of the time, but maybe once in a while. Another thing that bothers me is not everyone is affected by money in the same way, therefore generalizations about all people may be untrue, distorted, or biased by the evaluators subjectivity, especially if he is trying to prove a point. **LAWLER** states that impact of money on individuals is dependent upon the following :

1. Method of payment — how pay is related to behavior.
 - a.) time based system
 - b.) individual — output system
 - c.) group — output system
 - d.) any combination of the three.

2. Nature and state of employee — trust relationship between money and performance. Expectancy and Equity.

3. Nature and state of employer — how trustworthy are employers.⁶

Again when dealing with money, we are back to the question of how does it relate to performance. This will then lead us to **FESTINGER'S** Theory of Cognitive Dissonance which showed that a person who feels an imbalance between effort and performance rewards will move to minimize this feeling of being out of sync by either decreasing outputs (pay), but more likely will tend to increase inputs (effort). This is important because employees will react to the situation or other employees (peer pressure) in trying to get back into balance. Sort of a status quo idea. A good example of this is in piece work systems, whereby people succumb to peer pressure and do not break the rate, even though it could mean more financial rewards for themselves. Also when this is tied in with equity theory these employees may feel they are not getting the right wage, this will lead to the occurrence of things such as goldbricking or slowdowns. In either case **QUALITY** suffers.

I believe in the world of today much of this is valid with minor adjustments or updating. I believe that money is in fact a motivator. It does help people to fulfill needs. Even Herzberg who felt that money was not a motivator knew of its importance in the motivational process. He listed it as a **HYGIENE** factor, so if it was not there it would tend to counteract or negate motivation. In other words it may not help, but if it were missing then it would negate, or hurt motivation. At best money tended to keep you even. I also realize that there will be a level where money no longer motivates a person the way it once did previously. People are constantly changing and so are the needs, be it one need or many working at the same time. This was a fault in **MASLOW'S**; it did not recognize that disfunctionalization of needs could occur. **ERG** (Equity, Reward and Gratification) tends to show rewards are affected much better, due to its recognizing of the fact more than one need may be operating at a single point in time. Also **ERG** tends to take into account a frustration factor, and the moving back and forth between levels. Most employees are not at this stage in their work life, so money will still be of great significance to them. Equity theory holds up today, as does expectancy theory. However, I believe more than comparisons of wages with a reference person are involved. I believe that other criteria which is invoked may be illegal under Title VII and Affirmative Action of the US Government regulations and the Indonesian Labor Law. This is especially true of older workers who have been on the job longer than the supervisor or college

graduates who' be making more money. It is imperative you pay according to performance, otherwise people get the feeling of being cheated. This leads to all kinds of breakdowns in communication and production, the ultimate effect is a loss for all concerned parties. As for Cognitive Dissonance, I feel an employee will act faster if he feels their pay is adequate for the work being performed. The thing I want to know is, at what level does this idea kick in, when is enough not enough. As for restricting production as in piecework systems, there are many things besides financial considerations taking place here. As mentioned earlier, peer pressure may be one. Others are, the employee may feel that management will raise the standard, or that this person may work himself out of a job. I believe, that there is something in the psychological make-up of a person which has a determining effect on whether this person will be a rate buster or not. I believe, that there are many different ways to reward employees instead of just with pay. You can give them profit sharing, reward them for suggestions, Scanlon Plans for not being absent, etc. You can do like many organizations are now doing, offering a cafeteria approach to benefits. This has the fact of enabling employees to pick out those benefits that have the most worth to them. At the same time you must try to keep the intrinsics at as high a level as possible. In other words you must pay based upon performance. It is only through a dedicated and sincere effort can the organization and employee mesh into a positive force. It is up to the organization to properly service the needs of its employees with rewards, while at the same time the employee must make the organization profitable so that all of this can occur.

LEADERSHIP

“Leadership is a process concerning the relationship between two or more people in which one attempts to influence the other toward the accomplishment of some goal or goals.”⁷

Leadership is important to the organization and the individual because it is through this process that the goals and objectives of the organization are implemented by the employee. This is the means to the ends so to speak. The study of leadership has undergone three different phases over the years. The first phase will be named the **TRAIT THEORY**. This was where all great leaders were thought to have similar traits running throughout their bodies. The underlying theme here was the reliance on personality characteristics which were either inherited or acquired at an early age. This concept seems to have originated from Carlyle’s Great Man Theory.

“Held that progress is the result of the individual efforts and accomplishments of a few great men who have some special combination of personal traits which makes them ideally suited for leadership.”⁸

This theory strongly based upon personality was strong during the period between the two World Wars. Since there was no one set of universal traits which could be used in common for all leaders, other criteria and theories had to be developed. We then began to see where the social environment had something to do with the emergence of leadership and leaders. This became the second theory, **BEHAVIORAL THEORY**. This was the looking at how a leader’s behavior affected the conduct of his subordinates. Two major studies at this time were the **OHIO STATE STUDY** and the **UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN STUDY**. The Ohio State Study concentrated on broad issues of unit effectiveness and how the leader’s behavior affected the group. While the Michigan Study keyed in on the interaction between the leader’s behavior and group satisfaction. To put it another way, the Ohio Study dwelled on task identity and Michigan on employee satisfaction. This sounds a bit like **MCGREGOR’s Theory X–Y Management Styles**. The third type of theory to develop was that of the **SITUATIONAL THEORY**. This is where the style and decisions used will vary from one person and situation to that of another. A major example of this type of theory is **FIELDER’S Contingency Theory**. Fielder breaks the group down into three different areas :

1. Interacting group — depends on another person to complete his part of the task.
2. Co-acting group — total is the sum of each individual in the group.
3. Counteracting group — individual work against each other.

Fielder used questionnaires to describe what he termed the **LEAST PREFERRED COWORKER (LPC)** which gave an indication of how strongly a person identified either with the task or the employee. Again this sounds similar to McGregor. Fielder then proceeded to break down situational factors into three areas. Personal relationships between a leader and his subordinates.

The more friendly they were, the easier it was to get the employee to do something. The second aspect keyed in on task specificity, or what it was that had to be done. The more specific the task and instructions, the easier it was to do. The third thing was how much power did the leader have. The more power, the easier it was to get something done. The power here is assumed to be legal power (delegated by the organization) versus other informal sources of power. There are many different forms of indirect power in organization at work today. A good example of this would be the Executive Secretary of an organization. She/He can screen who gets in to see the BOSS, and thus could influence his decisions before he has even made them. We also have what are called, informal leaders within the organization. Examples of these are the older worker or person with seniority. These are more often than not picked as peer leaders. However, it is possible for a leader to be both informal and formal at the same time. We next advance into the PATH – GOAL Theory by HOUSE. This follows the expectancy theory of EFFORT – PERFORMANCE and PERFORMANCE – REWARD with the main function of a leader to be supplemental to his subordinates, to use participative management styles and be a coach figure. He tries to get them actively involved in the decision making processes whenever it is feasible to do so. He is there to give them direction and guidance, pose challenges, to more or less manage without having his management visibility dominate the situation. I believe that leadership today encompasses a wide gamut of responsibility, both to the organization and the individual. Important to the organization, because if it does not reach its objectives it will cease to exist. Organization seem to feel strongly about this as seen in the money they shell out for seminars, classes, workshops, and the hiring of well educated people. Leadership entails using all of a firm's resources optimally. This includes human resources because most firms have this as a major expense against their profit margins (labor costs). This is especially true in cases of hotels, restaurants and other related service industries, which by their very nature are labor intensive. For leaders to be successful they must be able to influence others. Charismatic leaders, those who get others to do for them because they like them, do not count. Because even though these people are successful in leading their immediate subordinates, they may in reality hurting the organization. When they leave, the new person coming in has no communication groundwork laid for them. This is a reason why the new supervisor is always being judged upon the personality, not necessarily job standards, of the previous supervisor. We have all heard at one time or another, "When Mr. So and So was here, we did it this way". This means that it is tough on all concerned, the organization, employee, supervisor, etc. Leaders have to be quite adapt in planning, delegating, evaluating objectively, training, and giving feedback for any system to work. I feel that these leaders must have the necessary power to accomplish the objectives for which they in turn will be evaluated. In other words, if you have the responsibility, then you need the power. This area can lead to problems in today's business world for a variety of reasons. The Supervisor's hands maybe tied because of policy, unions, economic conditions, geographic, etc. In the old days he was responsible for the hiring and firing, supervision of employees, etc., today many of these functions are taken over by specialized sections. This I believe is a change for the better. Another reason for this change was that many of these old "line bosses" abused this power and became dictatorial tyrants. I believe that participative management has a lot going for it. It is much easier to get people committed to seeing ideas work if they had

some say in what and how those decisions are implemented. This also at the same time assigns more responsibility onto the part of the employee which is positive. I believe leaders of today can become even more effective if they take advantage of all the things that are at their disposal. Seminars, workshops, etc., are definitely worth it if they cure any weaknesses that the organization might have. But one must be careful to make sure that the organization knows what it wants, and then gets the program, rather than be sold a "canned program" that is general in nature, and may not be the best choice for them. I feel that the external environment does play a role in developing leaders, as his style is bound to be effected by what is around him, and thus interacting with him. These interactions, be they positive or negative, will have to rub off in some way onto his subordinates. Leadership is the key that starts the organization engine, while the people are the fuel supply. If all runs well it is a safe pleasant trip, otherwise we will need major repairs, these are accompanied by huge repair bills. So we personally would rather pay it on the front end and get some use, instead of the back end, where you are spending an awful lot just to stay where you are.

JOB DESIGN

“Job design concerns the content, functions, and relationships of jobs that are directed toward the accomplishment of the organizational purposes and the satisfaction of the personal needs of the individual job holder”¹⁰

The history of job design covers three stages in time, job specialization, employee responses, and contemporary approaches. Job specialization — whereby task is broken down into many sub parts in order to make it more productive. (i.e. food production processes) This is beneficial to the organization because this allows for the use of less skilled and cheaper labor. Also since there is a smaller part of the product to turn out it can be done more efficiently and cheaper due to economics of scale. Another benefit is in the higher quality product, which should be turned out due to all of these controls. This was all happening around the early 1900's. Other changes at this time were Frederick Taylor's "Theory on Scientific Management", doing away with the craft specialist, and the Industrial Revolution. However, people got bored of doing the same task over and over again. This repetition was beginning to turn them into robots who were devoid of thinking processes, they just acted the same time after time. This led to an increase in the rate of absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover. Due to this negative reaction on the employees part, we emerge with the second phase, employee responses. This included things such as job rotation, where one person does more than one job. This is a horizontal move with no new challenges, (once the job is mastered), it is short — term in nature. The reason for this being, it does not take long to master the new skills once the job has been broken down into sub-units as previously mentioned. In actuality, what began to happen was employees were beginning to be bored by many jobs. Job Enlargement, again is a horizontal concept. Both, job rotation and enlargement were "seat of the pants methods" of operating, as no effective planning went into either of these processes. This is especially true when we look at the implementation level. The last phase is that of Job Enrichment. This deals with Herzberg's two factor theory, in that it provides for the giving of more responsibility to individuals in their jobs. It calls upon idea of vertical expansion versus horizontal, in the theories of the past. It is because of these factors that planning is a necessary step with these types of programs. Note, however, that along with increases in responsibility, motivation, satisfaction, etc., there is a corresponding increases in costs. This may be the case just in the short run, as learning curves will bring it back into relevant range. But the key is, this is a benefit — cost system, and as such the benefits must outweigh the costs to the organization. This is tied in with opportunity costs, and net present value of money being used to implement these decisions. As with any system, problems will tend to develop. Those that affect job enrichment are related to the implementation of the different programs. Most managers use scattergun approach rather than pinpointing their penetration on a narrow beam. Next is job re-design, where we try to match up individuals needs with the benefits a particular job has to offer. In other word, "getting the right person into the right job". Most jobs today tend to fulfill only lower level needs while ignoring the higher level. Workers tend to select their jobs via a system of trade-offs, as to what they feel the job is worth to them. They give up a little of this feature to gain more of that one. Some of these features are things such as task identity, autonomy, visibility, etc. Once they feel the good outweighs the bad they take the job. These needs which are used in the selection

processes are dynamic, in that, they are constantly changing in source and degree. Different people equals different needs. A person's own value system will play a major part in any thing concerning job design or selection. Extrinsic needs yield positions which are specialized in task force performance, the results are clear and easily reached. Intrinsic yield more complex tasks with higher levels of self-satisfaction and gratification.

In today's business world, job design is a subject of interest due to the fact, not everyone has the same needs, or degrees of want when it comes to the selection of a job. In today's world you need to make the job as challenging as possible in order to instill pride in the task being performed. Work the intrinsic whenever possible. As for those jobs which are repetitive and boring, we just have to accept the fact they will exist. However, we can use creativity and initiative to make the best of the situation. You can show the person how the jobs in within the total scheme of operations. This will help to instill a sense of worth in menial jobs as these people now have reference point of the total technological operation. I call this approach **JOB EDUCATION**. You try to inject as much vertical loading as possible into the system, thus increasing his/her authority and responsibility. You instill land marks into the operation. By this I mean, you break bulk for the employee, and thus let him feel good more often. Example, peeling shrimps, you give him around 250 to count instead of 5000 at any one time. You can highlight this idea by letting him/her take a little break: after completion of each lot. This let him/her stretch his/her legs, while really letting the organization have some control over when he take his/her breaks. This seems to be a good idea because as he/she nears completion of the task, we are confident he/she will work at a faster rate of production versus a slow steady pace. Speaking of pacing, try to get away from mechanized pacing because this tends to take away from the employee the feeling he/she has some say in the control of things. Of course in some operations this may not be feasible. Horizontal system such as job rotation and enlargement should serve as the starting point. Just remember, they are short run methods. They should be inter-spaced with vertical training to really of benefit. A problem that could crop up here is, people may feel you are trying to cut labor costs, while using them to increase production. Union considerations may also come into play here. Remember expectancy and equity theories, and pay them upon their performance. Another factor in horizontal situations, and in some cases vertical, is that a person may feel that the task is degrading to them. This is especially true in horizontal situations, whereby the person has a fairly high educational level. Any gains made in production can very easily be negated by losses in motivation when it comes to performing on the job. Getting the right person into the right job requires a great deal of research on the job, description, analysis, etc., plus the knowledge of individuals and their needs. The key here is, that since we are dealing with ever changing people, needs, etc., the job itself should be in constant state of change in regards to the growth, challenges, etc.

IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE

Since the underlying theme throughout the book is people, and how they effectively communicate, interact, and relate with one another, it should come as no great shock that successful companies put into practice what we have discussed in the previous body of this paper. Those companies mentioned **IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE**, be they large or small, have a similar philosophy when it comes to their employees, that is one of growth and understanding. Understanding — in that, they try to understand the needs and drives of their employees. The Corporation feels they are more or less there to act as a facilitator. They are “means” whereby congruence of organizational and individual needs (the Ends) take place. This meshing of ideals leads to productivity increase on the employees part, and also for the organization. Many of these corporations feel they are similar in their methods of operations, technical, production, service, etc., but the distinguishing factors are the people. Example, McDonalds sells food, so do a lot of other fast food outlets, but the key here, with McDonalds, is the ultra-high level in which they do it. This has become a form of religious creed with McDonalds, instituted by founder, the late Ray Kroc. Q.S.C.V. (Quality, Service, Cleanliness and Value). In fact, Kroc once said,

“If I had a brick for everytime I have repeated the phrase Q.S.C. & V. I think I would probably be able to build a bridge across the country”

Another example is Watson, of IBM, who once stated, that he could loose everything but his people and still be a success.¹¹

This feeling of being a sort of extended family was an underlying theme throughout **IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE**. One chapter in particular, entitled **AUTONOMY** and **ENTREPRENEURSHIP** dealt squarely with the sole issue. In 3M, they followed the guidelines of the chapter in that placed a high level on the intrinsic rewards. They gave each person a sense of worth, in that they created a wide level of responsibility for the job performance. They wide level of responsibility for the job performance. They allowed their people to be active in the decision making processes whenever possible. They encouraged the people to become actively involved, both physically and mentally. Most of the successful companies illustrated in the book were of decentralize nature. This was the case even though each person knew who their immediate supervisor was (a centralized approach).

All of this allows for the person to work at his utmost level of capacity and thus create bigger profits for the organization. Company's that take care a sincere interest in their employees will be in a much better position further down the road. These people know that their ccorrelation between the employees job satisfaction/gratification, and production. An example of this is **DANA'S** philosophy whereby everyone is committed to the idea, that productivity take place. **IBM** by the following quote,

"Our early emphasis on human relations was not motivated by altruism but by the simple belief that if we respected our people and helped them respect themselves, the company would make a profit."¹²

Much of this interest into the well being of employees came about as a result of the **HAWTHORNE STUDY**. This showed the effect of light on productivity, but the key was, the amount of attention being placed on the individual. In other words, the employee felt someone cared about how he/she felt on the job. I could go on for quite a while on the specific inferences that are **IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE** about taking care of your employees needs and desires. Suffice it is to say this is what separates the highly successful firms from those who are almost there. These succesful firms convert and maximize the highest amount of utility possible from their assets. This would definitely include people, who are, **THEIR MOST IMPORTANT ASSET**.

FOOTNOTES

1. House, Robert J., Management Development, University Press, Ann Arbor, Michigan 1967 p. 45.
2. Szilagyi, Andrew D., Organizational Behavior and Performance, 3rd Ed. Scott, Foresman and Company, Glenview, Illinois 1983 p. 295.
3. Nadler, Leonard., Corporate Human Resources Development, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, N.Y. p. 411.
4. McClelland D.C., "Money as a Motivator: Some Research Insights" The McKinsey Quarterly 1967 p.14.
5. Lupton, T., "Methods of Wage Payment, Organizational Change and Motivation." Work Study and Management 18 p.151, 1964.
6. Lawler, E.E., III. Pay and Organizational Effectiveness McGraw Hill Book Co. New York 1971 p. 133.
7. Ibid House p. 213.
8. Ibid, Szilagyi p. 265
9. Behling, Orlando, and Schriesheim, Chester, Organizational Behavior, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, Mass. 1976 p. 295.
10. Fielder, F.E., "Personality, Motivational Systems and Behavior of High and Low LPC Persons." Human Relations 25 (1972) p. 396.
11. Peters, Thomas J., and Waterman Jr., Robert H., "IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE" Harper Row, New York 1982 p. 249.
12. Ibid, p. 259