GAURI SHANKAR & P. C. JAIN

MONEY IN INDUSTRIAL MOTIVATION

(Socio-Psychological Aspects)

Productivity and higher productivity is the slogan of the day. "Higher productivity is acclaimed everywhere as the only solution to inflation and the only means of satisfying the workers' desire for a higher real standard of living" (1).

For raising productivity, the basic task of any manager or supervisor is that of maintaining an organisation that functions effectively. To do so, he must see that his subordinates work efficiently and produce results that are beneficial to the organisation. "Since every action a manager takes in an organisation stimulates a reaction in his employees, he has no choice of whether or not he motivates them, only of how he does it..." (2). This means motivation is a must; other things remaining the same, higher the motivation, higher will be the organisational performance and vice versa. This is supported by Keith Davis (3) Vroom (4) and Smallbone (5). Allen (6) has rightly pointed out :

"A manager in managing, must motivate to highest productivity the people who work for him. People are the unique element in every company. Outstanding people can make even a poor organisation operate successfully. Poorly motivated people can nullify the soundest organisation".

Here lies the importance of motivation.

For motivating employees two types of motivators (viz. monetary and non-monetary) are used. Monetary motivators include wages and salaries, productivity bonuses profit-sharing, free or subsidised services etc. Non-monetary motivators include higher status, greater responsibility, participation in work decisions, public praise from superiors and token rewards etc. Many motivators have both a monetary and non-monetary aspect. For example, promotion (i. e. greater authority and higher status plus increased pay); recognition for merit (i. e. pay increases within the job rate range plus public recognition); seniority standing (i. e. retention on the job during lay-offs, or preference or advancement plus rights and privileges) etc.

The purpose of this paper is to make an attempt at explaining and unravelling some of the mysteries and uncertainties which surround the role which money, as a reward for work, plays as a motivator of human behaviour and performance and thus to suggest some guiding principles for the manager.

II

Over the last half-century or so views have changed as to its relative importance, but the fact which has remained consistent is that money is still a sensitive and crucial element of the reward—compensation package. Undoubtedly, in a market economy, work and payment are inseparable. Without money, people are unable to buy the goods and services necessary for survival, they cannot advance in status in the eyes of their fellow men; nor can they make material improvements in their standard of living. If the work is difficult, dangerous, boring, demanding, degrading, people except appropriate compensation. The factors which influence people's levels of expectation concerning rewards, including payment, have been the subject of considerable research and theorising. Behavioural scientists have produced a number of models which seek to explain the relationship between pay and work, and which seek to provide some understanding of the role money plays as a motivating force. As the outstanding contributors are noted, it is important to remember that everyone had to base his conceptions upon the then—current assumptions and conclusion of related sciences. This is a shifting foundation and the end is not yet.

Frederick W. Taylor (7), an American was of the view that there was the master-servant relationship in industry in which both parties are predominantly economically motivated, competitive and self-interested. His so-called 'principles of scientific management' do not work in modern organisations, because they are based on traditional, but ill-founded, assumptions about the nature of human needs and behaviour. The assumptions are that people only try to satisfy economic needs at work—the only reward they seek is money; emotional needs do not enter the picture; and that the interests of the worker and employer are mutual—no conflict exists between the two.

McGregor (8) summed up this philosophy in what he called Theory X: 'People are basically lazy, have an inherent dislike of work of responsibility and must if necessary be coerced or punished. Management has sole responsibility for organising men, money, material and machines in the persuit of profit. Such views are anachronistic now. There is little evidence to support the view that man is primarily money—motivated, competitive and interested only in his economic well-being. It is now generally agreed that money by itself will not provide magic solutions to problems of motivation and productivity. This is not to imply that money is unimportant but rather to pose the question of its relative importance to other motivators.

The famous 'Hawthorne' experiments by Elton Mayo (9) and his associates were an important land mark in the development of behavioural theory, if for no other reason than the fact that they looked beyond the individual working in isolation, and considered the total group and sub-group in interaction. Unfortunately, few experiments have generated more confusion and misunderstanding. Out of the confusion which surrounds Hawthorne studies, a number of points emerge. They provide insufficient evidence to refute the money incentive. They do suggest that motivation and productivity are the results of complex behaviour patterns, and can be influenced by a range of variables. The studies, although controversial induced a shift of emphasis away from physical factors on to the higher plane of people's mental attitute to work. One must have some idea of the needs which people seek to satisfy, and so far as is possible, structure the working environment to provide opportunities for the satisfaction of these needs.

Emphasizing need satisfaction, Abraham Maslow (10) theorized that human needs stand in a hierarchy of importance, the lowest being the most pressing. Man is a wanting being—he always wants and he wants more. But what he wants depends upon what he already has. He concludes that satisfied needs are not motivators. A need which has not been satisfied is more likely to stimulate and call forth new behaviour patterns. Money is not mentioned. Clearly, in a market economy, it is useful, necessary, agent for satisfying the basic lower-level needs. The implications of Maslow's theory for practice are that an adequate income is a persequisite for survival; but if the hierarchy is valid, money is not likely to motivate the satisfaction of self-actualisation needs. Instead, higher-level needs are more likely to be satisfied by the opportunity and freedom to develop one's potentialities.

This type of thinking about human needs and motives led to the formulation of Mc Gregor's Theory Y (11). The main dogma of Theory Y is that man has a natural capacity for creativity, imagination and intellectual development. He needs to be motivated, therefore, on a higher level than simple carrot—and—stick philosophy. This implies that people cannot always be motivated by money alone.

Herzberg (12) on the basis of Pittsburgh studies proposed a two-factor theory of motivation. In one group he includes environmental factors composed of company policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations salary, status, job security and personal life. In the second group are the job content factors composed of achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement and growth. The first group has been called "hygiene" or "maintenance" factors. Their presence will not motive subordinates yet they must be present or dissatisfaction will arise. The job content factors are the real motivators because they have the potential of yielding a sense of satisfaction. This theory ignores the relationship between effort and performance, and effort and reward, and the implications of the expectancy theory of motivation. Herzberg does acknowledge that affective behaviour can be influenced by personality characteristics and suggests upgrading of the job content for motivating employees.

Mc Clelland (13) emphasized the importance of achievement as motivator. Some individuals will accomplish more than others because their need to achieve is greater. He and his associates found that high-achieves are neither low nor high risk-takers. Rather they set moderately difficult but potentially achievable goals for themselves. They like a challenge, but they want some influence over the outcome. They are aggressive realists. In addition, they are motivated more by accomplishment of a particular objective than by the rewards associated with it. Money, for example, is merely used as a means of measuring or assessing progress. High achievers also have a strong desire for feed back on how well they are doing. They want to know the score.

Vroom maintains (14) that a person's motivation toward an action at a particular time is determined by the anticipated values of all the outcomes (positive or negative) of the action, multiplied by the strength of a person's expectation that the action will lead to the outcome sought. Which course of action will be adopted will depend upon the relative strength of forces. We should make the point that a valence does not of course, have any intrinsic value in its own right, but acts simply as means to an end. Money, for instance, will have a higher valence according to the number of needs the individual thinks it will satisfy. To this extent Vroom acknowledges individual differences in motives, values and abilities. "Since Vroom's theory is based on a synthesis of many other research studies in addition to its own, it must stand as one of the leading theories currently held on motivation" (15). But Keith Davis (16) is of the opinion that Vrooms' model should be recognised as only a very broad treatment of the whole motivation process. It does not directly deal with sticky details such as the individual's personality. Further, instead of seeking a single outcome, a person usually seeks a complex network of many inter-related outcomes which makes actual motivation much more complicated. Inspite of all this, "current researchers have higher regard for it than for most of other motivation theories". (17).

Porter and Lawler's model (18) also based on the expectancy theory of motivation implies that individuals are motivated by future expectations based on previously learned experiences. Essentially, two ratios exist in the minds of individuals; on the one hand effort and reward; and on the other, effort and performance and accordingly an individual will move into a state of equilibrium in the balance between the two ratios. In contrast to Vroom's model, Porter and Lawler's model is more comprehensive. It also proposes the relationship between rewards and performance concluding that an individual's satisfaction is a function of the rewards he receives. In return, these rewards are brought about by performance. Thus performance leads to rewards which bring about satisfaction. This is rather interesting finding since many managers feel that satisfaction leads to performance; i.e. a happy worker is a productive worker. However, Porter and Lawler report just the opposite ; performance causes satisfaction. To-day the performance-satisfaction controversy continues. Which is the cause ? which is the effect ? And in a way of confusing the issue, it would be noted that there are some individuals like Charles N. Greene (1972) who contend that both performance and satisfaction are caused by the reward system. Although research is still being conducted in an attempt to resolve the issue, the importance of rewards is indisputable in the motivation process (19).

In Prof. Chris Argyris (20) view every body is already motivated. The problem facing companies is how to channel the motivation in the right direction. Every individual has "psychological energy" to expend. Exerting that energy in a way that helps him fulfil his own social and egoistic needs is what motivates an individual. Therefore, provided a company is structured in such a way that an individual is able to meet these self-fulfilment needs, the psychological energy will be sued in the company's interests. If the reverse is the case, the psychological energy can easily be used to thwart the company's aims. So, the technique of achieving motivation would involve offering job challenge and opportunity to employees who may need training to take advantage of the changed environment.

Likert (21) is a strong proponent of participative management. He sees the effective manager strongly oriented toward his sub-ordinates, relying on communication to keep all parties working as a unit. All members of the group, including the manager adopt a supportive relationship in which they feel a genuine common interest in terms of needs values, aspirations, goals and expectations. Likert sees this relationship as essential to personal motivation. Any manager concerned about the motivation of his sub-ordinates would have to think this very carefully. It is not clear whether the manager is supposed to dissolve himself within the group or whether proof of genuine interest in the development and goals of his subordinates is sufficient.

Gellerman (22) speaks of two major styles of management : the method involving coercian, threat of dismissal, and the method involving compensation, reward. Both of these methods are based on the assumption that people must be subjected to external controls to be productive. Tradionally, people must be managed by manipulation. Coercian and manipulation are always with us, but they are no longer to be considered potent motivators. Gellerman said that the manager must know why a man believes and acts as he does. One must get to the root of his behaviour, rather than react to this behaviour. According to him, money itself has no intrinsic meaning and acquires significant motivating power only when it comes to symbolize intanigible goals.

III

In the area of executive compensation, Arch Patton (23) found the six motivators—the challenge we find in work, status, urge to achieve leadership, lash of competition, fear and money. Although money has been placed last yet it is by no means the least effective motivator; quite the contrary, it is often more than mere money, being generally a reflection of other motivators.

In Schiff and Lewin's (24) view, the sub-set of personal goals that a manager aspires to achieve within the firm, while achieving the organisational goals are wealth (income: salaries plus bonus) staff (status) discretionary control over the allocation of resources and job security (25). But, "Discretionery control over the allocation of resources is a particularly appropriate goal dimension in a model of managerial motivation . . . within the organisation environment the greater the discretionary control over resources a manager has, the greater the responsibility he has and the more numerous his opportunities to experience personal growth and self-fulfilment." (26). From this, it appears that money as a motivator is not so important as self-actualisation needs.

Gerard R. Roche (1974) on the basis of a survey of top U.S. executives (1566 men and women who changed position at the highest rank in 1974) supports the belief that the need for self-actualisation surpasses the need for greatly increased compensation at least among senior executives. Results of the survey also indicated that the mobile executive does better—after a certain point in his or her career (27).

Strauss and Sayles (28) list five alternative methods of motivating people so that a situation may be created in which employees can satisfy their individual needs while at the same time working toward the goals of the organisation: (*i*) the "be strong" approach, (*ii*) the "be good" approach, (*iii*) implicit bargaining, (*iv*) Competition, and (*v*) internalised motivation. From many points of view, internalised motivation is the "best" form of motivation, since it provides the greatest opportunity for individuals to satisfy their needs and to develop their personalities. Yet internalised motivation can rarely be applied alone and is considerably more appropriate with some sorts of people and jobs (for example, jobs which require individual discretion and commitment) than it is with others (29).

IV

Even in Russia, personnel—managerial and non-managerial is motivated. But they "rely on monetary incentives to a greater extent than any other industrial nation" (30). Richman has rightly pointed out: "The soviets have given little attention to the impact of non-material factors on human motivation in industry. This in itself strongly suggests thar they believe that material incentives are more potent than any other motivational factor in the Sovient industrial culture". (31).

V

In India also, the importance of an optimum human motivation had been recognised. Bose (32) maintained that the worker could not be considered apart from the total work environment. Singh and Baumgartel (33) while studying work motivation of airline mechanics brought out the importance of the needs for advancement, security, stability in job and interpersonal relations. It was found that level of educational achievement bears a positive relationship with advancement motivation. B. N. Mukherjee (34) in a study of textile workers in a 'progressive' unit found that pay, opportunities for advancement and job security are the three most important incentives while fringe benefits and working hours are the least important. Ganguly (35) analysed the relative importance of various incentives motivating the Indian Workers and found wages and security to be of great importance. It appears from the above studies that pay is the most important motivator for employees at lower levels. But Varma (36) maintained that attempts to provide financial incentives in an industrial undertaking as means of motivating people at work will most likely fail unless certain pre-requisities of a non-financial kind already exist.

VI

On analysis of the literature on management as given in the previous sections of this paper, it is found that the body of research on the varying effects and the meaning of money as a motivating element in the job setting is very small. According to Opsahl and Dunnette (37) in spite of large amounts of money spent on compensation, and of the relevance of behavioural theory, there is less solid research in this area than in any other field related to work performance. We know little about how money either interacts with other factors or how it acts individually to affect job behaviour. They describe five theories as to how money stimulates work performance. These theories, in fact. summarise the literature on the role of money in industrial motivation and, therefore, being discussed here :

(*i*) money as a generalised conditioned reinforcer : This theory holds that money acts as a reinforcer because it is so often paired with primary reinforcers—need satisfies and that some deprivation usually exists that creates the desire for money. This research must be regarded as inconclusive, and most of it consists of experiments with animals.

(*ii*) Money as a conditioned incentive : According to this theory, a new learned drive for money itself is created by the constant pairing of money with primary incentives, rather than with primary reinforcers. Money could be a generalised conditioned incentive just as it could be a generalised conditioned reinforcer. This introduces the concept of "drive" in connection with money.

(*iii*) Money as an anxiety reducer : This theory holds that people are anxious in the presence of certain cues signifying the absence of money. Money operates to reduce this anxiety. This theory is compatiable and can operate jointly with the preceding two theories.

(*iv*) Money as a 'hygienic' factor : The Herzberg research considers money as a potential dissatisfier if it is not present in the right amounts, but it is not a potential satisfier or positive motivator if it is present in the right amounts. According to these researchers, money's main value is that it leads to both the avoidance of economic deprivation and the avoidance of feelings of being treated unfairly.

Its hygienic role is one of avoiding pain and dissatisfaction (disease) but not of promoting greater motivation (health).

(*v*) Money as an instrument for gaining desired outcomes : Vroom's theories of the cognitive model of motivation imply that money acquires valence as a result of being perceived as an instrument of obtaining other desired outcomes. Valence refers to affective orientations toward particular outcomes and has no direct behavioural consequences.

VII

What we have now reached at this stage is some acknowledgement that money is important. It can never be overlooked as a motivator. And, as Patton pointed out, money is often more than money, in that it can be a reflection of other motivators. Economists and most managers have tended to place money high on the scale of motivators, while behavioural scientists tend to place it low. Neither view is probably right. But if money is to be the kind of motivator that it can and should be, managers might give some thought to the implications of the following ideas (38).

(*i*) Motivation, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder. Thus, one man's motivating meat may well be another's demotivating poison The research findings may be generally true but individually ineffective, depending on many variables.

(*ii*) Each worker is very like all other employees in some ways, like some others in some ways, and like no other in some ways. The manager looks for constants in the work force but realises that human differences are the rule, not the exception.

(*iii*) Workers want to satisfy a range of needs rather than satiate one or two. The manager should offer his people opportunities to experience a balanced diet of satisfactions rather than relying on those that would motivate him.

(*iv*) For real motivation of subordinates, changes in corporate structures and managerial attitudes are necessary. If the firm does not allow people to achieve and grow and if the manager's attitudes are negative, the best motivational efforts and techniques may be negated.

(*v*) Motivation by imposition is as futile as management by imposition. Analysis must precede understanding, which must come before a choice of techniques. There is no need to dissect employees. It is necessary, however, to have some inkling of why they are working and what returns they expect from their jobs. No manager has the right to psychoanalyze his people. Not only is this an invasion of privacy, but amateur psychiatry is like amateur brain surgery—there are no survivers.

(*vi*) An experimental approach is a must. The executive should prudently test various techniques to discover which are most effective with each employee. If he adapts the authorities' dicta to his people rather than slavishly following them like a robot, he will soon discover which are the most practical within the ever present environmental constraints.

(*vii*) No manager can sustain the motivation of his subordinates if he does not allow them to motivate him. The best way to influence thinking and behaviour is to be open to their influence.

(*viii*) All motivational efforts must be congruent with the executive's overall pattern of management. If he is ineffective as a manager, his motivational procedures will fail.

(*ix*) Money, as money is likely to be most important to people who are younger and are raising a family than to people who have 'arrived' in the sense that their money needs are not so urgent. But generalisation is not possible even in these terms. For some people money will always be of the utmost importance, while to others it may never be (39).

(*x*) Finally, it is the 'man' in manager who exerts the greatest impact in motivating or demotivating. To motivate is to move people through influence. What the manager says or does is far less important than the kind of human being he is.

VIII

To sum up, higher productivity is need of the hour. Efforts must be made by every body for raising productivity. Any manager's basic task in raising productivity is to maintain an organisation that functions effectively. To do so, he must motivate people. Employee motivation is a must for effective organisational performance at all levels of organisation irrespective of size and nature of organisation and type of economic system. Other things remaining the same, higher the motivation, higher will be the organisational porformance and vice versa.

What motivates employees has been a matter of prolonged and absorbing interest. The answers are far from clear. The psychological theories which have been put forward are largely products of their time. The models which have been presented do not have universal validity; they contain an element of truth and an element of error. So wide is the range of individual differences and human aspirations, so variable are the goals and means by which they are sought, that a master plan is likely to remain deceptive.

The relative importance of money as a reward for work is debatable. No firm conclusion is possible. At least money must be regarded as a 'maintenance' factor. Depending on the individual's preception, money can be seen as a reward or recognition for effort and performance and so contribute to personal satisfaction. People are likely to look for a link between effort and reward and for a link between effort and performance. They will seek a state of equilibrium in balancing the two sets of ratios. These processes are highly subjective. Measurement of reward values, effort and performance in quantitative terms is difficult. What matters is an individual's perception of the situation rather than the actuality. Effort is further modified by one's capacities and inclinations and how one sees one's work role in relation to others. Generalisation is not really possible, because of differences between individuals and because people do not always act logically and rationally in pursuit of their goals (40).

IX

To conclude, to what extent monetary or non-monetary or both factors (and if both, in which ratio) motivate an individual employee depends on the environment within the organisation and make-up of mind and socio-economic environment of each individual employee. This suggests while motivating others, a manager should never under-estimate the importance of seemingly minor details or trifles. What is the trifle to the manager may be the exact notch in the key that unlocks his employee's fullest motivation.

In fact, employee motivation, particularly in practice, is excessively difficult due to man's complex and dynamic nature. The complexicity and dynamism is a challenge to students of motivation, managers, social workers, and political leaders.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

(1) Davison J.P., Florence P.S., Gray B. and Ross N.S.: *'Productivity and Economic Incentives'*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1958, Page 7.

(2) Hicks, Herbert G.: *'The Management of Organisations'* Mc Graw-Hill Book Co. Inc., New York, 1967, P. 234.

(3) Davis, Kaith: *'Human Relations at Work'*, Mc Graw—Hill Book Company Inc., New York, 1967, pp. 483-484.

(4) Vroom, Victor H.: *'Work and Motivation'*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1967, pp. 203-204.

(5) Smallbone, D.W.: *'An Introduction to Marketing'*, Staples Press, London, 1968; Ch. 7.

(6) Allen, Louis A.: *'Management and Organisation'*, Mc Graw—Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1968, International Student Edn., p. 43.

(7) Taylor, F.W.: *'Scientific Management'* Harper and Row, Publishers Inc., New York, 1947.

(8) Mc Gregor, Douglas: *'The Human Side of Enterprise'*, Mc Graw—Hill Book Co., New York, 1960, Ch. 3.

(9) Gellerman, Saul W.: *'Motivation and Productivity'*, AMA, New York, 1963, pp. 19-31. (Also see: Roethlisberger F. and Dickson, W.J.: *'Management and Worker'*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1939).

(10) Maslow, A.H.: *'Motivation and Personality'*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1954.

(11) Mc Greger Douglas: op. cit., ch. 4 and Part II.

(12) Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B.B.: *'The Motivation to Work'*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1959.

(13) Mc Clelland, David C.: *'The Achieving Society'*, D. Van Norstand Company Inc., Princeton N.J., 1961. (Also see David C. Mc Clelland et. al: *'The Achievement Motive'*, Appleton Century Crofs, Inc., New York, 1953).

(14) Vroom Victor H. : *'Work and Motivation'*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1967, particularly chs. 2 and 9.

(15) Mc Farland, Dalton E. : *'Personnel Management—Theory and Practice'*, The Macmillan Co., Collier Macmillan Ltd., London, 1969, p. 387.

(16) Davis Keith : *'Human Behaviour at Work'*, Tata Mc Graw—Hill Publishing Co. Ltd., New Delhi, TMH Edn., 1975, p. 60.

(17) Hodgetts, Richard M. : *'Management—Theory, Process and Practice'*, W.B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1975, pp. 329-330.

(18) Ibid, pp. 330-331 (Also Sec Porter, Lyman W. and Lawler, Edward E. III : *'Managerial Attitudes and Performance'*, Home Wood, III, Richard D. Irwin Inc. and Dorsey Press, 1968, pp. 12-13.

(19) Ibid, p. 332.

(20) Argyris, Chris : *'Personality and Organisation'*, Herper 'and Brothers, New York, 1957 (Also see *'Integrating the Individual and the Organisation'*, John Willey and Sons, Inc., New York, 1964).

(21) Linkert, Rensis : *'New Patterns of Management'*, Mc Graw—Hill Book Co., New Delhi, 1961 (Also see his *'The Human Organisation'*, Mc Graw—Hill Book Co., New York, 1967).

(22) Gellerman, Saul W. : op. cit., particularly ch. 25.

(23) Patton, Arch : *'Men, Money and Motivation'*, Mc Graw—Hill Book Co., New York, 1961-Ch. 2.

(24) Schiff, Michael and Lewin, Arie, Y. : *Behavioural Aspects of Accounting'* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood, Cliff, N.J., 1974, p. 7.

(25) Williamson, Oliver E. : *'The Economics of Discretionary Behaviour—Managerial Objectives in a theory of the Firm'*, 1964, pp. 28-38.

(26) Schiff and Lewin : op. cit., p. 7.

(27) Roche, Gerard R. : 'Compensation and the Mobile Executive' in *'Harvard Business Review'*, Vol. 53, No. 6, Nov.-Dec., 1975, pp. 53-62.

(28) Strauss, Georga and Sayles, Leonard R. : *'Personnel—The Human Problems of Management'*, Prentice-Hall of India Ltd., New Delhi, 1968, ch. 6, pp. 127-145.

(29) Ibid, p. 145.

(30) Richman, Barry M. : *'Soviet Management'*, Scientific Book Agency, Calcutta, 1965, p. 132.

(31) Ibid, p. 132 (Second Paragraph).

(32) Bose, S.K. : 'Psychological Aspects of Plant Personnel' in *Education and Psychology'*, 1956, 3(3), pp. 8-17.

(33) Singh, Tripit N., and Baumgartel, Howard : "Background Factors in Airline Mechanics work Motivation' : A Research Note" in *'Journal of Applied Psychology'*, 50(5), 1966, pp. 357-359.

(34) Mukherjee, B.N. : 'Importance of Job-Related Needs by Indian Textile Mill Workers' in *'Indian Journal of Industrial Relations'*, 4(2), Oct. 1968. pp. 162-181.

(35) Ganguli, H.C. : 'An Inquiry into Incentive for Workers in an Engg. Factory' in *'Indian Journal of Social Work'*, 1954, 15, pp. 30-40.

(36) Varma, S. : 'Work Study—A basis for Financial Incentives' in *'Management Review'*, Delhi, 1(12), Dec. 1961, pp. 24-26.

(37) Victor, H. and Deci, Edward L. Edited : *'Management and Motivation'*, Penguin Modern Management Readings, England, 1974 (Reprinted), pp. 127-159.

(38) Cribbin, James J. : *'Effective Managerial Leadership'*, AMA, Inc., U.S.A. 1972, pp. 151-153.

(39) Koontz, Harold and O'Donnell, Cyril : *'Management : A System and Contengency Analysis of Managerial Functions'*, Mc Graw--Hill Kogakusha, Ltd., Tokyo, 1976, pp. 574-75.

(40) Livy, Bryan : Job Evaluation : *'A Critical Review'*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1975, chs. 2 and 10.