

CHAPTER II

THEORIES RELATING TO EUPSYCHIAN MANAGEMENT

The philosophy of Eupsychian management rests on Maslow's (1973) Z theory of motivation. Though this theory stems from his broad clinical observations and personality researches, its extension to industrial management has a functional link with modern structural theories. As a challenge to the Taylorism which perceived worker as an extension of job rather than as a person, developed strong set of beliefs that had one common integrating element, the conception that organizations are essentially human phenomena. Among the strong advocates of these beliefs are Mayo (1933), Argyris (1957), Herzberg (1959), McGregor (1960) and Maslow (1965, 1973).

In the present context, a critical appreciation of modern structural theories propounded by these authors is presented which emphasize a humanistic approach towards organizations.

Rabble Hypothesis

Mayo (1933) and his team performed a number of experiments at Hawthorne in the industrial situation to observe the effect of improved working conditions on the output of workers. During their experiments, they observed a new phenomenon—the human aspect of the work. The implications of the Hawthorne studies stressed that what management needed was to study and understand the relationships among workers. The most significant factors

affecting organizational productivity were found to be the interpersonal relationships developed on the job. Mayo perceived that industrial management derived the satisfaction of esteem and self-actualization needs on the job. The management operated and organized work on the assumptions that people were primarily motivated by physiological and safety needs. As a result of these assumptions, the worker felt tension, anxiety and helplessness. The inhuman element turned them dejected and confused. Thus, management assumed that workers, in general, were contemptible. Mayo (1973) called this assumption the "Rabble Hypothesis" and sharply criticizing the authoritarian, task-oriented management practices, stressed the human approach to solve industrial problems.

Immaturity-Maturity Theory

Argyris (1957) like Mayo, examined industrial organizations to see the effect of management practices on individual behaviour and personal growth within the work-environment. He observed the incongruency between the needs of a healthy personality and those of formal organization. As a result of his observations, he developed "Immaturity-Maturity theory" which contended that the widespread worker apathy and lack of effort in industry are not simply the result of individual laziness but because they are kept from maturing by formal management practices. This lack of congruency results in frustration, failure and conflict. The bureaucratic values

which dominate organizational life are basically impersonal values decreasing organizational effectiveness.

The basic problem according to Argyris (1957) is to decrease the degree of dependency, subordination and submissiveness. He proposed "power equalization practices" by minimizing or eliminating hierarchy. Management, Argyris (1957) felt, needed a work-climate in which every member contributes upto his or her full potential and has a chance to grow and mature as an individual.

Strauss (1963) criticized Argyris' views on two main grounds; his global personality assumption and his propensity to blame the structure of the organization for all of its ills. He asserted that the 'power-equalization practices' may in fact adversely affect the security needs of those workers who are not prepared the responsibilities that accompany an expanded role.

Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Herzberg (1959) impressed by Argyris' emphasis on human-needs, concentrated on the areas of human needs and motives as an invaluable part of the organizational study. As a result of a number of studies, he concluded that humans have two different categories of needs which are essentially independent of each other and affect behaviour in different ways. According to him, people's dissatisfaction with their jobs refers to their work-environment while their satisfaction about their job relates to the intrinsic nature of the work. Herzberg called the first

category of needs Hygiene factors because their absence leads to dis-satisfaction but not to satisfaction. Hygiene factors are company policies, administration, supervision, working conditions, security, status and interpersonal relations etc.

He called the second category of needs motivators since they foster the individuals' need for self-actualization in their work. Motivators include achievement, recognition, advancement, possibility of growth and work itself. Satisfaction of the motivators will permit individuals to grow and develop in a mature way. Herzberg encouraged management to provide in the work-climate ample opportunity for the satisfaction of motivators.

In recent years Herzberg's theory has received widespread attention in the literature. Organizational theorists have attempted to verify Herzberg's contention that motivators and Hygiene are unidimensional.

Friedlander's (1963, 1964) two studies provide some support for the theory. In the first (1963) study on engineers, supervisors and salaried employees he factor-analyzed a 17 item questionnaire which measured the importance of various job characteristics to employee-satisfaction: Three factors emerged, two of which corresponded in part with Herzberg's concepts of motivation and Hygiene while the third factor drew from both the motivation and Hygiene,

In the second study Friedlander (1964) investigated the bipolar assumptions of job satisfaction. Both correlational and variance analyses indicated that satisfaction and

dissatisfaction are unrelated and not complementary functions.

Hulin & Smith (1967) found in a study that the motivators acted both as motivators and Hygiene factors and the Hygiene factors acted as Motivators as well as Hygienes.

Ewen (1964) in a factor-analysis study observed that six interpretable factors emerged of which three were Hygienes and two motivators. Two of the three Hygienes acted like motivators in both samples.

Friendlander and Walton (1964), in a study of 82 engineers and scientists concluded that motivators are different from and not merely opposite to the Hygienes.

Burke's (1966) study indicated that no unidimensional attribute underlies both the Motivators and Hygienes and asserted the two factor theory as an over-simplified representation of job-satisfaction.

Lindsay, Marks and Gorlow's (1967) study indicated that both motivators and Hygienes are related to satisfaction- conceptualized as a bipolar variable.

Halpern's (1966) study shows substantial correlations between motivators and Hygienes. His results are non-supportive of Herzberg's theory.

Some other studies indicated that different samples show different reaction to the same factor i.e. a given factor, which causes job satisfaction in one sample results in job-dissatisfaction in other sample. These studies concluded that job or occupational level, age and sex of respondents are partially responsible for a factor causing job satisfaction or job

dissatisfaction. (Friedlander, 1965, Myers, 1964, Rosen, 1963, Friedlander, 1963 and Wernimont, 1966), still there are some studies which partially supported two factors theory. Gardner's (1977) study showed that Herzberg's two-factor theory was well supported by the analysis of aggregate responses. The individual analysis supported only half of the theory relating to motivators.

Despite the controversial issues on two-factors theory, this theory is important in distinguishing between factors revolving around the opportunities for self-actualization on the job and factors dealing with the technical environment of the job.

Theory X-Theory Y

Like Mayo (1933), Argyris (1957), Mayo (1949) and Herzberg (1959), McGregor (1960) perceived that most industrial situations failed to notice the human needs. The inner world of the worker was totally ignored. The traditional organizational structure, with its division of labour and span of control did not permit the worker to utilize his capabilities. To make this explicit McGregor developed "Theory X-Theory Y".

Theory X

Theory X assumes that people are by nature lazy, indolent, indifferent to organizational needs and resistant to change. According to this theory, people have a general tendency to shirk any responsibility and perceive the work as uninteresting and burdensome. They want only money and security in life with less

efforts. Because of this mentality, they prefer to be directed rather than take the trouble on their own. This theory rests on the assumptions that people are immature and careless and blames human nature for ineffective organizational functioning. Managers who accept these assumptions put emphasis on structure, control and close supervision.

In brief, this theory overlooked human needs and failed to perceive in people the urge to achieve and actualize their talents. It believed that strict control and supervision of people will result in better management.

Theory Y

Mcgregor developed theory Y as a challenge to theory X.

Theory Y perceives the problem in a new light and places the causes of human indolence, laziness and indifference in the lap of management. In contrast to theory X, theory Y emphasizes intrinsic motivation.

Theory Y assumes that humans are not by nature lazy and unreliable. They are basically self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated. They learn under proper conditions not only to accept but to seek responsibility and have the capacity to exercise imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of the organizational problems. The heavy emphasis on intrinsic motivation implies that the employee will be motivated by self-esteem and self-actualization needs, while on the job.

Theory Y expresses faith in goodness and trust-worthiness of all human beings. It assumes in people the impulse to achieve and to lead themselves toward perfection according to their talents and capabilities. They are healthy enough to take their responsibility and make full use of the facilities provided to them. Further, this theory assumes that human beings have an inclination to take initiatives and live an active life rather than being guided by others. They have a preference for a meaningful work rather than to meaningless work and a tendency to grow toward self-actualization. According to this theory, the structure of the organization is responsible for difficult employees. An alternation in the structure is called for the human quest for self-actualization. The management based on the assumptions of theory Y attempts to provide work environment to its employees where they are able to achieve the satisfaction of self-esteem and self-actualization needs.

Maslow (1965) viewed theory Y in a new light and put forth his reactions to certain deficiencies in the theory. This theory, as Maslow points out, stresses heavily on the "higher" needs as motivators. It overlooked the basic philosophy underlying the theory. In the first place, this theory regarded these management principles as intrinsically good without any doubt regarding their applicability. It is totally unaware of the fact that the applicability of the theory would not work in every situation. There are many places where authoritarian management can work. "Authoritarian characters confronted with human

relations principles of management, based on all sorts of beneficent and benevolent assumptions would consider management as weak and unrealistic" (Maslow, 1965, p. 35). This theory assumes the goodness of all human beings and neglect the individual differences. Dogmatics, bureaucratic oriented individuals and neurotics raise their individual problems for the management. The growth needs remain unoperative in these people, no matter, how growth-oriented the environment is. Also, this theory is oblivious to the fact that the most people never reach the higher levels because they are fixated at some basic need level. In addition to this, Maslow argues, that there is a proportion of the population that cannot take responsibility. Such people get disturbed in a open and self-responsible situation.

It is apparent from Maslow's criticism of theory Y that it, as a challenge to theory X, touched the other extreme. This theory has exaggerated in its assumptions on the goodness and capabilities of human beings. In brief, it turned to be a little impractical. But despite, these defects, it is a successful theory so far as it helped to change management's mechanistic notion of human beings. The high authorities in the organizations felt their duties to create democratic environment and provide all the facilities and opportunities for the people to grow and develop. This resulted in the more intrinsically satisfied employees and more efficiency in the work and long range health of the organization.

Theory Z (Theory of **Metamotivation**)

Maslow (1973) accepting some of the basic principles of McGregor's theory, developed his theory Z. It is on the same continuum as theories X-Y and with them forms a hierarchy. The concept of eupsychian management rests on theory Z. It assumes that individuals who have sufficiently satisfied their deficiency needs of safety, respect, love and esteem, function at a higher level of self-actualization. Self-actualization implies that "the individual is not only sufficiently gratified in his basic needs and is positively using his capacities but that he is motivated by some values which he strives for or gropes for and to which he is loyal" (Maslow, 1973 p. 315).

Maslow's (1973) theory of self-actualization rests on a philosophy of Biology. According to him, man's highest nature is rooted in his biological nature; the full humanness is an expression of the biological life. Maslow (1973) has not differentiated the value life and the animal life into separate entities. They function on the same continuum where the gratification at the lower levels leads to the fullest development. He perceives self-actualization not as a momentary state or life achievement but as the process of psychological growth in which the individual attains his highest potential through the hierarchy of basic needs. "Self-actualization is not only an end state, but also the process of actualizing one's potentialities at any time, in any amount" (Maslow, 1973, p. 49). Those

self-actualizing individuals who are satisfied in their basic needs function at a higher level of meta motivation. The term "meta" denotes "after" or "beyond" and implies a state of unmotivated behaviour. Self-actualizing individuals are not motivated, rather they are meta motivated. They are dedicated to some task or mission which becomes a defining characteristic of the self. Their work is their destiny to them; something they have come for in the world. They feel from the inside a sort of compellingness towards the task; something irresistible. This inner-requiredness is submerged with external requiredness which is a sort of duty or responsibility the person feels towards the work. At this stage such people transcend the dichotomy of work and play and devote themselves to the realization of self-actualization values. They love their tasks because they incarnate these values. The self-actualization values are "Being" or B-values, the ultimate values which are intrinsic, which cannot be reduced to anything more ultimate" (Maslow, 1973 p. 45). The term 'Being' refers to the concepts of perfection, to the ideal limits of human development. It implies the end states rather than means or instruments, in which the person experiences pure joy and fulfillment. Some of the B-values which Maslow (1973) listed are truth, goodness, beauty, wholeness, dichotomy-transcendence, aliveness, uniqueness, perfection, necessity, completion, justice, order, simplicity, richness, effortlessness, playfulness and self-sufficiency etc.

These B-values become the needs of self-actualizing individuals which, Maslow referred to as the meta needs. The deprivation of meta needs causes metapathologies i.e. renders person frustrated and craving for these values. These metaneeds are instinctoid in nature and hierarchically integrated with the basic needs where as the basic needs are prepotent to the metaneeds. Metaneeds, despite their biological nature, differ from the basic needs so far they ingest growth rather than having only survival values. All B-values are dynamically linked with each other. B-values are equal in their character strength. They cannot be categorized in terms of their importance, though different persons may have their individual perception of a value. At the higher stage of metamotivation B-values or metaneeds seem to be the B-facts or the ultimate reality. When the highest level of growth is attained, the individuals perceive the reality most clearly as it is. They perceive the world's real nature uninterrupted by their defences or inhibitions. The fact and value fuse, losing their separate entities. At this level, the individual transcends the distinction between 'is' and 'ought'. The individual's highly developed perception brings the actuality closer to the ideal. The reality is described in terms of value as true, good, perfect, lawful etc.

B-values are no longer only a part of inner self. They become both inner and outer as individuals do not differentiate themselves from the outside world. They develop an enlarged self in which both the world and the self become a part of each other.

Thus it is apparent from the above review of theory Z that it has emphasized heavily on metaneeds or B-values. It's relation to McGregor's theory can be explained in a single formula.

Maslow's Need Priority Model	Physiological, Safety, Security needs	Middle order Higher order needs	Metaneeds B-values
---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------	-----------------------

McGregor's Theories	Theory X	Theory Y	Theory Z
------------------------	----------	----------	----------

Theory Y and theory Z people share all the common characteristics of self-actualizing individuals, with one major difference of presence or absence of B-values. The people on theory Y level are merely healthy self-actualizers that fulfill the expectations of theory Y. The individuals on theory Z level not only fulfill but transcend the theory Y. They are guided by B-values and in contrast to theory Y people who are more practical and realistic, live to fulfill their own idiosyncratic potentialities. Such people are holistic in perception; they perceive the human kind into whole rather than discriminating it into sects as religions or nationalities. They have a synergic attitude towards life which tends them to place diverse constructs i.e. selfishness and unselfishness under a single superordinate concept.

The theory Z people possess more innovative mind than theory Y people and get pleasure in the discovery of new. Mystery is attractive and challenging to them rather than frightening. Moreover, such people have a deep sensitivity towards the world.

But despite their regrets over the world's evil they understand and accept its inevitability in the holistic sense. Their perception of the sin and evil is more towards compassion and reformation rather than ambivalence. In short, theory Z people live a value life.

Theory Z, though attempted to overcome deficiencies of past theories, is not free from certain flaws in it. Some of the writers like Rogers (1963), Frankl (1973), Friedman (1976) and Smith (1973) have pointed out those defects in the light of their arguments.

Rogers (1963) observed growth as a process active throughout life. According to him, every living organism possesses a directional tendency to maintain, enhance and reproduce itself, "substratum of all motivation is the organism's tendency toward self-fulfilment"(Rogers, 1963, p. 6). It includes both the physiological and psychological aspects of growth. At the lower levels, this tendency is directed only towards homeostatic balance. On the emergence of self, this tendency is shifted from physiological to psychological level.

Growth, according to Rogers (1963), not emerges at the point where basic needs disappear but is operative all the time over and above the basic needs. Moreover, Rogers questions the desirability of categorizing behavioral phenomena into a set of specific motives since it leaves unsolved the question why certain behaviors take place.

Frankl's (1969) description of a fully human individual is similar to that of Maslow but he contrasted Maslow on the fundamental issue of human nature as being pre-determined by instincts. The essential nature of man, according to him, is not in its biological rooting but in the self-transcendence, in the search for meaning. Self-actualization, he thought was not an end in itself but as a by product of humans' discovery of meaning or purpose in life. Humans fulfil themselves to the extent they fulfil meaning in the world. Moreover, Maslow perceived self-actualization based on the potentialities actualized while Frankl observed that potentialities are chosen by man in the light of meaning and value.

Friedman (1976) perceived potentialities as not something inherent in humanbeings. "They are not in us, they are between us and what calls us out" (Friedman, 1976, p. 12). He believed that they are discovered only in the face of actuality. Human beings are aware of their potentiality only when they face the stringency of the situation.

Smith (1973) in his discussion of Maslow's doctrine of potentiality questioned his biologism. He argued, "our biology cannot be made to carry our ethics as Maslow would have it" (1973, p. 25). According to Smith, only some universal attributes as language and symbolization etc. are determined through evolution. The individuals possess many potentialities in them and they get any of them actualized according to their temperament and capacity. Smith (1973) points out that,

"Becoming fully human is a personal-cultural-historical adventure" (p. 30). According to him, Maslow did not differentiate between biology and history. "His misguided attempt to arrive at a naturalistic basis for human values, rules out any serious consideration of the ethics and politics of human action" (1973, p. 29-30). Smith considered Maslow's concept of self-actualization as defective in this sense.

These theorists may be partly right in their criticism of Maslow's theory of metamotivation. But despite their questioning on Maslow's biologism and the doctrine of potentiality, his theory of metamotivation has an intuitive appeal. His introduction of metaneeds or B-values led organizational theorists perceive human problems in a new perspective. Though other writers of humanistic psychology as Argyris, McGregor and Herzberg drew the attention towards higher needs and intrinsic motivation, they could not perceive the existence of metaneeds, the frustration of which causes serious pathologies.

Maslow's concept of healthy personality made it apparent that why most of the successful people who appear to have everything (security, love, esteem) are unhappy and frustrated. It is because they have not got the opportunities for the satisfaction of their metaneeds. Maslow's theory of metamotivation established a new trend in the organizational psychology. He made organizational theorists realize that organization may be responsible for the ingestion or suppression of growth and that people require growth-oriented environment where they would exercise their B-values.