



Property of the Library  
INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE  
ARMED FORCES

HUMAN RELATIONS AND INDIVIDUAL MOTIVATION

Dr. Robert J. Agnew

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by: Colonel Tom W. Sills, USA

Date: 27 October 1960

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

1960-1961

HUMAN RELATIONS AND INDIVIDUAL MOTIVATION

23 September 1960

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION--Colonel Raymond J. Harvey, USA, Member of the Faculty, Industrial College of the Armed Forces.....	1
SPEAKER--Dr. Robert J. Agnew, Associate Professor of Industry, University of Pittsburgh.....	2
GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	21

Property of the Library  
INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE  
ARMED FORCES

Reporter: Ralph W. Bennett

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker  
it has been reproduced directly from the reporter's  
notes for the students and faculty for reference and  
study purpose.

No direct quotations are to be made either in  
written report or in oral presentations based on  
this unedited copy.

Reviewed By: Carlton W. Silla USA Date OCT 27 1960

Publication No. L61-33

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington, D. C.

## HUMAN RELATIONS AND INDIVIDUAL MOTIVATION

23 September 1960

COL. HARVEY: General Houseman, Gentlemen: Earlier this morning we were given a rather general overview of management. Among all the factors that affect the management environment perhaps none are of greater importance than the relations among humans and the motivations that impel people to act and react as they do. This is so because people never do anything without some motivation. It may be inner-inspired, like going to sleep when you are tired, or outer-directed, such as the persuasive influence of a ball bat. But in any case there is always motivation.

During this period we shall examine the various influences that affect individual and group behavior. Since you have all read his biography, your speaker's history is well known to you. He has had a number of years of experience as an educator and<sup>a</sup> consultant in the fields of industrial and human relations. If I might add a personal note, I had the privilege a couple of years ago of taking a course that he conducted in these areas.

The title of the lecture, his first at the Industrial College, is "Human Relations and Individual Motivation."

I am pleased to present Dr. Robert J. Agnew, of the School of Business Administration of the University of Pittsburgh.

DR. AGNEW: Thank you, Colonel Harvey; and it's only fair to tell you gentlemen that Ray was one of my "A" students. But we say

on the faculty of that particular course that one of the main things we like about it is that we don't have to give grades. So don't take that "A" too seriously.

As Colonel Harvey has told you, I am going to speak this morning in the general area of motivation, because I do feel that the essential question to which any manager, be he military, be he civilian, be he industrial, or be he educational--the essential question to which any individual concerned with directing the work of people has to address himself is this: Why do people work?

Now, unless we know why it is that people work, we cannot really attack the problem of how to get them to work better, how to get them to work harder, how to get them to work more willingly, because people work for essentially the same set of reasons that they do anything else. People work or loaf, they invest their money as stockholders, or they sell their stocks, they buy Brand A instead of Brand B, they come to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces or they don't, for essentially the same set of reasons. People behave in a particular way because, as they see it, doing this instead of that will best satisfy their needs.

So people work, then, in order to satisfy needs. They work hard or not so hard, they work willingly or unwillingly, they cooperate or they obstruct, because, as they see it, they can in that way satisfy their needs.

Well, what are these needs that I have been talking about? A psychologist, which I am not, might say that a need is a tension state. Something is stretched or pulled, is under tension, when we have a need. Satisfy that need and the tension dies down.

Now, a comedian who was quite popular a number of years ago, Colonel Stoopnagle, of Stoopnagle and ~~Sparks~~<sup>Budd</sup>, once gave a definition of just ordinary table salt that might well be applicable here. He said that salt is something that makes potatoes taste bad if you don't put it on them. Well, similarly, we could say that needs are something that make us feel badly if they are not satisfied.

Some of our needs are conscious. We know that we have this need or that need. An hour or so ago, before breakfast, you knew that you were hungry. Or some of you right now know that you're sleepy. You need either sleep or stimulation. Just as a few hours ago you needed food, you will need food again in a few hours before lunch. So that the simple fact that a need has been satisfied doesn't mean that it has been satisfied for all time.

So that you need right now sleep or stimulation. My function as a speaker is to attempt at least to give you stimulation. But should I fail in that endeavor and sleep conquer ~~us~~<sup>eth</sup> all, be my guests. As Colonel Harvey has told you, I've been in education for a number of years and I'm quite used to students going to sleep.

The point is, you knew that you were hungry. So some of our needs, then, are conscious. But some of our needs are unconscious, and we don't know about them. We may know that something is wrong, that we don't feel quite right, that something is bothering us. Or we may not be aware of it at all. People who know us, who work with us, perhaps live with us, may be aware that we are acting differently, or that we are acting

in a way that we don't like or in a way that we shouldn't act. We don't know why. They don't know why. Well, it may be that some need, some tension state, is bothering us. Some unconscious need is making us act as we're acting without our knowing it.

Now, let me use myself, if I may, as an example. I have a very high degree of finger and tweezer dexterity. Many years ago, when I was trying to make up my mind whether to come back to school or not, I had myself tested, and they said: "Mr. Agnew, it's a shame we didn't get hold of you years ago, because you are among the most dexterous, and we perhaps could have steered you into something where this could be used." They indicated: "Now, whatever you do, you want to make sure that you find some occupation in which you put this to use." So I became a professor.

Of course, as a professor you can putter around with the chalk and the blackboard, you can putter with a cigarette. And it's my proud boast that in some ten years of teaching I have never yet tried to light the chalk. I have tried to write on the board with the cigarette a couple of times, though. But I have discovered intellectually that sometimes, if I start getting what my Jewish friends call "nuggy," sort of get the temptation to give the head of the house the back of the hand or something of the sort--a temptation which I try to resist--it may well be the fingers that are bothering me. You see, I haven't put them to enough use.

Well, I've discovered that if I can sit down at a typewriter perhaps for fifteen or twenty minutes and just type, just copy anything, sort of

relieving those tensions, my disposition really tends to improve.

So that some of our needs, then, are unconscious. They can be making us behave and act in a particular way without our knowing it.

Well, now, we have already looked at some of the needs that people have--the need for food, the need for sleep. Some of our needs are physical needs. Some of our needs are of and in the body--food, shelter, sleep, elimination of bodily wastes, a variety of other physical needs. But some of our most important needs are in the mind, are psychological in nature.

Well, what are some of these psychological needs, these needs that are in our mind? We could go around this room and ask each of you to make up a list of needs, and ask each of you to indicate one need that you feel to be particularly important to people, and we would get a very good and a very complete list of needs in that way. It would be as good a list as the list that a psychologist might make up or that I might make up. But this, however, would take a bit of time; so it might be faster if we took a look at a list of needs, not a list of the needs, or not the list of needs, but just a list of needs, which by some strange coincidence I just happen to have with me.

It isn't any better than your list; and many of the things that you would put on such a list are here. Many of the things perhaps you would call by a different name than I would. But I think by and large we could certainly agree that these things are tension states which have to be relieved, needs which have to be satisfied. People behave and act so as to satisfy

needs, so as to relieve these tensions. In short, people do what they do in part to satisfy these needs. Need satisfaction, then, is what motivates people.

Some of these needs are (writing on blackboard) as follows: The need for support. Now, by this I don't mean the way you have to support your brother-in-law, the one who can't hold a job; but the need to feel that somebody is behind you; the need to feel that somebody agrees with you, the need to feel that you are not alone. If you have ever been a vocal minority of one, you know that it can get pretty damn lonesome out there; and the idea of somebody agreeing with you is a nice, warming feeling.

Well, now, I come up against this problem rather often. As one who does a reasonable amount of public speaking, I will go up against a group right after a nice, heavy roast beef dinner, see them all sitting out there, sort of like speaking almost to a wall. You sort of have the feeling that the faces are really painted there. You know, they just don't exist. So you begin and there's no reaction at all. You start wondering: "Is this phony bow tie coming loose on one side?" All sorts of different feelings. You just go on and literally nothing happens.

Then, all of a sudden, out in the crowd, as you make a point, somebody nods. It is a nice feeling. Somebody is listening. Of course it never occurs to you that the nod may have been more like this (demonstrating) than of agreement. But at least it is a warming feeling.

Now, we all have this need for support. Some of us have it in much

greater quantity than others. Certainly each of us has it at one time or another in greater quantity than he might normally. But the need for support is a tremendously important one to people.

Another of the needs that is tremendously important to people is the need to acquire, the need to get things. I think we all have that to an extent. I suppose that the miser would be the real gone guy in this particular need, driven by it almost. But we each have it to an extent. Most of us really have more automobile than we need for transportation alone. We have more housing perhaps than we need. We have more in the way of clothes than we need really just to keep our body warm. It is obvious that many of us have more food than we really need too. But this need to acquire, this need to get something, sort of satisfies a need in most of us.

I am always reminded of the story of the nut who went to a psychiatrist. The psychiatrist spoke with him for quite a while; gave him some pretty extensive examination, and finally said: "Well, my friend, I don't see anything wrong with you. As far as I can tell, you're quite all right. You're the same as anybody I know." So the nut said: "I knew there was nothing wrong with me." The doctor said: "Then what were you doing here?" The fellow said: "Well, as I say, I knew there was nothing wrong with me, but my family insisted that I come." "Well, do you mind telling me what it is you do that your family objects to?" The nut says: "Well, no. I like pancakes." The doctor says: "Well, heavens; there's nothing wrong with that. I like pancakes too." So the

man said: "You do? You must come over. I have three closets full of them."

So that sometimes this need to acquire sort of gets beyond us.

Another of the needs that is tremendously important to people is closely related to the first one, but not quite the same thing. It's the need to belong. It's the need to feel part of a group, the need to feel: "Here I am at home. Here I am accepted. Here I belong."

For instance, oh, if we get ill at work, our immediate reaction is to go home. We're going to be just as sick at home as we are anywhere else, but our immediate need really is to go where we belong, to go where we are completely accepted.

I have two children. One is five and one is two. And I am acutely aware of the depth of that drive to belong in children. You see, one of the ways in which my daughter can be most easily caused to dissolve into tears is when the other kids say, "We won't play with you." When she is shut out from that particular group. And I think most of us are pretty much the same way.

When you men came to this course a month or two ago, you were a group of strangers. You sort of look around and say, "What am I doing here?" That sort of thing, you know, the "Look at him" feeling. Really a tremendous emotional reaction, of feeling a little lost for a while. But then, as you get to know each other, as you get into the groove, the feeling of belonging--a relief from the tension that you felt initially.

I am certain that many of you have been transferred around. You go

into a new situation. You don't really know anybody. They're a bunch of faces, a bunch of names. Perhaps you give it a little time to get your feet on the ground, which usually means getting familiar with the informal organization, getting to know the people. You see, you come in and you don't know the shared jokes. People will say something that doesn't sound very funny to you, and everybody else will laugh uproarously, as at a family-type joke. But eventually, maybe over coffee or a luncheon or two, you get that feeling of belonging. You know that Gertie, the office girl, was dating Homer, the shipping clerk; so that you understand a few more of the jokes that people are telling. It's a much nicer and warmer feeling. So that that need to belong, then, is a tremendously important motivator of people.

Now, another of the needs that is quite important, that is related in a variety of different ways, is the need to know, the need to know. This, of course, is the need that keeps me in business. If this need ever disappeared, I probably would have to go back to working for a living--a reasonably horrible prospect. But this need to know. Perhaps you know people, perhaps you are yourself almost driven by gadgetry. You see some particular gadget and you can't really rest content until you know how it works. Perhaps you even have to take it apart. I'm that way with ballpoint pens, for instance. I just want to know how the release mechanism works, where the spring is, and the rest of it. And I just wouldn't give you a nickel for a ballpoint pen that I couldn't take apart. It isn't true that I have three closets full of them, but at least I'm almost driven to know

how they work. So many of you are perhaps the same about other varieties of gadgets.

Certainly we like to know what's going on. It sort of bothers us if we see two people whispering in a sort of intimate conversation. We'd sort of like to tune in on it. You know, "maybe they're talking about me." But we do like to know. We want the latest hot dope, the latest rumor that's going around. Of course we have to get it very quickly, because it won't be around long. There'll be another one around in a minute or two. But we like to tune in on it. You see, knowledge is a kind of power. Knowledge is a kind of power.

Again, if I can exemplify this with children, another good way to get a fight started is, "I know something you don't know." Well, we don't really lose that fully and completely as we grow with age either.

Now, I'm certain that this has never happened to any of you men, or in any of your offices; but I've seen it happen a few times in industry: The boss will come back from a meeting; and at that meeting you know that something has been discussed that has a direct bearing on you, your section, your responsibility. Well, the boss comes back from this meeting and you can almost see it--"I know something you don't know." You can almost sense it.

Well, this is good for him. You see, his shoulders are back, and his carriage is a bit more erect. Knowledge is a kind of power. You can almost see it. There's a little secret there. He knows, and you know he knows, and he knows you know he knows.

Well, now, if he's a boss of long experience, he can make it all the way across the office without meeting anyone's eye. It's no mean feat. But he goes in his office and you're sitting outside nibbling your nails, and there he is, looking at this little tracer.

Well, eventually, just as he was supposed to do right from the very start, he calls you in and presents this to you. Somehow he always makes it appear, or just manages to convey the impression, that there are a few things he didn't tell you, just for policy reasons.

Well, now you have it, and you can walk out through the aisle. And this is good for you. If you are a man really on his way up, you can make it across the office without meeting anybody's eye. And you know, and they know you know, and what's really good for you is, you know they know.

Well, again, just as you were supposed to, you pass it out and give that impression that there are a few things you're not telling them.

Well, knowledge is a kind of power. The need to know, the need to know about the things that directly affect us in the operations of our job, in the performance of our duty. It's a very strong motivator of people.

Another of the strong needs is the need to achieve, the need to accomplish something, the need to feel that we really have done something. This may be at the level of, "Why did you climb that mountain?" "Just because it was there." Or it may be something vastly simpler.

One of the first jobs I ever had in industry when I was fresh out of high school was a pulpit operator in a pipe mill, where I stood up sort of

on a platform and pushed a couple of hammer motor control buttons that made the conveyor wheels go around that carried pipe past me.

Well, as far as you could see in that direction, nothing but pipe. As far as you could see in that direction, nothing but pipe. And when you've seen one, you've seen them all. But every now and then some kind soul would write "50" on one of them. A nice feeling of achievement. There are fifty of the damn things that I'll never see again. It's something like the feeling you get when I turn over a page in my notes.

But the need to achieve, the need to feel that you have accomplished something. And I would certainly say it for those of you who are regular students in this particular program that you probably meet this need reasonably late at night, when you are in bed perhaps trying to finish up that reading assignment. The nods come a little faster, and the chest slowly rises to meet the chin. "Gee, how many more pages in this thing? Well, three pages left." Boy, you'll fight it out on this line if it takes all winter. And finally you finish it. Then you can put the thing down and go to sleep. Of course you haven't understood a thing you've read for fifteen minutes, but at least you've finished it. The need to achieve. The need to feel that we have accomplished something.

Two other needs, that are pretty closely related, are the need for respect and the need for recognition. These are similar, but they are not quite the same thing. The need for respect. The need for recognition. As I say, these are not quite the same thing.

I think that "respect" carries with it at least the connotation of an

appropriate value system. That is to say, you get respect for doing the right thing. It is quite possible, of course, to get recognition for doing the wrong thing. I mean, you couldn't make the team as a halfback, so you become the cheer leader for it. Or the noxious type who puts on the ladies' hats at a party. He gets recognition. While respect, I think, we tend to give and we tend to get essentially for doing the right thing.

Now, we all like to be respected for what we are, for what we do, for what we know and say; and it's tremendously important to us.

But I think one of the things that we have to remember about people--and this is particularly important in the area of managing people--is that if they cannot get respect from their on-the-job performance, or if they cannot get recognition for doing the right thing, they will seek recognition and take it wherever they can find it. You see, if a man cannot get the respect, let us say, of his boss for being a good workman, it's altogether possible that he will seek the recognition of his work group as being the biggest goof-off in the shop. So that we must attempt to satisfy that need for respect and the need for recognition in the on-the-job situation, making it possible for the individual to satisfy that particular need through doing the right thing.

Now, another of the needs that is quite important--and it may seem to be about 180 degrees out of phase with the third need --is the need to reject others. We don't like to feel that we have to be more or less common carriers and just accept anyone who comes to us. The need to reject others.

Now, I suppose that being a hermit would be the equivalent to being the miser on that need to acquire--someone who has rejected other people completely.

I recognize that this is out of phase with that need to belong, but I am certain that each of you, perhaps at the end of a long, hard day, has sort of had the feeling that "If I see another human being today, I'm going to blow my top." A lot of times this is a function of our moods. Yet each of us has it from time to time. Some people have it much more strongly than others.

A lot of time this is a function of the nature of the job that we have. I know when I was doing my research for my doctorate up at MIT and spending a lot of time in the library, my wife was gainfully employed. As a matter of fact, I was put through school by a loving wife and a grateful government--a combination of my wife's earning power and the G.I. Bill. But her job was in the personnel office of a department store in Boston. Her whole day was just one person after another--just people, people, people. So that when she came home at night, about all she wanted to do was to take off her shoes and look at the wall.

Well, here I was, back in the library stacks, the dusty old library shelves, and the dusty old library books, and the dusty old librarian. About all I got to see in the way of people was really not very much except at lunch. So I would come home at night and "Where's the action?"

Well, we made the usual variety of married couple's compromises. We had people in or went out about once every three weeks or something of the sort.

Well, of course, today the situation is just reversed. My whole day is just people, people, people. And here's the head of the house chained up at home with the two little monsters in the process of becoming people. And the current betting in the neighborhood is about six-two as to whether they're going to make it. The situation is reversed. So when I come home, about all I want to do is sit down. But, of course, Frances says, "Why don't you ever take me out?" I give her the same thing and take her out about once every three weeks.

But a lot of times the satisfaction of that need or the strength of that need is really determined by how we spend the rest of our time.

Now, another of the very strong needs--it's a good deal stronger, I think, than we might expect--is the need to avoid or escape blame.

Again, I think we can see this particularly strong in children. But, again, we don't escape this as we grow in age and mature. We don't like to be blamed for things. We don't even like to blame ourselves for things. I mean, "Did you leave that door open?" "Who? Me? What door?" "I haven't seen a door."

And, again, even self-blame. Let's suppose that you are driving to work every morning. Every morning there is this stop sign there. There hasn't been a car coming since the mind of man runneth not to the contrary; and we sort of get in the habit, you know, of giving the stop sign a courtesy nod. We come to a full rolling stop. One bright, fine morning we go through the usual routine, and there's the blare of a horn and the screech of the tires, and who's fault is it? He must have been doing 90.

We can't even blame ourselves.

So that need to avoid blame. Some people will be so driven by this that they won't ever make a decision, for instance, because they might be blamed for it.

Again, if I can exemplify this with my children, this is the stage when my daughter was learning to walk and carry a glass of water at the same time--again, no mean feat. She was standing there one time with the glass at about that three-martini angle. I think you've seen it. And a little of the water spilled out. She looked around as if she expected to be hit momentarily with an axe handle, and stooped down to wipe it up, and, of course, spilled the whole glass of water; and just broke into tears and took off as fast as she could go. You see, the fear of being blamed. We have that.

Now, of course, there are some people--and this is one of the tragedies of the whole situation--with such a tremendous capacity for self-blame that they can make themselves feel worse about having goofed off than you could if you yammered at them for two weeks. Yet this need to avoid blame is directly counter, you see, to the natural tendency that we all have to find out who goofed and let him know we know.

So that one of the things, again, as members of mankind, I think we have to be able to make the distinction to recognize people who have the capacity for self-blame and let them take care of it. There are other people, of course, who don't; and we have to lower the boom.

Another of the needs--one of the last that we'll look at here--is the

need for freedom. You know, again, we can look at this from the idealistic four-freedoms point of view. Or we can look at it "Mountaineers are ever free." Or we can view it from the point of view that many societies see fit to punish offenders against them by depriving them of their freedom, putting them in the pokey for sixty days, ninety days, or from now on. But we like freedom.

We like freedom many times, most of us, to do our jobs the way we think they should be done. We like our boss, for instance, to give us something to do, but let the choice of methods, for instance, be ours; turn us loose in effect to do it. Yet many of us who are the most insistent about having that kind of freedom for ourselves are least inclined, or most reluctant, to give that kind of freedom to others.

Now, another--and this will be the last--admittedly there are many, many more. Certainly you have been thinking of a number as we have gone along--but this is a very important one. It is the need for recreation. The need for recreation, literally re-creation.

Now, recreation doesn't necessarily have to be a weekend at Miami Beach or a weekend at Atlantic City or something of that sort. It doesn't have to be an expensive thing. Recreation sometimes can be just working on green ones when you've been working on red ones for a while.

It can be a change of pace. For instance, for many of you, if you had been told before you came here that you would be getting up and walking around for a few minutes between classes and lectures and that would be recreation, you wouldn't have accepted it. But let some speaker now

try to run over a bit. Even that very simple thing has become recreation.

Well, there may be more; and, as I indicated, there are many more.

All right. What does this have to do with management? A few interesting observations about people.

I think it has this kind of significance: We give people for working, for taking part in the collective enterprise, whatever it happens to be, a variety of rewards, a variety of need satisfactions.

We give them for the most part wages. Now, with these wages they may satisfy a wide range of needs--food, shelter, and the like. They can buy a split-level ranch house, or a four-door Buick. They can take their kids to the seashore. Many of the needs that people have may be satisfied directly as physical needs, or indirectly through gaining status, through recognition in the eyes of the neighbors. They may satisfy indirectly their psychological needs. Many, many of the needs that people have may be satisfied through the wages and the salaries that they earn on the job.

However, one thing is characteristic of this whole variety of need satisfactions, and that is simply that these needs are satisfied only outside the job situation. I mean, you can't bring the split-level ranch house to work with you, for instance. They are satisfied only outside the job situation. These rewards can be cashed in only off the job.

The same thing is true of many of the so-called fringe benefits that we get. Retirement, for instance; or vacations. Employee discounts, in some situations. A variety of other fringe benefits. You see, again,

only outside the job situation. It's true that many people try to retire on the job, but by and large management tends to discourage that sort of thing. But, again, all of these rewards outside the job situation.

So that it becomes almost inevitable that the job comes to be regarded as a sort of penalty period that the individual has to go through in order to get this need satisfaction. For certainly the extent to which the individual consciously or unconsciously brings that point of view to the job, it's really remarkable that we get the degree of cooperation and work that we do.

Well, now, I ask you to take another look either at my list of needs or at your list of needs and see if it isn't possible for us to do more to satisfy these psychological needs within the job situation. Do you satisfy in your people the need for support? Do you satisfy the need to belong? Do you satisfy the need to know? Do you make it possible for the individual to satisfy the need to achieve? Do you really give respect and recognition for the right thing, or is it possible that the subordinate comes to your attention only when he does the wrong thing? Do you have any people who have pretty strongly this need to reject others; and would a slight change in the nature of their job at periodic intervals, let's say, make it possible for them to get greater satisfaction of that particular need?

What about this blame thing that we looked at a moment ago? Do you give your subordinates all of the freedom that you can so as to satisfy that particular need? And recreation. Many times it is--I'm not suggesting that you put a pin ball machine in each department and let them get

their exercise on it. But many times just a slight change in the nature of the job will give it a change of pace, will give it a little variety, and the new work then constitutes a kind of recreation. You see, what we have to do is to move into the job situation the satisfaction of many of these psychological needs.

Now, the face-to-face manager is the guy who is in the optimum position for doing this. You see, this doesn't require a new section and 99 more pages in the organization manual or a new department of Subordinate Need Satisfaction. This, like charity, can begin at home. This is something that the individual face-to-face manager can do at relatively little cost in time; quite a bit of cost in spots. You see, what we have to do, as custodians, if you will, for an industrial and organized culture, is to move into the job situation the satisfaction and more satisfaction of these needs.

Well, now, these things, then, are things that the manager can do.

I've been talking for quite a while now about the needs of subordinates and the ways in which a manager can satisfy them. Perhaps I should consider the needs of an audience in the ways in which a speaker can satisfy them, because you too as an audience have needs. Some of these needs are physical and some of them are psychological. For those of you whose needs at the moment are essentially physical, I shall be quiet and let you leave. For those of you whose needs are essentially psychological, I shall be glad to give recognition to any question or comment that you might have. And if Colonel Harvey has the need to avoid or escape blame,

I can assure you that he had nothing to do with my talk.

COL. HARVEY: Dr. Agnew is ready for your questions.

QUESTION: Dr. Agnew, would you say that the motivations and satisfactions for groups are essentially the same as those you described for individuals?

DR. AGNEW: Generally yes. I think many of them are. Certainly the need for support, the need to know, the need for respect, also achievement, avoiding blame, freedom. I think these apply just as much to a collective enterprise really as they do to an individual.

There has been some quite interesting research done. Perhaps the most interesting research in this area that has been done has been done on research groups, because you can identify a group a bit easier if they happen to be working on research. They found that one of the things that makes groups work a little harder is recognition, the need to know, and avoid blame.

So that I would see no necessity perhaps of throwing any of those out, including even the need to belong. I think even the small group likes to feel that it's part of a larger group, and the need then to identify with a variety of rewards I should say is as characteristic of a small, intimate, face-to-face group.

Now, this would not be true, let us say, of a Department of Defense, or thousands with hundreds of thousands of people. But certainly the small, intimate, face-to-face work group itself is motivated by much the same set of needs.

QUESTION: Do you see any differences between the motiva-

tions of an employee versus an employer?

DR. AGNEW: I don't think so.

Now, these may be present in any individual in differing amounts. The man at the top of the organization may be much more strongly motivated by recognition, let's say, than the lower-level, blue-collar employee. But recognition is still there.

You notice, I haven't said anything here about money, for instance, because I think that this is well known enough so there's no point in my taking your time talking about dough.

It would appear that the man in the executive rank, once he has reached a particular level of income, is much more inclined to view increases as recognition rather than as just more money or a raise, as <sup>it</sup> might be viewed lower in the organization.

So I should say that this list, with additions of course, motivates everyone in the organization; but it might be a bit stronger in the man at the top, a little bit less in the man at the bottom.

Now, I think, too, that those of you who will look at your own job, let's say, now, and what you may have had before you progressed up the ladder, will say that you are getting more psychological rewards in your job now simply because the opportunity is there. For many of the jobs in the lower levels, the opportunity is not there. It has to be created by the manager, which is the reason I gave my reasonably impassioned pitch there toward the end.

QUESTION: Dr. Agnew, would you discuss the difference between

groups, perhaps even between nations, in the relative strength of these motivations?

DR. AGNEW: Well, let me compare two classes that I happen to had have/at the university last summer. One of them was a group of approximately eleven, twelve, thirteen graduate students. These men were fully employed part-time graduate students. There was another group I had of about fifteen people who were full-time graduate students, who were not working out in industry and who were not quite so mature.

I discovered that the motivator for my mature people was essentially freedom, while the motivator for my full-time students was essentially recognition. Now, let me explain that just a bit more.

To my graduate evening group I said: "Here is the reading list. This is what you ought to read to acquire a knowledge of this particular subject." I tried this with my daytime group and checked with the librarians as to whether any of my people were coming around and calling for these books. Well, my evening people were; my daytime people were not. So that it became necessary for me to ask my day people for a brief criticism, in writing, of each one of these. And I graded them.

Well, this sort of punishment reward didn't quite do the trick. But what I eventually evolved after three or four weeks that put these kids really to work was that I was going to read in class the best one that was turned in, which I did religiously every day.

Now, I don't know the extent to which I could generalize about that. But, as I indicated, most of the really interesting work on groups has

been done in the research area. One study that I had the pleasure of working on quite recently--which was never completed--we ran out of money, as so many research projects do--was looking at research groups using a variety of what we call projective techniques in studies of the groups. We would take a research group that would be called a hot group. Without further definition I think most organizations can identify a hot group when they have one, as opposed to a cold group. And we discovered that the better groups were much more loosely organized, being given much more freedom, than the cold groups were. The cold groups were much more definitely structured in authority terms.

Attempting to use these same techniques on a production group, a group that was involved in a fan assembly, involving an electric motor, and the rotor blades and a few other things--we found there that your hot groups were much more likely to have a structure, a recognized leader, who exercised a pretty high degree of authority, even though he might have been what the sociologists call an indigenous leader--a guy picked essentially by the group, or just emerging out of the group, instead of the supervisor who had been appointed by management.

Well, now, again, I don't know what generalizations we can make about that. But the more highly educated<sup>group</sup> seemed to function with less evident leadership, function best with an unobtrusive leadership, where the essentially blue-collar organizations seemed to function much better with a pretty clearly defined authority structure.

Now, I would hesitate to make any generalizations about the national

differences. If you will have me back a year from now, I think I can, because one of my students, who is a very delightful young lady, spent a couple of months--this is one of the intangible rewards sometimes of being a professor--supervising the research of an attractive female student--she spent several months this year in Europe looking at this very same thing in an effort to determine if the more people-centered, human relations approach to management is as appropriate to Western Europe as it is to the United States.

Her tentative findings are that this is essentially a function of the education level; that the more highly educated a group happens to be, the more susceptible it is to being best led essentially in a non-directive way. The more poorly educated a group happens to be, the better it is led by more direct methods. This tends to bear out the comparison study between research groups and the assembly group.

I realize I haven't answered your question; but that's about the best I can do with it.

QUESTION: In attempting to satisfy this variety of needs, some companies are accused of paternalism. How would you in effect avoid that criticism?

DR. AGNEW: What is my cure in effect to that paternalism criticism? It is this: that I have not been talking about companies. I have been talking about the individual, face-to-face manager. I think this range of psychological needs cannot be satisfied at the company level. Indeed, I

think the range of individual differences is so great that the company may well find itself in a dangerous situation in attempting to cope with these at the company level.

Recognition, for instance, just to take that as an example. At the company level there are many different kinds of recognition. If you do a particularly good job, you may get your pretty badly blurred and usually out-of-focus picture in the house organ. If you happen to get married, maybe you get your name in the "What happened to Johnnie and Gert shouldn't happen to a dog" kind of thing. But usually about the only kind of recognition that you get at the company level is that happy day when they give you your service pin. You've been around there for twenty-five years and you're up on the platform with a bunch of other senior people, and some big shot gives a very nice address about your years of faithful service. Well, really all it means is that you have gone through twenty-five years without getting fired. This guy really doesn't know whether you've done a good job or not. He doesn't know you from Adam's off ox. The company doesn't know you from Adam's off ox.

The kind of recognition that is particularly important is the recognition that comes from the face-to-face manager, from the guy who knows that you have done a good job--the fellow who knows the obstacles that you had to overcome to get the job done.

Now, I don't to sell down river the service pin. It's tremendously important. I remember when I got married during the war, all of my compatriots being off to the wars, I had to take ushers who were over about

sixty, and to get a best man I had to use my father.

Well, clothing being rationed during the war and me an only child, my father found himself pretty hard put to it to get a new suit to wear to his son's wedding. Well, he begged, borrowed, and did everything but stole clothing coupons, and finally got a new suit. But his last act that I remember was taking his 25-year pin off of one suit and putting it on the other. I mean, he wouldn't be truly dressed up for his son's wedding if he didn't have that pin on.

So I don't mean they are not important. I am saying simply that the kind of recognition, just for instance, that is much more significant is the kind of recognition that comes from the face-to-face supervisor. So I don't think that at the company level, except through educating and training the individual managers, the company really has a role in the kind of thing that I have been talking about.

QUESTION: I have heard it said that some people are born leaders. We know that throughout history many men have been great leaders or greater leaders. In your opinion, sir, is it these needs, or the satisfaction of these needs, that produces these so-called born leaders?

DR. AGNEW: In short, how are needs tied into the concept overall of leadership?

Leadership is an extremely complex thing, upon which a lot of research has been done lately. Your own Navy has paid for much of the better research in it. The Armed Forces as a whole have contributed

funds for this.

It would appear from most of the more recent research that leadership is not a unitary thing. It is not a single quality that anybody has. It's a collection of things. And leadership appears to be as much a function of the group as it is of the individual.

To an extent it is also a function of the situation. We would not necessarily choose the same leader for all things.

Now, I realize that in this company the example that I usually give in this area is not as appropriate as it might be in a civilian group. But bear with me.

I say to them when this question comes up, to use this as an example: "Let's imagine that instead of being here in a classroom, we're in a lifeboat, out in the middle of the Pacific some place. We're lost." So I say: "All right. I'm the professor. I have a Ph. D. from MIT. I say, we should go that way."

Well, somebody else says: "Well, in my organization I'm only three levels from the top, which makes me superior to you. You're about the ninety-ninth from the top. I'd say we should go this way."

Somebody else says: "Well, I hate to bring this up, but I was in the Navy during the war and a navigator, and I think we should go that way." I think we're much more likely to go that way, to recognize the expertise, which is saying "Go in that direction."

Well, let's suppose, then, that we finally do come to land and the strength of our reliance in our leader has been proved and improved, and

we start heading inland. We go over the crest of the hill and we see a bunch of naked heathen with bones in their noses and spears in their hands, heading toward us; and our leader says, "Run." We're going to follow him, without any doubt. But eventually, you see, we realize that we have to make a stand.

Our leader says, "I think we ought to make our stand here." I say: "No. I'm a professor. I think we ought to make it over there." And finally somebody says: "Well, look. I was in the Marine Corps during the war. I was in the infantry. I think the best place to make a stand is right over here." I think, with some degree of promptitude, we now have a new leader.

Well, you can carry this on in a variety of directions.

Now, this is not to say that our original leader, or even I myself, could not have taken and retained leadership over that entire time. I could have by making the best use of the human resources that were available to me. For instance, instead of saying: "I'm a professor. I think we ought to go that way," I can say: "Does anybody have any idea where we are?" And "Does anybody know anything about navigation?" and making him, not the leader, but the navigator, for instance. And make the next man, you see, not the leader, but the guy in charge of selecting the defense position, or something of the sort.

So that the leadership is not necessarily a full and complete function of the situation. What I am saying is that the same guy cannot be leader, as we ordinarily visualize it, under all circumstances. It in part is a

function of the group to be led. Many of you are leaders of men. Most of you are leaders of men by definition or you wouldn't be here. Yet I doubt very much that you could exert very much in the way of leadership in, let's say, street-corner society--to move into the poolroom, for instance, and take over as the recognized leader. Maybe because that particular group doesn't share your value system. You don't share their value system.

If I can use one more technical term here: It appears that the man most likely to be selected by the group, the indigenous leader, is the man who most nearly represents the, well, ideal of the group--not an idealized picture, but the man who most nearly approaches the norm of the group. The norm does not mean the average or normal in that particular sense. It is a term from sociology essentially, and the norms of the group are the sort of standards of conduct that they expect in a member.

Now, this means, then, that the individual to be a leader must know his group. Rule one is always "Know your people." Well, what I mean by "Know your people" is to know their motivations. And I feel that you don't lead really a group; you lead individuals. And you have to know these people as individuals in a face-to-face way, which means essentially understanding their motivations.

Well, then, of course, you can lead a group by appealing essentially to the norms of that particular group, because there is a lot to be said in favor of group consciousness. <sup>If</sup> Most of them are following you because you do understand them as individuals, in all probability the rest will go along,

out of natural, well, the need to belong sort of thing.

I realize that I have dwelt overlong on this and I really haven't answered the question. But, again, it's an awfully complex thing.

QUESTION: From the management point of view, are these basic motivating forces relatively equal in importance? Or can they be more logically lined up in an order of priority or in an order of importance?

DR. AGNEW: In short, can these motivations be lined up in a sort of order of precedence in a given situation? Yes. Let me develop this just a little further.

We can view needs as being sort of arrayed in almost a straight line. A fellow by the name of Mazwell did some very interesting work for the Air Force, and the result of his research is called the Mazwell Air Force theory, as a matter of fact. These can be sort of arrayed along a straight line, ranging from the survival needs, the needs that we have to satisfy just to stay alive, through security needs--a little thought about tomorrow--into the range of love and belonging; sort of tailing off into a kind of recognition area, and then eventually up into this area of what Mazwell calls self-realization.

Well, most of us are sort of hung up in this area of love and belonging. Very few of us are motivated or actuated by needs up in the self-realization area. An example of a man, I suppose, who is might be Albert Schweitzer. But I really can't think of very many more offhand who are really up there. And in our society there are not very many of us who are really motivated by the survival needs. These are pretty well

taken care of in our society.

So are the bulk of the security needs. Yet let's suppose that the university should come to its senses and fire me. I would attempt to keep up appearances for as long as I could. I mean, I would continue to drink <sup>bourbon and</sup> ~~Water~~, for instance, for a while; but as the money sort of started running out, I would tail off to Iron City beer; and as it ran off a little bit more, I might even go on the wagon. And as it got a little bit more, I would be willing to devote all of my energy, so to speak, to keeping the family together--down at that level. And I wouldn't care what the neighbors thought, what my friends thought, or anything else. This would be the thing that would be motivating me.

Eventually, if things kept on, and I couldn't get back in the Navy-- I'm an ex-Navy man three years, eight months, and twenty-seven days-- my apologies, Admiral, but you can tell I loved every minute of it--and if I still couldn't get a job and things got worse and worse and worse, probably I would let the family fall apart. My wife has some reasonably affluent relatives, who might well take the children. Eventually I might even send her to one of her <sup>wealthier</sup> relatives. Now really in the "Am I going to have enough to eat tomorrow?" stage.

I'm a man of reasonably high principles, but I think if I got hungry enough, I might well take a loaf of bread off an old lady. At the moment I am not motivated in the survival area; but if I got hungry enough, I would be.

So that we are motivated at any given moment in time essentially

at  
somewhere in this range. And/any given moment in time the thing that  
is motivating us may not be what it was yesterday.

Now, in any particular situation I think we have to put this again on  
the individual level. It might be for this guy, at that moment in time,  
the strongest motivator he has is recognition. It may be <sup>that</sup> /for the next  
individual the strongest motivator that he has at that moment in time might  
be the need to belong. So that these can be arranged, but this is a highly  
individual matter. It varies greatly with the situation. And I would  
really hesitate to go beyond that by way of generalization. But I should  
say certainly that if you do know your people in the sense that I'm talking  
about, in any given situation you will be much more likely to realize that  
this is the thing that would be the motivator.

COL. HARVEY: Dr. Agnew, will be back this afternoon to conduct  
a case discussion of a faculty group here on the stage, and you are all  
cordially invited. I might say, there's even a stronger motivation.

In the meantime, Dr. Agnew, I'd like to thank you on behalf of the  
audience for a most lucid explanation of the things that motivate people.  
Thank you very much.

- - - - -