

## CHAPTER II

# REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

## **CHAPTER – II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

In this chapter, an attempt has been made to present a review of literature related to concepts of motivation, performance, and their inter-relationship. This chapter presents an account of reported literature on job motivation and performance available in a variety of contexts i.e. in the form of studies on implication of motivation, research articles, monographs, view points, conceptual papers and technical papers presented at different forums, etc. There were a number of studies, though not substantial in number, found in the field of motivation and performance of library and information professionals and studies conducted on professionals of other fields that considered as relevant in line with the objectives and hypotheses of this study are also reviewed here. These studies were of great help in conceptualizing this research problem; in getting a comprehensive view of the problem undertaken; in formulating the hypotheses; and in designing the framework for this study.

The available literature is organized in three broad headings as follows:

1. Motivation
2. Performance Evaluation
3. Relationship between Motivation and Performance

#### **1. MOTIVATION**

Though motivation process is the most important aspect of the human resource management yet it is probably the least understood phenomena till today. The reason being human behavior is complex and difficult to understand. It has long been a concern of behavioral scientists that try to figure out what motivates various employees. However, researches conducted in various fields have given some important insights into employee motivation (Sadaruddin, 2001).

One of the most persistent themes in the literature of personnel management has been the nature and causes of motivation. Again by scanning the literature it has become

evident that one of the most important conditions for an effective and efficient library is staff motivation. However, while innumerable studies on motivation were conducted by industrial psychologists relating to business organizations, the library world has been little studied by academics.

Research on motivation of nonprofit organization's employees like library employees has been neglected so far. Bruyns (1982) and Olorunsola (1992) in their respective studies opined that the age old concept of fixed salary and system of promotion are the only means of motivating staff has no longer proved to be successful in achieving the goals. The studies prescribed the importance of motivation, the factors affecting the achievement of goals and the application of Maslow's and Herzberg's theory of motivation in motivating staff.

Bruyns (1982) described job motivation as 'motivation at work' and is a complex of factors, which induces him/her to perform (or not) certain duties. He therefore suggested that attempts should be made to determine both the nature and strength of motivation that to what extent one intends to satisfy his/her needs at work.

Thiedke (2004) is of the opinion that "good wages and pleasant working conditions are important for employees, but true motivation stems from something deeper" (Thiedke, 2004). Therefore the employers or managers should not mistake these hygiene factors as true motivators. Having a sense of achievement, recognition and responsibility in job actually motivate the employees.

One technical paper by Cooper (2000) prescribes application of neuroscience by the managers to acquire new insights and skills so that they can mobilize or inspire the people to contribute their best which is often untapped. The paper highlights the fact that human behavior cannot be controlled. Only it can be given direction "by example, through genuine inspiration and compelling influence, exceptional leaders help ordinary people to accomplish extraordinary results. To do this, they must develop and apply an energizing authentic level of intelligence and bring it to everything they do, combining the perceptions and impressions of the gut, heart and mind" (Cooper, 2000).

A research paper by Jain (2005) attempts to provide a strategic human resource development model for public libraries in Botswana also identifies some motivational issues relating to the staff. These issues include a sense of achievement, a feeling of worth, job security, staff recognition, status, career development, good salary, effective communication, job satisfaction, delegation of authority, clear job description, performance feedback and a favorable work environment.

Hollis (2005) evaluated eight research studies to provide an understanding about what motivate employees in general, irrespective of their job difference. The evaluation includes studies carried out in different job sectors by National Study of the Changing Workforce (2002); Abifarin (1997); Elangovan and Xie (2000); Green, Chivers and Mynott (2000); Douglas (2003); Mould (2005); Williamson & Stephens (1998); Wiley (1997); and Badu (2005). The conclusions she derived after evaluating these studies include that motivational factors have changed over the years; money though important to everyone, it is not considered as the top motivator rather involvement, communication, opportunities for growth and development, job achievement, enjoyment from doing the job that are the aspects intrinsic to job found to motivate the employees. People dislike to engage in routine and boring job or to remain stagnant in job even if they are paid extraordinarily. This finding has implications to motivate employees in libraries since most of the library jobs are routine and repetitive.

Myers (1991) surveyed the related studies on motivation and performance in the information system (IS) field to review personnel management literature on IS motivation. Various research articles on IS motivation have demonstrated inconclusive and contradictory results. These inconsistencies in results were due to the rapidly changing IS job environments, changes in development of methodology and IS organizational structure. One such study included in Myers' review was done by Ferrat and Short in 1986. The study was on work environment and productivity. While studying the motivation pattern of IS workers the researchers found significant differences between IS and non-IS people. However in another study carried out in 1988 they contradict their earlier findings and suggested motivational patterns for IS professionals and non-IS professionals were not significantly different.

Steers and Porter (1991) by reviewing the variables of motivation that are found widely in organizations suggested a conceptual framework, which organizes the factors or variables that affect motivation. According to the model these variables can be found at three levels of organizational setting viz. in relation to individual, job itself and job environment. Attitude, interest, etc. are some of the variables unique to the individual itself. Secondly variables like degree of control over job and responsibility towards job derive from the nature of the job. Environmental factors like peer group relations, supervisory practices, systematic rewards and organizational climate are the variables related to job environment. The authors concluded with a note that there is a sizeable discrepancy between the practices followed in the organizations and the advanced theories of motivation. It is still viewed by most of the managers that motivation is largely a “carrot and stick” process although the findings of numerous researches have revealed that the employees become motivated or want to contribute on a job if they actively participate in the organizational affairs.

Jennifer Rowley, known for her contribution to work motivation in current days, opines that staff motivation is the key for providing quality services in libraries (Rowley, 1996) as well as for imparting quality education in higher education (Rowley, 1996). She discusses four models of motivation derived from the well-established theories of motivation that can be suitably applied to library professionals as well as teachers. These models are 1) rational-economic model which prescribes economic benefit motivate employees; 2) social model summarizes people respond to social relationship, acceptance and sense of identity, which are much needed now due to increased mechanization and rationalization; 3) self-actualization model puts emphasis on intrinsic factors means people’s need for seeking a sense of meaning and accomplishment in their work motivate them to work. Financial rewards, the culture of libraries, customer-oriented service and professionalism, and diversity of staff experience and their role are some aspects of the environmental factors that impinge on the management of motivation in libraries. She concludes by suggesting some possible strategies for motivation that include staff appraisal and schemes for staff; providing opportunities for personal development (job rotation, job enrichment, training, conference, etc.); managing dissatisfiers through negotiation and proper communication of constraints to staff; financial motivators in terms of pay and promotion may be applied if possible which is often not directly controlled by libraries;

and by providing a cordial environment where staff's contribution is appreciated and acknowledged that in turn will satisfy their social need.

Herzberg and others (1953) demonstrated the concept of motivation to work and job satisfaction is quite separate. They conducted a study of accountants and engineers and the respondents were asked to provide what they feel about their jobs against certain factors called satisfiers and dissatisfiers. These two factors constituted the base for famous bi-factorial theory of motivation. Satisfiers or motivators i.e. the intrinsic factors were closely related to the job and relate to the self-actualizing needs of Maslow's theory. These include work itself, recognition, advancement and responsibility. Dissatisfiers or hygiene factors or extrinsic to job were related to the environment and relate to the Maslow's lower level needs and their un-fulfillment leads to dissatisfaction in job. These factors include working condition, company policy and administration, interpersonal relations and financial benefits. The result revealed that elimination of dissatisfiers did not elicit positive motivation though these would help to keep employees satisfied. It was the work itself seen as the important motivator or in other words positive motivation would only come from the accomplishing work that is meaningful and challenging. There are some limitations observed in Herzberg's study. The result of this study may not be applicable to all workers groups. The distinction between satisfiers and dissatisfiers always does not hold true to all cases. However, the study of Plate and Stone (1976) that tested the Herzberg theory on librarians supports Herzberg's view.

Reports of 26<sup>th</sup> Annual British and Irish Association of Law Librarian's Study Conference, Sept, 1995 assessed the key motivating factors at work (British and Irish Association of Law Librarians, 1995). It has identified 5 categories of needs which motivation satisfies. These needs are esteem, power, relational, creativity and others. Pascoe (1996) and Abifarín (1997) have shared the same views regarding the factors that motivate the professionals at work. The factors are work environment, human relationship with the user, assigned duties, frequency of developments, social responsibility, job security, etc.

Mendelsohn (1995) reported the views of European librarians and information scientists that they found their job as most exciting. It was further noted by Mendelsohn

that elements like intellectual stimulation of helping patrons and curiosity motivate them most.

Apart from the factors of motivation, some of the studies also focused on the factors that de-motivate the staff. Bakewell (1993), Gouws and Toit (1996), and Abifarin (1997) investigated the motivation of professional library staff and found that the staff members are dissatisfied with pay, training opportunities, poorly articulated promotion standards, management style etc. Line (1992) listed certain techniques even to de-motivate staff that includes ignoring staff, forgetting their existence and their contributions to organization, lack of interest on staff and unclear job descriptions.

Bakewell (1993) reported that the professional library staff tended to be dissatisfied with pay and opportunities for promotion and they liked to have more training and better communication with management.

Alemna (1992) conducted a survey to investigate the factors to motivate the junior staff of the Balme Library of Ghana. One of the major issues revealed by the study was the stagnation of junior staff in one position, which is mainly attributed to lack of education. Even some staff despite their higher professional education remained stagnant, as there was lack of vacancy in the staffing structure.

Abifarin (1997) investigated a sample of 300 professional and paraprofessional librarians through questionnaire method containing eight variables on job motivation. The variable 'work environment' was found to be the source of dissatisfaction for both types of respondents. Communication and training opportunities were also seemed as important to the staff as these help them to feel confident at work.

The topic of motivating employees though proved to be extremely important, through various research results and experience, for the management and managers, still there are several myths persist. An article by McNamara (1999) posted in a website lists certain common myths prevalent among some managers. One common myth is that one can motivate people. This is not really true because people have to motivate themselves as motivation comes from within. The theories of achievement motivation of McClelland and VIE of Vroom support this view of people set their own goals. Money as well as fear

though perceived to be good motivators by some, these cannot hold true for a long time. Another myth deals with increased job satisfaction means increased job performance. Research evidence shows that this need not be true. The classical work of Herzberg also holds the view that fulfillment of needs external to job does not translate into motivation to perform.

Martha Myers in a similar study examined the motivational differences exist in IS and other profession (Myers, 1991). This was an extensive study covering 1400 private sector employees and data collected from them were subjected to multivariate analysis of variance (ANOVA). The result showed that there were highly significant difference between IS and non-IS needs. Though the social needs of IS professionals were similar to those reported by other professionals, IS professionals have lower internal needs and slightly higher environmental needs as compared to other professionals.

Plate and Stone's (1976) study on motivation of librarians is a land-mark study and a pioneer work on motivation ever done in the library world. The study also cited in most of the literature found on personnel management in libraries. While using Herzberg theory they examined the factors affecting job satisfaction between 162 American and 75 Canadian librarians from all types of libraries. Responses to the questions concerning job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in relation to hygiene and motivational factors were analyzed. The result of the study confirmed Herzberg's views that certain factors were positive motivators or the primary cause of satisfaction and while others were hygiene factors i.e. the primary cause of dissatisfaction. The findings revealed that of all the factors reported by the respondents as contributing to job satisfaction, 99 percent were motivators and were related to job content. Again of all the factors that contribute to their dissatisfaction or causes of dissatisfaction at work, 81 percent were related to job context or were environmental factors. Achievement, recognition, responsibility, work itself, advancement, and professional or personal growth were identified as motivators and institution policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationship, working conditions, status, salary, and security were identified as hygiene factors. They concluded with the suggestion that since many library jobs are not rich in self-achievement potential, the library managers can provide an environment and a job in which the employees' job enrichment, the most important motivator, is facilitated (Plate and Stone, 1976).

The Sheffield Manpower Project of 1970 examined a sample of public, academic and special librarians and found that factors, which were considered as “satisfiers” for them, were related to job it-self and similar to those of intrinsic factors prescribed by Herzberg (Sergean et al, 1976). The staff of all levels irrespective of the type of libraries in which they were serving reported responsibility; greater opportunity to personal development and to act in a solo capacity; a sense of service and social worth; variety etc. were the factors that affect their job satisfaction.

Further probing into whether motivation means same to all type of employees the study of Kenneth Kovach reveals surprising results (Bessell et al, 2002). Kovach in 1999 conducted a comparative study of how motivation is viewed from the associates’ as well as from the employers’ perspective. The associates were asked to rank what they want from their jobs. Again they were asked to provide what their boss thought about their needs. The associates overwhelmingly responded interesting work, appreciation of work, a feeling of “being on things”, job security followed by good wages were most important to them. But when it comes to ranking of what employers thought, the result tells a different story. Employers thought good wages, job security, promotion/growth, good working conditions and interesting work were most important to motivate their staff. Thus from the Kovach’s result one can say that employees and their bosses have different views on what motivates employees. Managers often view monetary incentives or the extrinsic rewards are the best way to motivate workers and they neglect the issues what actually motivate their staff most.

Another paper by Tietjen and Myers (1998) reviews the literature of motivational theories and draws from their approaches to motivation and job satisfaction. They presented Herzberg’s as well as Locke’s theory chronologically to demonstrate how Locke’s theory was a response to the theory of Herzberg and suggested that understanding of these theories would help the managers in developing strategies for job satisfaction.

An interesting paper written by Wiley (1997) explores the factors that motivate employees based on data of motivation surveys conducted over 40 years. The paper compares the findings of four surveys carried out in the year 1946, 1980, 1986 and 1992. The result revealed that over the year employees’ motivational preferences vary. Again the result of the later survey i.e. done in 1992 revealed that today’s workers are motivated

more by extrinsic factors than they used to be in the past. About the ranking of preference most of them responded 'good wages' as the top motivator. Good wage is an extrinsic factor, has intrinsic potency to motivate. This is so because monetary rewards at a greater level indicate the company's attitude towards employee and also affect the emotional and familial well being of employees. The result of this work contradicted the findings of numerous well-proven studies on motivation, which view intrinsic factors as the top motivators.

Singh (1998) studied job involvement as an aspect of job motivation of librarians of social science institutes of New Delhi, India. While studying the influence of demographic variables on job involvement he found that demographic variables like age, duration of service, experience, pay, etc. have no relation with motivation.

Lindner (1998) through his study sought to describe the importance of certain factors in motivation of employees, ranking of these factors as most important or least important in motivating them and to compare the findings of this study with that of other studies. Here 'interesting work' was emerged as the most important motivator, which is mostly, agreed in all studies. Further pay as well as appreciation was ranked second although this finding contradicted the findings of other studies with which Lindner was comparing his results.

Al\_Khalifa and Peterson (2004) while studying the relationship between motivation, and satisfaction and performance among the employees of international joint ventures in Bahrain found that environmental factors were more significant than economic factors in the initial motivation decision of employees.

As it is evident from the literature on motivation in libraries that most of them are written relying on the motivational theories developed by Maslow, Herzberg and others, Usherwood (1982) wrote an article to ease out the over-reliance and repetition of well-known theories and also to indicate the personal implications of these theories which would help to answer the question 'why do people work?' While analyzing the studies made on the assumptions of Herzberg and Maslow, he criticized that they have given little importance to individual's preferences. He analyzed the Porter and Lawler motivation

model to explain that the performance of the employee leads to both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. It was discussed in the article that personal attitude and social attitude to work influence the employee's behaviour at work. He reproduced the Bennett's 'desire' and 'expectation' scale for measuring attitude to work to indicate their possible application in libraries. He concluded with the note that since no one source or theory can provide a total explanation to how people view work, the managers at the first place must understand about how the staff views their work and what is the meaning of work that holds for them? Then accordingly strategies can be developed to encourage people to work to their full potential.

Sever and Westcott (1983) taking a serious note on literature pertaining to library motivation view that even the recent literature still reflects at the age old works of Maslow, Drucker and Likert rather than the two modern theories which currently dominating the motivational practices. "Expectancy theories have common concern for the needs of the individual, the effect of environment at the workplace, and the clarity of communication between the manager and those who work with him." They view that Vroom's valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory and McClelland's achievement motivation have been extensively tested and successfully applied in various industrial sectors because these theories assume that the individual's behaviour is voluntary and determined by a number of factors such as his/her needs, perception of equity, desired outcome, etc. rather than the classical conditioning of reflex behaviour. Therefore Sever and Westcott prescribed that since these two theories have much to offer in motivating library staff and yet unexplored, further researches can be carried out to explore how these would be applied in library management successfully.

Cassidy and Lynn (1989), while giving due importance to achievement motivation as a psychological concept, considered that it has wide implications for the individual behaviour. They developed an achievement motivation scale for the first time to measure all the factors of motivation for research usage. The scale includes 49 items described under seven factors dealing with need for Achievement (n-Ach) viz. acquisitiveness (Acq) dominance (Dom), excellence (Exc), competitiveness (Com), status aspiration (SA) and Mastery (Ms). The tool was administered to three groups of samples. The data collected using this scale was subjected to internal reliability and validity. The result revealed that

the research instrument has reasonable reliability and validity and contains many original items drawn from well-known sources on n-Ach. In the researches for measuring multi-factorial approach to achievement motivation in library environment, the use of this tool would be quite helpful.

Uma J. and Kamalanabhan (1998) reviewed the work on achievement motivation with an objective to construct a self-report measure of achievement motivation. They defined achievement motivation as a predisposition to strive for motivation. They started with McClelland's achievement motivation in which the motive to work was initially conceptualized as a single factor. The self-report on achievement motivation developed by them included a pool of 48 forced-choice stimulus items drawn from the literature. The questionnaire was administered among 206 adults and the analysis led to the emergence of 10 factors as relevant for measuring achievement motivation. These factors were task orientation; perseverance; anticipatory behavior; risk taking behavior; competitiveness; reaction to success/failure; future orientation; independence; rigidity; and involvement.

Prior to the development of this n-Ach scale by Cassidy and Lynn (1989), there were also quite a number of questionnaires to measure n-Ach have been developed by researchers and dominated the literature on this area. These include the works of Mehabrian (1969), McClelland and others (1953), etc.

Does the old work of Maslow still have value in present day management to motivate the individual employee? One can find answer to this in the work of David L. Stum (2001). Stum modified the Maslow's hierarchy of need pyramid to suit the present day work management and developed a model for building an employee commitment pyramid. While the Maslow's model conceptualizes the individual's motivational needs ranges from safety to self-actualization, the work research design of Stum attempts to understand workforce motivators, which influence the employees' commitment level. The commitment pyramid otherwise known as performance pyramid has also five levels: safety/security, rewards, affiliation, growth, and work/life harmony. These issues are long-held, well-known in organizational life and are important to employee motivation. Stum viewed that amidst changes in organizational life, expectation from workforce, and advance in technology, Maslow's concept still holds in today's work environment and can

be used to create an environment where both the employees as well as the organization will be committed to each other and reciprocate each other's want.

Further whether the factors that motivate the employees of middle and lower level of management can be applied to senior managerial motivation or not? The study of Analoui (2000) can be quoted here which focuses on the understanding of what motivates senior managers? This study included methodology as well as findings of the study that was carried out for the first time in any Eastern European countries i.e. in Romania. The investigator surveyed the motivation level of senior managers of 3 top organizations of Romania. The results of this study found to be similar to the results of the study on what motivates the senior managers in Western European countries. Recognition, salary, promotional status and job satisfaction emerged as the factors that motivate the senior managers for high performance.

Morgan (2001) wrote about the mechanism to equip university library staffs who face constant challenges due to changes in technology. In a technology driven environment, the staff's contribution in providing quality services should not be neglected. The article suggests use of interpersonal skills; greater involvement of staff; wider participation in decision-making; and a greater degree of strategic awareness are the need of the hour to keep the library staff motivated, challenging and involved.

Greg Smith (1999) also developed a five-step PRIDE model that can be followed in any organization to attract, keep and motivate today's workforce. These steps are:

- P- Provide a positive working environment.
- Q- Recognize, reward and reinforce the right behavior
- I- Involve everyone.
- D- Develop their skills and potentials.
- E- Evaluate and improve continuously.

University librarians can apply the above model to create a work environment, where the staffs would really enjoy their work, find meaning in jobs and as a result they will contribute their best (Smith, 1999).

Lahiri (1987) wrote on the basis of a survey that motivational needs of library workers in India are not satisfied. Such needs include status, salary, working condition, interpersonal relation, growth and development, participation, etc. He further in the year 1988 conducted an empirical study at Manipur on the basis of Herzberg's theory of motivation and concluded that 68% of library personnel of Manipur were dissatisfied with their jobs. It in fact, depicted a sorry state of affairs of motivation among library professionals in Manipur (Lahiri, 1988). Later on another study conducted by Ebru Kaya in 1995 supports this finding that in developing countries like India the motivation level of librarians are lower than that of developed countries. He further mentioned that in developing countries there is a less demand of library services and this led to low social status of library professionals. He suggested formulation of library policies and standards with regard to responsibilities, salary, promotions, authority, participation, and security (Kaya, 1995).

A study conducted by Mehta, Dubinsky and Anderson (2003) found that motivation and performance of professionals also depends on the leadership style followed in management practice. The conclusion of their study is important in the context of current global environment as the linkages among leadership styles, motivation, and performance are empirically drawn from sample of international automobile distributors in the USA, Finland and Poland. The results revealed that in USA, participative and supportive leadership styles have strong impact on channel member motivation rather than directive leadership. This is because USA has a highly individualistic culture. People here strive to achieve when their individual contribution is recognized. In Finland, participative leadership style was found to be strongest than the other two styles in motivating the channel members. This is because here collectivist societies exist and people are motivated more by group interests. The results from Poland totally negated the hypothesis. Here neither any of the leadership styles was related to member motivation nor were there any link between motivation and performance of members. The probable reasons for such a finding can be attributed to Poland's history and culture, which resists changes. Again in Poland the economy is transitioning to a capitalistic one. Therefore the "type of rewards channel partners might expect to receive (a la instrumentality) might not be considered important to them (a la valence); thus they may not put forth high levels of effort (a la expectancy)" (Mehta et al, 2003). It has been concluded by the researchers that the real

reasons for preference or behavior of members towards leadership styles stem from the reality of the present economic and social conditions of the country.

Berman and Miner (1985) developed a measure of managerial motivation known as the Miner Sentence Completion Scale-Form H (MSCS-Form H) and administered to a sample of 75 chief executives. Out of these, 49 respondents have worked through bureaucratic hierarchy and hence were congruent with managerial role motivation while the rest 26 were original entrepreneurs. The result of the study showed that congruent top executives have higher managerial motivation than the other groups. The authors suggest the MSCS-Form H could be a helpful tool for selecting and assessing managerial talent.

Then it is also quite interesting to know whether the women managers can be motivated by the same factors that motivate their male counterparts? The study of Murgai (1999) attempted to compare the managerial motivation of male and female library and information science students in the United States of America, India, Singapore and Japan. Murgai developed a questionnaire, based on achievement motivation concept, which included 41 statements on managerial motivation under 10 broad categories such as task orientation; fear of success; perseverance; reaction to success/failure; future orientation; competitiveness; independence; rigidity; social needs; and acceptance of women as managers. The findings revealed that majority of the respondents irrespective of their gender as well as their country of origin motivated to achieve the objectives set by them and were future-orientated. On factors like “women as managers”, “reaction to success/failure” and “social acceptance” it was found that they have different views. The American and the Singaporean participants were more positive about accepting women as managers than their Indian counterparts. Majority of Indian female students (52%) though found to be ambitious and could handle managerial situations, they were doubtful about the objectivity required to evaluate library situation properly. This situation may be attributed to the stereotype cast of women in Indian society. Therefore the paper suggests the need for attitudinal change towards accepting women as managers and this could be brought based on empirical studies.

Dumont (1985) also agrees with this view that there are certain barriers in motivating women as managers and discusses the causes of their under representation in

library management. She carried out a study on academic librarians and library science students on the issue of what motivate them to manage. The findings of the study revealed that generally women were not aware of their managerial potentials even though their management skills typically exceeded their own expectations. There was lack of perception about managerial qualities.

In the area of motivation a lot of studies are carried out relating to job satisfaction and job attitudes of employees by researchers. Job satisfaction is a central topic for motivational theories and it is often evaluated in relation to a number of intrinsic and extrinsic factors of motivation by most of the researchers (Pors and Johannsen, 2002).

Job satisfaction is also a determining factor for high performance. Siggins (1992) views that if there is a level of interest and job satisfaction among library staff is sustained then only high performance can be ensured.

Voleck (1995); Horenstein (1983); Prasad (1994); Navalani (1990); Schneider (1991); Lee and Kim (1993); Chopra (1984); Lifer (1998); Parmer and East (1993); and Pascoe (1996) analyzed the components of job attitudes and explored the factors, which are responsible for job-satisfaction in a variety of library environment.

Voleck (1995) while studying the support staff of academic libraries at Michigan found that the staff was satisfied with supervision, nature of work, co-workers and benefits. But they were dissatisfied with opportunities for promotion, pay and contingent rewards. It was also found that most of the workers working with the patrons were not having much job-satisfaction.

However the results of this study is notably different from the result of an earlier study conducted by Parmer and East (1993). While surveying the job satisfaction of support staff in 12 state supported academic libraries in Ohio, the researchers found that the staffs who work directly with patrons were more satisfied than those who worked in technical areas.

Lifer (1998) conducted a survey of job satisfaction of librarians by taking the readers of the Library Journal as sample for the study. His findings focused on 4 aspects of satisfaction: 1) "your career" that provides a composite look at librarian's job; 2) "your

worth” that analyses salary by gender and library sector where one is working; 3) “your outlook” which reflects the librarians’ prognostications for themselves and their profession; and 4) “your library” that deals with working environment.

Lee and Kim (1993) examined the relationship of job satisfaction with 4 dimensions of perceived quality of goal setting: specificity, difficulty, feedback and participation among the both professional and support staff in a library. Their findings revealed that all the 4 dimensions of goal setting were co-related with overall job satisfaction of both professional and support staff although in a varied way.

Schneider (1991) surveyed the paraprofessionals working in a large library system and found that nature of the work itself, co-workers, immediate supervisors and working directly with patrons were the sources of job satisfaction for the respondents. However, they were dissatisfied with communication between the staff and management, and with the heavy workload.

The study of Chopra (1984) brings out the need for job satisfaction among the librarians and analyses the results of data on job satisfaction reported by 100 librarians working in Lucknow city in India. The result show majority of them were satisfied with nature of work, recognition, working condition, job security and social status. Avenues for promotion, relation with supervisor and pay scale were the main sources of their dissatisfaction.

Navalani (1990) compared job satisfaction of male and female professionals working in university libraries in India. Correlation analysis was done on data collected to ascertain the extent and direction of dimensions of the job satisfaction. The analysis revealed majority of the respondents irrespective of their gender were satisfied with attributes of their work. The men and women had different perception for the dimension ‘work’. Men found to derive greater level of job satisfaction from their work than women did and again seniors did derive higher job satisfaction than juniors.

On the basis of analysis of the findings of most of the studies discussed above it can be concluded here that the library staff is generally satisfied with the factor ‘nature of

work' i.e. 'work itself'. However the study of Thapsia (1992) that surveyed the library assistants of 25 UK university libraries contradicts this view. The study concluded that the respondents were unhappy about their work; termed it as unchallenging and they revealed that they would not continue in library work if elsewhere they could get a better job.

A similar study conducted by Yang (1999) supports findings of Thapsia. Yang surveyed 300 working African American librarians to explore what they think for their profession and work and found that recognition as well as appreciation was the major hindrances of job satisfaction of librarians.

Horenstein (1983) also tried to examine the relationship between job satisfaction, faculty status, and participation of academic librarians through a different kind of sampling. The sample included three groups of librarians: librarians with no faculty status or rank; librarians either having one; and librarians having both. It was observed that librarians having both faculty status and rank were more satisfied than the other two groups of librarians. This group of librarians was more involved, consulted and informed about library affairs and this perception of participation as well as possession of academic rank provided them satisfaction in job.

Pors and Johannsen (2002) surveyed the Danish library directors to explore the correlation between job satisfaction, and the intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. It was found that there were major differences between levels of job-satisfaction and these factors. Need to create attractive workplace and the need for recruiting the right kind of staff at right place were found to be important.

Further a cross-cultural study conducted by Niels O. Pors in 2003 analyzed the job-satisfaction of British and Danish library managers in relation to stress, freedom and job-conditions. One of the findings of the study revealed that although the other factors of job satisfaction tended to be the same for all library managers background factors like nationality, size of the employing institution and the mix of tasks in the job significantly influenced job satisfaction (Pors, 2003).

At the time of change in library jobs owing to the pressure of providing varied, precise and timely information as well as introduction of technology to handle the services it becomes very crucial to understand what actually can motivate the library staff?

A conceptual article written by Williamson and Stephens (1998) explores the issues that could put pressure on staff and provides suggestions for motivating staff during times of intense change. More staff autonomy, development of competency through necessary training as per the change in job, and fostering feelings of being connected with each other and with the library are some of the recommendations provided in order to motivate them today.

Pascoe (1996) carried out a study in a large Australian research library to investigate the impact of information management system technology on job satisfaction of library staff. Results revealed that factors like workers' expected concern over health and safety, social satisfaction and perception of skill getting devalued may influence the level of job satisfaction, what they are currently enjoying, once such technology introduced in the workplace.

Then does the organizational structure and job content have any role in motivating the staff? The article of Thapsia (1993) focuses this issue and analyzes the relationship between motivation, organizational structure, and work design. The article confirms this relationship and its impact on motivating staff. It advocates work team approach rather than bureaucratic practice; features of an effective payment system; and introduces triple tier dual concept organizational structure. It also advocates the importance of studying job content, which is very often typical to libraries only, so that enrichment in job can be possible and applied to motivate library employees.

Owing to the recent developments in LIS profession, Broady-Preston and Bell (2001) prescribe realignment of organizational structure as well as acquisition of skill and academic credentials by the professionals to sustain a level of high morale and compete in today's changing LIS market.

Dewey (1990) addressed the issue of studying job content in her research paper and developed a practical methodology to analyze the job components of all library positions at

the University of Iowa. She surveyed the library staff there and found that reallocation of some staff was needed owing to application of technology in several library jobs. This paper advocates use of methodology, developed by Dewey, in other academic libraries who are interested in examining their own staffing needs with a view to enrich jobs and thereby to motivate staff.

On the basis of literature reviewed here it can be concluded that efficiency of a library for providing quality services depends on motivated staff. Maslow's and Herzberg's theory of motivation should be applied to motivate library employees. Factors like salary, promotion, working condition, responsibility, recognition, sense of achievement, job-security, effective communication, performance feedback, etc. motivate employees. Money matters in motivating although employees get motivated more than by money. Job itself is judged as the most important motivator irrespective of employees working in different job sectors. Ignoring employees, lack of recognition, lack of interest, unclear job description, etc are some of the factors that de-motivate staff. McClelland achievement motivation theory is found to be used more in industrial and competitive organizational environment of today although Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory still holds worth in all type of organizations. On job satisfaction, an important aspect of motivation, quite a number of studies are reported in India and abroad. Formulation of library policies with regard to promotion, salary, delegation of authority, status, job enrichment, etc. is recommended in motivational process of library employees which is currently lacking in Indian library management. However, as there is little evidence reported in literature about motivation of librarians in Indian context one cannot discern the factors properly on what motivate them.

## **2. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

If any organization is to use extrinsic rewards to motivate performance then they must have an effective performance evaluation or appraisal system. To perceive any reward as a motivator for performance, performance must be measured (Porter, Lawler and Hackman, 1975). Performance evaluation is an important area of human resource management where lots of theoretical and empirical evidence are found in the literature.

A number of studies have been conducted to measure performance of employees in different work organization for different purposes. A study on the purpose of conducting performance evaluation in organizations showed that career development and assessment is the major purpose (in 300 firms) followed by promotion (298), training (265), pay rise (240) and for other purposes (Porter, Lawler and Hackman, 1975). The modern performance appraisal also aimed at to derive feedback data on performance and thereby to enhance performance through strategic developmental programmes (Archer North Performance Appraisal System, 2004).

Performance evaluation of employees in libraries, especially in higher education library environment, is not a new phenomenon and had been prevalent in most of the twentieth century organizations (Edwards and Williams, 1998).

A survey of literature on performance evaluation in the field of librarianship revealed that though a number of studies have been done on this topic, these only deal with appraising the status of academic librarians. Again these are done at a superficial level and lack perspective ignoring the very objective of performance evaluation that is to implement the evaluation data for improvement. "Instead of specifically stating what to measure, what components to control, and why one application variable leads to another, researchers have been content with depicting "how to" schemes that only touch the tip of the iceberg" (Edwards and Williams, 1998). In library field no standard quantitative measures of performance are available as it is found on studies relating to industrial and other work sectors.

However, an attempt has been made here to present the literature on different aspects of performance evaluation namely its need, techniques, and methods of implementation; the results of researches; and suggestions.

Arnold (2005) opines that performance evaluation conducted in libraries is more or less similar to the evaluation carried out in other organization. The purpose of such evaluation is to explore the positive and negative work traits of employees and to find out ways for improving job performance.

Gómez-Mejia (1990) highlights the role of performance evaluation and the consequent reward system for enhancing employee performance. His paper which included a model for performance appraisal argues that feedback is a powerful tool in enhancing performance. Feedback on performance indicates how the work has been accomplished against what performance is expected.

Performance appraisals can be an effective motivation tool. Performance evaluation process if accepted in right spirit and with a positive frame of mind both by evaluator and the evaluated staff then the employees have no problem in modifying their behavior. The resultant is always a more conducive environment where the superiors, employees and the institution perform better (Lindsey, 1990).

Daly and Kleiner (1995) also viewed performance appraisal, if effectively practiced is an excellent way for a manager to communicate the organization's objectives and motivate employees and also help to bridge the communication breakdown that often leads to problem employees.

An article by McDonagh (1995) discusses the importance of performance evaluation schemes among librarians in identifying training needs and for improving both individual and corporate performance through dialogue between managers and subordinates.

Performance evaluation is generally carried out to provide documentation for current and future personnel decisions such as promotion, pay rises, staff training and development and if required for implementing disciplinary actions to correct problematic situations (Edwards and Williams, 1998).

University of Michigan Library views performance review is the annual process and a formal procedure by which the librarian's job performance is evaluated by his/her supervisor in order to improve communication, to determine performance level and to foster professional development of the librarian.

Bender (1994) describes performance appraisal is an effective process to examine the skills of each library employee and emphasizes the need for any remedial action related to the work of the employee so that his/her performance is improved.

Best (1995) reviewed the progress of implementing a performance based remuneration system for the public libraries' staff members in New Zealand and found that the system was proved to be useful for achieving the specific goals. He further proposed that the system should be implemented in discussing and assessing each job biannually.

Analysis of the above literature clearly indicates that performance evaluation is viewed as an effective mechanism for employee development. But at the same time not all people agree on performance evaluation as an effective tool for performance management. W. Edwards Deming condemned performance appraisal while describing it as a deadly disease afflicting American management (Aluri and Reichel, 1994). He argued that performance evaluations nourish fear, stifle teamwork, and are like lotteries. Again there are those also who expressed doubts about validity and reliability of performance evaluation process since it has several inherent flaws and that cannot be perfected (Derven, 1990).

However, Aluri and Reichel (1994) examined the library literature from Deming's perspective and explored that the available literature though accepts performance evaluation as useful there are doubts about the effectiveness of evaluations and this is more so when these are related to fulfilling the objectives of the library.

Literature on performance evaluation at the same time also points out to a debatable issue; whether rewards should be attached to evaluation results or not? Experts' views are divided here as one group strongly favors the linking of rewards to performance. But simultaneously there are those who scorn any attempt to link the process with reward outcome such as pay rises and promotion. The later group believes that developmental value of appraisals gets reduced once these are linked to reward outcome (Archer North Performance Appraisal System, 2004).

But in contrast to this fact Bannister and Balkin (1990), who developed an integrated model of performance evaluation and compensation feedback messages, reported that their 'appraisees' seemed to have accepted performance evaluation greatly and felt satisfied if the process is directly linked to rewards. One more research study by Green (1993) also agreed to this point that performance evaluation process should be

related to rewards. While surveying the staff appraisal in ex-UFC Sector UK university libraries, Green reported that the appraisal had been well received by most of the staff as a means of reviewing and communicating feedback on performance; setting personal objectives; and aiding training and developmental programmes. But the staff viewed lack of link with reward system, which was not included in the performance appraisal process, is a disadvantage.

The above two findings are a serious setback to those who feel that appraisal results must be strictly separated from reward outcome.

Coming to what should be the criteria for performance evaluation a number of researches available in the literature revealed that usually evaluation is a formal procedure and always guided by the rules and procedures of the organization in writing the evaluation form. The appraisal form should include items based on job-description and skills required to perform a task and achievement of goal. These items comprising job-description are usually the performance standards (Maharana & Panda, 2001; and Edward & Williams, 1998).

In developing performance standards the qualitative and quantitative aspects of performance should be taken care of (Vishwa Mohan and Ramakrishna, 1991). These aspects are quantity of work done and quality of work that includes precision, relevance, co-operation, accuracy, interpersonal relation, etc.

A job performance appraisal form, which is used for judging the performance level, may include some factors that influence job performance (Job Performance Appraisal Form). Some important factors are quantity as well as quality of work, job knowledge, dependability, problem solving, interpersonal relationship and technical skill. It has also got another section for judging supervisory ability and includes factor like fiscal awareness, delegation, leadership, external awareness, etc.

Various university libraries of reputation regularly conduct performance evaluation of their employees in order to recognize their effort, to identify training needs and to improve performance through feedback data. Information about the criteria followed by some of these libraries in evaluating the employee performance is provided here.

Indiana University Library provides a list of interview questions that should be included in the performance appraisal tool such as work history, job performance, education, self-assessment, creativity, motivation, oral and written communication, decisiveness, etc. (Indiana University Bloomington Libraries, 2002) .

According to University of Michigan Library knowledge of jobs, relevant skills and overall performance, initiative and creativity, leadership and teamwork, interpersonal relations and supervisory/managerial skills (whenever applicable) are some of the factors that may be considered in evaluating the performance level of librarians. These factors fall within the scope of the job assignment and are mutually determined performance goals (University of Michigan Library).

Cornell University Library's policy for performance expectations and evaluation criteria states that knowledge, constituent relations, resource management, adaptability, teamwork, initiative, and creativity are the factors for evaluating their IRIS (Instruction, Research and Information Services) professional staff (Cornell University Library).

Vishwa Mohan and Ramakrishna (1991) observed that absence of performance appraisal coupled with lack of well established criteria for evaluation is the main reason for the average performance in libraries in India.

Out of the several techniques of performance appraisal, those have been thoroughly investigated, some of them found to provide better results than others. Trait rating, objectives-oriented or MBO methods, essay methods are the most common performance appraisal methods adopted in different organization (Porter, Lawler & Hackman, 1975). A remarkable study by Locher and Teel (1977) revealed that rating scales (56%) followed by essay method (25%) and result-oriented or MBO methods (13%) are the most widely used methods.

Literature on methods or techniques of performance appraisal adopted in libraries reveals self-assessment, annual confidential report or controlled written reports, appraisal interview schedule, graphic rating scales are the most used methods (Jones and Jordan, 1982). Jones and Jordan (1982) further provided example for each of these appraisal

methods. Self appraisal or self assessment form has three sections where the individual employee being reviewed; the immediate supervisor; and the divisional head librarian each have to be filled up one section. The graphic rating scale includes various items of job components under the broad categories of character and personality; capacity; and performance of duties.

Maharana and Panda (2001) developed a performance appraisal form to evaluate library employee performance through rating. Rating was done through a five-point scale catering to i) effectiveness of librarians; ii) contributions through service/commitment to library institution and profession; and iii) outstanding achievement in bibliographic activities, research or professional endeavors.

McDonagh (1995) prescribed grading; written assessment; and setting of objectives and targets to appraise performance. Appraisal by clientele (ABC) is also a good appraisal method especially for service oriented organizations like libraries to assess the professional services (Prasad, 1994).

Miner (1988) developed a rated ranking technique for performance appraisal and applied to the skilled and non-skilled workers for establishing their performance as well as to judge the validity of performance appraisal tool. The performance appraisal form includes five aspects of performance drawn mainly from job descriptions. These were verbal task performance, mathematical task performance, judgmental task performance, new task performance and overall task performance. Each aspect of job performance was measured against a seven point rating scale starting from an outstanding performer to a poor performer. The result indicated that the rated ranking can judge absolute levels of performance because through this it is possible to rank both poor as well as excellent performer sufficiently.

Many others like Wallace and Klosinski and another group such as Wolfgang and Wolfgang in 1998 have used various criteria for evaluating job performance against a three- point numerical rating scale (Panning & Farrell, 2002). Excellent, average and poor performance rated as 3, 2, and 1 respectively. Here the employees are to rate themselves and the total score and the average score has to be found out.

A study by Nkereuwem (1996) examines whether gender of the employees has any role in job performance attribution process? He studied 754 librarians both male and female from universities and polytechnics in Nigeria to explore how the library attributes the job performance of a man to that of a woman. The findings revealed predicted gender difference in 'ability' attributions and that too held only among the most successful performers. It was noted that women's job performance was less likely to be attributed to 'ability' than men's job performance. This finding proved the predicted gender difference in higher performance group which is consistently reported in several earlier studies. However, among the moderate group both men's and women's performance attributed to ability was found to be more or less same.

Harrison and Goulding (1997) carried out a study on public libraries to discuss the theory of performance appraisal in relation to practice as well as while using evidence (this evidence or data was collected through a case study on performance appraisal at Loughborough University Library) to see how successfully it can be applied for improving individual and organizational performance. They found out that if specific nature of library work is not considered in appraisal design then it wouldn't be successful.

As per the study of Neubert (2004) performance is determined by several aspects present at job viz. motivation, job satisfaction, deviation, and teamwork. The investigator also tried to establish whether personality is related to the performance exhibited by employees at job. He found that people who have personality factors like high conscientiousness and extraversion always perform well while who lack conscientiousness tends to perform badly at job.

In the literature of performance management it is also evident that performance appraisal ratings are often manipulated due to political reasons (Poon, 2004). Poon's study unveiled the effects of employees' perceptions of political motives in performance appraisal on their job satisfaction. The results through regression analysis revealed that employees exhibited low job satisfaction when they perceived performance ratings to be manipulated as a result of raters' personal bias and intent to punish subordinates. However,

when ratings had to be manipulated for motivational purposes it didn't affect job satisfaction.

The review of above observations reported in the theory of performance appraisal and empirical studies confirmed the fact that appropriate use of performance appraisal proved to be an important tool for performance management in libraries in order to assess employee performance and to suggest remedial measure for enhancing performance. Again it is also true that, some are against it, generally employees welcome performance appraisal if it is attached to reward outcome. Further out of the different evaluation tools available rating scale is found to be the preferred and used in most of the studies. It is also explored in most of the works that different aspects related to job performance such as quantity as well as quality of work, job knowledge, dependability, problem solving, creativity, interpersonal relationship, commitment and technical skill were used to measure job performance.

### **3. RELATION BETWEEN MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE**

Literature on personnel management is dominated by the fact that there exists a relationship between motivation and performance. At the same time this relationship is perceived to be elusive and has intrigued organizational researchers for decades. The debate on 'whether a satisfied/motivated worker is a productive worker' has been mostly discussed in theoretical and research developments (Steers and Porter, 1991). However through the literature discussed here the researcher tried to reach at a conclusion on this aspect.

Use of incentives as motivators to improve work performance though is a controversial issue, as some researchers argue that incentives in tangible form affect personal interest in work, it is also true that US organizations are spending approximately \$ 117 billion on incentives to boost performance on annual basis (Stolovitch, Clark and Condly, 2002). Stolovitch and his associates conducted a two-step study to arrive at an accurate set of conclusions relating to whether incentives increase work performance and if so, then which are the effective incentives? They rigorously reviewed 45 research studies on the issue and also carried out 145 on-line highly detailed lengthy surveys supplemented

with structured interviews. The findings revealed that incentives do notably and positively influence performance both in terms of quantity and quality. Tangible incentives such as salary, bonus, etc. increase performance although team-based incentives are considered as major intangible incentive.

Buckingham and Coffman in 1999 based on their research findings on the behavior of working population, opine that people are engaged to work differently and the way they are engaged in work clearly depicts their motivation and its influence upon their performance in job (Kreisman, 2002). Their finding categorizes the employees into three groups namely, i) people who are fully engaged are by and large productive ; ii) people who are not engaged are just putting their time( a majority of 55%) ; and iii) people who are actively disengaged are discontented.

Another research findings of William James (1982) on relation of motivation to performance revealed that employees put work at close to 80 to 90 percent of their ability if they are highly motivated and if they are not they put to work only 20 to 30 percent of their ability which in turn leads to poor employee performance (Hersey and Blanchard, 1992).

According to Bruyns (1982) therefore, the library administrators should try to establish the level of motivation necessary to achieve the best performance in a work and also the actual motivation displayed by the employee while carrying out the task. He further reported that any discrepancy between the desired performance and the actual performance might be attributed to the working conditions and the resources available. But, if one assumes that these factors are sufficient to carry out a task then an increase in appropriate level of motivation from the employee will result in higher achievement.

Siggins (1992) in his work analyses the elements of job attitude and their relationship to performance output. He prescribes clear job description, communication and job satisfaction to improve performance outcome.

Neubert (2004) investigated the correlation and validity of a five factor model of personality namely conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, extraversion and openness to experience with job performance. The result of this research showed

correlations between personality and four aspects of job performance viz. motivation, job satisfaction, deviation, and teamwork. People who have high conscientiousness and extraversion always perform well while who lack conscientiousness tends to perform badly at job. Agreeableness and neuroticism is negatively correlated with work performance where as openness to experience is unrelated.

Smith and Rupp (2003) explored the effects of receiving a high performance rating and a low merit increase or a low performance rating and a high merit decrease which is commonly practiced as decoupling of performance rating and merit increases in modern knowledge-based environments. People work harder provided that employment is secured and also this is so when they are involved in a responsible way and committed to work.

A study by Jain (2005), carried out on public libraries in Botswana with the objective of developing a model for strategic human resource management, was based on effective performance appraisal data in order to provide enhanced information delivery services. She reported enthusiasm, positive attitude, innovative thinking and commitment are the critical qualities and further job related aspects like clear job description, performance feedback and effective communication are very much required to provide effective library services. Some motivational and other issues like a sense of achievement, recognition, status, clear job description, reward system, career, conducive work environment, job security, etc. were identified as the factors that influence performance of employees in providing efficient library services to their clientele.

Researchers like Sadaruddin (2001); Wofford (1971); and Al-Khalifa & Peterson (2004) believe that performance is a function of motivation. In an organization one's performance is a function of two factors namely ability and willingness to do the job (Sadaruddin, 2001). Therefore performance management should be handled in two phases. First of all the employees need to have the required skills and abilities to carry out the job effectively and secondly if the jobs are be properly designed and properly laid out that will create interest among the employees which in turn leads to enhanced performance.

While studying the relationship between Initial motivation, satisfaction and performance in international joint venture Al-Khalifa and Peterson (2004) revealed that past as well as anticipated performance of future are also functions of initial motivation.

Desai and Reddy (1992) analyzed the influence of technical competence, their motivation and organizational climate on job performance of staff. They suggested depending upon the findings that training, personal career development, interpersonal relations or communication in organization could be introduced to improve the quality of the performance.

Mould's (2004) research study, focused on what motivational factors influence job performance, revealed that 'job itself' is the important motivator that influences workplace performance greatly. Monetary gain and personal achievement come at second place.

Motivational factors categorized under extrinsic rewards like pay rise, promotion, status, praise, recognition etc. work as motivators and can be tied to performance (Porter, Lawler, Hackman, 1975).

Williams (2003) listed employment security, participation, empowerment, self-managed team, financial compensation, training and skill development and measurement as the effective means which influence the workforce. So the human resource management should focus on these areas for managing the workforce towards high productivity.

To develop a productive and effective work environment for libraries Arizona State University Libraries (2000) developed a strategic plan. This plan was based on the findings of the study which explored the influence of various motivational factors on performance outcome. One such factor shared leadership/collaboration among staff of all levels was actively promoted to see the effect on work performance. Staff reported improved internal customer service to library users as a result of incorporation of decisions of all level both inter and intra-departmental collaboration. Rewards and recognition, the crucial motivational factors that drive employees toward excellence, led to perception of increased motivation among majority of staff and resulted in improved quality services to both external and internal customers. The factor training and development when introduced

majority of staff enhanced their skills on using electronic resources and also in providing quality service to the users. Regular training and development programmes make the staff more informed and clear about their job requirement as well as the role and vision of the library. Continuous improvement in knowledge and skills enable the staff to perform with a consistent high caliber.

While studying the motivation and productivity, Antwi and Bello (1993) in Nigerian University Library agreed that staff motivation influences their job performance and in turn affect organizational productivity.

Motivation always demonstrated to have link with performance as people do their best only when they are confident and satisfied at their job (Green, 2000). Motivation together with ability and work environment influences employee's job performance. Ability and work environment deficiencies can be overcome to some extent by skill development and improving work environment but it is very difficult to address motivation due to its intangible nature.

For maintaining an effective work culture in libraries factors like motivation, leadership styles and communication are intertwined with each other. "Creation and maintenance of the desired culture for performance in any organization has an intimate relationship with the leadership styles, communication framework, recognition of human factor and the systems of motives, motivators and job satisfaction" (Dabas and Singh, 2002, p.4).

An empirical study by Mehta, Dubinsky and Anderson (2003) investigated the linkages among leadership styles, motivation, and performance in international marketing channels in USA, Finland and Poland. The findings explored that though channel member motivation was found to be positively related to channel member performance in USA and Finland, motivation was not linked to performance in Poland. This situation may be attributed to the prevailing economy of Poland which is still an economy that is transitioning to a capitalistic system, possibly the type of rewards channel partners might expect to receive (a la instrumentality) might not be considered important to them (a la valence); thus, they may not put forth high levels of effort (a la expectancy). Therefore this finding pointed to the need for developing different sets of motivational rewards for

different countries as some rewards seemed to be important in one country may not be appropriate to boost performance in other country.

In case of blue-collar industrial workers also motivation and job involvement were highly co-related to their job performance. This finding was based on the study of Mishra and Gupta (1994) that employed established motivation schedule, job involvement scale and performance rating scale to measure motivation, job involvement and performance respectively and analyzed the data through analyses of variance (ANOVA). The result shows that highly motivated and high job involvement group showed increased performance.

Kominis and Emmanuel (2005) explored the preferences of rewards i.e. whether intrinsic or extrinsic rewards that motivate middle level managers for performance. The findings based on empirical evidence revealed associations between motivation and performance, and valued rewards. Intrinsic rewards were found to be highly valued than extrinsic but higher motivation and performance is positively associated with a preference for a combination of rewards.

Kibico's (1995) study explored the motivational effects of anxiety and aspiration on learning performance of both male and female students of Allahabad University. The major findings the investigator derived were: with increasing level of anxiety performance decreased where as with increasing level of aspiration performance improved and students with low-anxiety performed better in comparison to high-anxiety group.

Ostroff (1992) carried out a study with the observation that little work has been done on exploring the relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance at organizational level as most of the researches examine satisfaction-performance relationship at individuals' level within an organization. He argued that if the organization alienate worker through practices then it tended to be less effective as frustrated workers usually work less than the satisfied workers. To prove this hypothesis he collected data on organizational performance from 298 schools and employee satisfaction and attitude data from 13, 808 teachers of the sample schools. The correlation and regression analysis of data revealed the expected relationship that organization having more satisfied employees

were found to be more effective in comparison to organizations with less satisfied employees.

Bhattacharya (1986) conducted a study to examine the validity of the notion that employees with a higher motivational force are more productive while other conditions held as constant. The investigator measured the motivational level of the employee by administering a valence – instrumentality – expectancy questionnaire. The result of the study supported the hypothesis that employees with higher motivational force perform significantly better in their job than those employees having lower motivational force.

To find out the motives of employees who restrict their output at job Hickson (1961) conducted a study on motivational attitudes of workers while carrying out work. It was found that uncertainty in areas of motivation such as uncertainty in the (1) continuance of employment; (2) continuance of existing social relationship; and (3) continuance of the existing effort-bargain were the motives which influenced the employees' performance and as a result their output was restricted.

One of the most cited researches in the motivation-performance management literature was that of J. C. Wofford. Wofford (1971), a well known industrial psychologist, studied 3 diverse groups of employees of different organizations to explore their motivational bases for job satisfaction and job performance. He employed a number of good research scales such as Job-satisfaction scale, Need-gratification index, Expectation index, Critical Satisfaction Incidents and Performance Rating scale for measuring employee's extent of need gratification, satisfaction level and performance relationship. The findings of his study supported the hypotheses drawn on expectancy theory that "Job motivation and performance is a function of the strength of need and the expectancy that performance would result in need gratification. Job performance was found to be significantly related to expectancy and to the strength of needs" (Wofford, 1971, p. 515). However the results of this study did not support Maslow's theoretical position that upper level needs can not become active as motivators unless lower level needs are gratified. Because the findings also showed that for employees even if their lower level needs were not gratified their upper level needs were found to be significantly related to their job satisfaction. Wofford argued for implication of expectancy theory rather than either

Maslow's theory or Herzberg's two-factor theory as this theory is more promising in providing a basis for understanding and predicting job motivation for job performance.

A work by Sever and Westcott (1983) supported Wofford's view and argues use of expectancy and re-enforcement theories in library management for motivating employees for performance. They argued that design of pay and other reward systems in the library should be related to job performance and the practice of relating pay raises and promotion to length of service should be avoided as it leads to low motivation and low performance. Greatedon (2001) also viewed that to have one productive staff in any organization motivation of staff is a requisite. The managers must apply motivational techniques to create an ideal state of performance.

According to Daly and Kleiner (1995) managers are to a great extent responsible for their subordinate's performance. "Before pinning blame on the employee they must ask themselves what they are doing that may contribute to the employee's poor performance. A final issue for managers to understand is that all people do not see the world in the same way and that they should attempt to look at it from their employees' point of view" (Daly and Kleiner, 1995, p.7). This statement clearly relates motivation to performance and argues for application of motivational techniques by managers to enhance performance of their employees.

An article by Siggins (1992) explores the relationship of job satisfaction and performance in the changing electronic environment of library today. It prescribes a framework for job satisfaction on the basis of a number of research studies that improve performance. Enrichment of jobs, redesigning of work, training and development, empowerment, fair reward system, effective performance management system, etc. are the factors that can be used to motivate employees for better performance.

In an effort made to understand how to measure the influence of motivational factors on performance, Roch's (2005) study explored to what extent two motivational factors viz. rating audience and incentive can influence performance ratings. It was found that ratings are inflated or influenced by incentives in some cases irrespective of incentive provided or not, and that the audience of the ratings can determine whether incentives result in lower or higher ratings.

A survey conducted by Thapsia and Jain (2000) focused to explore the main barriers to productivity in academic and public libraries in Botswana, Nigeria. Among the two-factor or two variables used for measuring effect on performance, the independent variables included job experience, gender, type of library and status of the employees and the dependent variables were work environment, attitudes, technology, individual, organizational and work ethics to measure the higher and lower productivity of library personnel. The data collected were subjected to factor analysis and multivariate ANOVA. The findings revealed that job experience and type of library did not influence productivity though gender seemed to influence productivity significantly. Work attitude as well as work environment were also appeared as important factors to influence productivity. Lack of job satisfaction, a lack of technological facilities, low work ethics, budget constraints, lack of training opportunities, improper use of human and material resources, poor working environment, lack of interpersonal relationship among staff were found to be main barriers of productivity in these libraries. Since there was no incentive to work the study recommended implementing it for improving productivity.

Awuku (1995) analyzed the variables that affect motivation and productivity of library personnel through a comparative study carried out in two West African and two Southern African University libraries. Awuku argued that employee performance is depended greatly on motivation and motivation of employees again depends on the social conditions in interaction with employees' needs. Participation, communication, rewards, training, etc. are the most powerful motivation tools to boost productivity. He again recommended that the library should use performance ratings to measure employee performance based on a constructive developmental approach that can be vitally useful in motivation performance management.

The analysis of above literature provides an insight that experts and researchers in the motivation performance management field agree with the fact that to have one productive staff in any organization motivation of staff is a pre-requisite. Again on the basis of literature reviewed here one can conclude that motivation influences library personnel's performance and organizational effectiveness and that there is a positive relationship between motivation and the performance level of the personnel (Green, Chivers & Mynott, 2000; Antwi & Bello, 1993; Thapsia, 1993; Thapsia & Jain 2000; Jain,

2005; Badu, 2005; Awuku, 1995; Williamson & Stephens, 1998; Best 1995; and Abifarin, 1997). Therefore in every organization including libraries if the managers want to enhance performance then it becomes essential for them to understand the motives of their employees and then apply suitable motivational techniques to counter that actively which in turn lead to performance.

## CONCLUSION

On the basis of literature reviewed here it can be concluded that a motivated staff is the most essential requirement for providing efficient and quality library services. Therefore it is prescribed in the literature to apply classic theories of Maslow's and Herzberg's, which are still valued in today's competitive environment, and modern theories like expectancy theory of Vroom and achievement motivation theory of McClelland to motivate library employees. Motivational factors like salary, promotion, working condition, responsibility, recognition, sense of achievement, job-security, effective communication, performance feedback, etc. motivate employees. Although 'money' is not that important as a motivator it matters to most of the employees while 'job- itself' is judged as the most important motivator irrespective of employees working in different job sectors.

Further it is also reported that performance evaluation is an important tool to assess employee performance and to suggest remedial measure for enhancing performance. Quantity as well as quality of work, job knowledge, dependability, problem solving, creativity, interpersonal relationship, commitment and technical skill are the different aspects related to job performance that are used in most of the studies to measure job performance.

About the relation of motivation to performance most of the studies view performance is the function of motivation along with ability to perform. Job performance gets influenced by the level of motivation of employees at job. Again motivation and performance are correlated or there exists a positive relationship between motivation and performance.

However the above derivations, drawn from studies and observations from diversified job sectors, were not solely of librarians and again most of them were studied from Western and African perspective. Therefore the findings of these studies could not be generalized to motivate the library personnel of Indian university libraries. As there was little empirical evidence reported in literature about motivation and performance of librarians in Indian context, one cannot discern the factors properly on what motivate them. Further there was no such study so far reported in the available literature (subjected to oversight) which could provide ample understanding on different aspects of motivation and how it is related to the job performance of library personnel. Therefore these issues pointed towards taking up studies like the present one where motivation and performance level of library personnel could be explored as well as a strategy for motivation could be developed.

## REFERENCES

- Abifarin, A. (1997). Motivating staff in Nigerian university libraries. *Library Management*, 18(3), 124-28. Retrieved June 20, 2000, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Alemna, A. (1992). Motivation and productivity in academic libraries: A case study of Balme Library, University of Ghana. *Journal of Library Administration*, 6(4), 45-56. Retrieved June 20, 2000, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Al-Khalifa, A., & Peterson, S.E. (2004). On the relationship between initial motivation, and satisfaction and performance in joint ventures. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38(1/2), 150-174. Retrieved February 28, 2005, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Aluri, R., & Reichel, M. (1994). Performance evaluation: A deadly disease? *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 20 (3), 145-155. Retrieved June 21, 2000, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Analoui, F. (2000). What motivates senior managers? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15 (4), 324-340.
- Antwi, I.K., & Bello, M.A. (1993). Motivation and productivity in academic libraries. *Library Management*, 14(5), 27-34. Retrieved June 20, 2000 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Archer North Performance Appraisal System (2004). *Performance appraisal*. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from <http://www.performance-appraisal.com/intro.html>

- Arizona State University Libraries (2000). *Libraries as a productive, effective workplace*. Retrieved May 6, 2004, from <http://www.asu.edu/library/ulsp/ul2000/workplac.htm>
- Arnold, K. (2005). *Motivating and evaluating staff*. Retrieved March 23, 2005, from <http://www.librarysupportstaff.com/staffappraise.html>
- Awuku, O.S. (1995). Productivity in university libraries of developing countries: A West and Southern African perspective. *Library Management*, 16(3), 24-33. Retrieved June 21, 2000, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Badu, E. E. (2005). Employee motivation in university libraries in Ghana: A comparative analysis. *Information Development*, 21 (1), 38-46. Retrieved December 10, 2005, from <http://idv.sagepub.com/cgi/content/short/21/1/38>
- Bakewell, K. (1993). Motivation of library staff. *Library Management*, 14(5), 18-19. Retrieved June 21, 2000 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Bannister, B.D., & Balkin, D.B. (1990). Performance evaluation and compensation feedback messages: an integrated model. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 97-111.
- Bender, D.R. (1994). Improving personnel management through evaluation. *Library Administration and Management*, 8 (2), 109-112. Retrieved June 21, 2000 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Berman, F. E., & Miner, J.B. (1985). Motivation to manage at the executive level. *Personnel Psychology*, 38, 377-389.
- Bessell, I., Dicks, B., Wysocki, A., & Kepner, K. (2002). Understanding motivation: An effective tool for managers. Retrieved March 12, 2004 from <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>
- Best, J. (1995). Performance appraisal and bonus pay in a public library: Latest fad or super motivator? *Australian Public Libraries and Information Services*, 8(3), 144-146.
- Bhattacharya, K. (1986). Motivation and productivity: An empirical study. *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 23 (2), 49-57.
- British and Irish Association of Law Librarians (1995). *Reports of 26<sup>th</sup> Annual British and Irish Association of Law Librarian's Study Conference, Sept, 1995*. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from [www.law.warwick.ac.uk/ltj/4-2m.html](http://www.law.warwick.ac.uk/ltj/4-2m.html)
- Broady-Preston, J., & Bell, S. (2001). Motivating mid-career LIS professionals: The Aberystwyth experience. *New Library World*. 102 (10), 372-381. Retrieved May 11, 2005 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Bruyns, R. A. C. (1982). Library structure and staff motivation: Trends in the Dutch Public Library. In A. Vaugan (Ed.), *Studies in Library Management*, Vol. 6 (pp.195-211). London: Clive Bingley.

Cassidy, T., & Lynn, R. (1989). A multi-factorial approach to achievement motivation: The development of a comprehensive measure. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 62, 301-312.

Chopra, K. (1984). Job satisfaction among the librarians of Lucknow city. *Herald of Library Science*, 23(3/4), 156-161.

Cooper, R.K. (2000). A new neuroscience of leadership: Bringing out more of the best in people. *Strategy and Leadership*, 28 (6), 11-15. Retrieved January 12, 2006 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Cornell University Library. *Performance expectations and evaluation criteria –IRIS professional staff*. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from <http://www.library.cornell.edu/iris/policies/performance.html>

Dabas, K.C., & Singh, S. (2002). Organizational culture and leadership styles in some selected university libraries. *ILA Bulletin*, 38 (1), 4-10.

Daly, D. & Kleiner, B.H. (1995). How to motivate problem employees? *Work Study*, 44(2), 5-7. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Derven, M.G. (1990). The paradox of performance appraisals. *Personnel Journal*, 69, 107-111. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from <http://www.performance-appraisal.com/intro.html>

Desai, G.R., & Reddy, M.R. (1992). *Management of agriculture development systems: Case studies*. Retrieved April 3, 2004, from [www.manage.gov.in/managelib/research/research.htm](http://www.manage.gov.in/managelib/research/research.htm)

Dewey, B. I. (1990). A practical methodology for the study of job components and staffing needs. *College and Research Libraries*, 51 (1), 107-112.

Douglas, K. (2003). *Motivating employee-owners in ESOP firms human resource policies and company performance*. Retrieved December 1, 2005, from [http://www.ownershipassociates.com/motivate\\_co\\_2.shtm](http://www.ownershipassociates.com/motivate_co_2.shtm)

Dumont, R. R. (1985). Motivation to manage: A study of academic librarians and library science students. *Library Trends*, 34(2), 219-234.

Edwards, R.G., & Williams, C. J. (1998). Performance appraisal in academic libraries: Minor changes or major renovation? *Library Review*, 47 (1), 14-19. Retrieved June 21, 2000 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Elangovan, A. R. & Xie, J. L. (2000). Effects of perceived power of superior on subordinate work attitudes. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 21 (6), 319-328. Retrieved December 1, 2005, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Gomez-Mejia, L. (1990). Increasing productivity: Performance appraisal and reward systems. *Personnel Review*, 19 (2). Retrieved April 22, 2004 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Gouws, A., & Toit, A. S. (1996). Relationship between motivation and job satisfaction of a group of information workers in public libraries. *South African Journal of Library and Information Science*, 64 (4), 186-193.

Greaton, J. (2001). *Motivation in organizations*. Retrieved March 12, 2004, from <http://www.academic.com/lib/paper>

Green, A. (1993). A survey of staff appraisal in university libraries. *British Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 8 (3), 109.

Green, J., Chivers, B., & Mynott, G. (2000). In the librarian's chair: An analysis of factors which influence the motivation of library staff and contribute to the effective delivery of services. *Library Review*, 49(8), 380-386. Retrieved April 20, 2004, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Green, T. B. (2000). *Motivation management: Book review*. Retrieved July 12, 2005, from [www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/](http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/)

Harrison, K., & Goulding, A. (1997). Performance appraisal in public libraries. *New Library World*, 98 (7), 275-280. Retrieved September 24, 2004, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1992). *Management of organizational behavior* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Wiley.

Hickson, D. J. (1961). Motives of workpeople who restrict their output. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 35 (3), 111-121.

Hollis, S. K. (2005). *A research study on the motivation of library employees*. Retrieved December 1, 2005, from <http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~skhollis/ResearchStudy.htm>

Horenstein, B. (1983). Job satisfaction of academic librarians: An examination of the relationships between satisfaction, faculty status and participation. *College and Research Libraries*, 54 (3), 255-270.

Indiana University Bloomington Libraries (2002). *A list of interview questions for performance appraisal form*. Retrieved March 29, 2005, from <http://www.indiana.edu/~libpers/interview.html>

Jain, P. (2005). Strategic human resource development in public libraries in Botswana. *Library Management*, 26 (6/7), 336-350. Retrieved January 16, 2006 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Job Performance Appraisal Form. Retrieved November 26, 2005, from [http://www.uhv.edu/forms/job\\_performance\\_appraisal.pdf](http://www.uhv.edu/forms/job_performance_appraisal.pdf)

Jones, N., & Jordan, P. (1984). *Staff management in library and information work*. Hampshire: Gower Publishing.

Kaya, E. (1995). *Job satisfaction of the librarians in the developing countries*. Proceedings of 61<sup>st</sup> IFLA General Conference, August, 20-25. Retrieved May 23, 2003 from <http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla61-kaye.htm>

Kibico, D. N. (1995). Motivational aspects of anxiety and aspiration. *Perspectives in Psychological Researches*, 18 (1/2), 22-25.

Kominis, G., & Emmanuel, C. R. (2005). Exploring the reward preferences for middle level managers. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 2 (1), 54 – 76. Retrieved May 10, 2006 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Kreisman, B.J. (2002). *Insights into employee commitment, productivity and retention*. Retrieved May 14, 2003 from [www.insightsvancouver.com/PDFs/](http://www.insightsvancouver.com/PDFs/)

Lahiri, R. (1987). The human side of the library: A study of theory and literature. *Annals of Library and Documentation*, 34(2), 41-51.

Lahiri, R. (1988). The human side of library: A profile of Manipur. *Annals of Library and Documentation*, 35(2), 84-92.

Lee, H.K., & Kim, M. T. (1993). Relationship between quality of goal setting and job satisfaction in a public library setting. *Public Library Quarterly*, 13 (2), 41-57.

Lifer, E. (1998). Are you happy in your job? *Library Journal*, 119(18), 44-49.

Lindner, J.R. (1998). Understanding employee motivation. *Journal of Extension*, 36 (3). Retrieved November 23, 2005, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1998june/rb3.html>

Lindsey, A. (1990). *Performance appraisals*. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from <http://www.performance-appraisal.com/intro.html>

Line, M.B. (1992). How to de-motivate staff: A brief guide. *Library Management*, 13 (1). Retrieved June 25, 2000, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Locher, A.H., & Teel, K.S. (1977). Performance appraisal: A survey of current practices. *Personnel Journal*, 56 (5), 245-257. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from <http://www.performance-appraisal.com/locher.htm>

Maharana, B., & Panda, K.C. (2001). Performance evaluation for library and information professionals: A tool for human resources management in academic libraries. *IASLIC Bulletin*, 46 (4), 197-201.

- McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.A., & Lowell, E.L. (1953). *The achievement motive*. New York: Appleton.
- McDonagh, B. (1995). Appraisals. *Law Librarian*, 26(3), 423-425.
- McNamara, C. (2003). *Basics about employee motivation*. Retrieved July 5, 2003, from <http://www.mapnp.org/library/guiding/motivate/basics.htm>
- Mehabrian, A. (1969). Measures of achieving tendency. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 29, 445-451.
- Mehta, R., Dubinsky, A.O., & Anderson, R.E. (2003). Leadership style, motivation and performance in international marketing channels: An empirical investigation of the USA, Finland and Poland. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(1/2), 50-85. Retrieved January 16, 2006 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Mendelsohn, S. (1995). What do you find most exciting about being information professional in the 1990's? *Information World Review*, 107, 36-37.
- Miner, J. (1988). Development and application of the rated ranking technique in performance appraisal. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 291-305.
- Mishra, P.C., & Gupta, J. (1994). Performance as a function of employee's motivation and job involvement. *Psychological Studies*, 39 (1), 18-20.
- Morgan, S. (2001). Change in university libraries: Don't forget the people. *Library Management*, 22 (1/2), 58-61. Retrieved April 20, 2005 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>
- Mould, C. (2004). *Factors influencing the motivation of information technology professionals in the workplace*. Retrieved December 1, 2005, from [http://www.fti.co.za/index.php?id=7&news\\_id=9](http://www.fti.co.za/index.php?id=7&news_id=9)
- Murgai, S. R. (1999). *Motivation to manage: A comparative study of male and female library & information science students in the United States of America, India, Singapore, & Japan*. Proceedings of 65<sup>th</sup> IFLA Council and General Conference, August 20-28, Bangkok. Retrieved November 5, 2005, from <http://www.ifla.org>
- Myers, M.E. (1991). *Motivation and performance in the information systems field: A survey of related studies*. Retrieved October 24, 2004, from <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm>
- National Study of the Changing Work Force (2002). Retrieved December 1, 2005 from <http://familiesandwork.org/announce/2002NSCW.html>
- Navalani, K. (1990). Job characteristics of library and information work as satisfiers and dissatisfiers: A survey. *Annals of Library science and Documentation*, 37 (3), 85-95.

Neubert, S. P. (2004). *Five-factor model of personality in the workplace*. Retrieved November 29, 2005, from <http://www.personalityresearch.org/papers/neubert.html>

Nkereuwem, E.E. (1996). Job performance attributions and career advancement prospects for women in the academic libraries. *Librarian Career Development*, 4 (2), 4-7.

Olorunsola, R. (1992). Motivating staff: A look at Frederic Herzberg's motivating-hygiene theory. *Library Review*, 41 (2), 25-28. Retrieved June 24, 2000, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Ostroff, C. (1992). Relationship between satisfaction, attitudes and performance: an organization level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (6), 963-974.

Panning, R., & Farrell, B. (2002). *Performance appraisal process: What to expect as a laboratory professional*. Retrieved April 2, 2005, from <http://www.ascls.org/jobs/grads/performance-appraisal.asp>

Parmer, C., & East, D. (1993). Job satisfaction among support staff in 12 Ohio academic libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, 54 (1), 43-57.

Pascoe, C. (1996). Impact of an integrated management system on the job characteristics, satisfaction and motivation of library staff. *Australian Library Review*, 13 (2), 135-146.

Plate, K. H., & Stone, E.W. (1976). Factors affecting librarians' job satisfaction. In R. Shimon (Ed.), *A Reader in Library Management*, (pp.146-160), London: Clive Bingley.

Poon, M.L. (2004). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Personnel Review*, 33 (3), 322-334.

Pors, N. O., & Johannsen, C.G. (2002). Job satisfaction and motivational strategies among library directors. *New Library World*, 103 (6), 199-209. Retrieved December 21, 2005, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Pors, N.O. (2003). Job satisfaction among library managers: A cross-cultural study of stress, freedom and job conditions. *New Library World*, 104 (11/12), 464-473. Retrieved December 21, 2005, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., & Hackman, J. R. (1975). *Behavior in organizations*. Tokyo: McGraw-Hill.

Prasad, H.N. (1994). Job anxiety and job satisfaction among professional library employees: A study. *Annals of Library Science and Documentation*, 41 (2), 41-54.

Roch, S. G. (2005). An investigation of motivational factors influencing performance ratings: Rating audience and incentive. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20 (8), 695 – 711.

Rowley, J. (1996). Motivation and academic staff in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4 (3), 11-16. Retrieved March 23, 2000, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Rowley, J. (1996). Motivation of staff in libraries. *Library Management*, 17(5), 31-35. Retrieved March 23, 2000, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Sadaruddin, A. (2001). Motivation. Retrieved November 24, 2005, from <http://www.suite101.com/profile.cfm/aghasad>

Schneider, M. S. (1991). Stress and job satisfaction among employees in a public library system with a focus on public service. *Library and Information Science Research*, 13, 385-404.

Sergean, R., McKay, J. R., Corkill, C.M., & Saunders, W. L. (1976). *The Sheffield manpower project: A survey of staffing requirements for librarianship ...* Retrieved November 26, 2005 from <http://www.unesdoc.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?database=ged&>

Sever, S., & Westcott, F. (1983). Motivational basis for compensation strategies in a library environment. *College and Research Libraries*, 54 (3), 228-235.

Siggins, J.A. (1992). Job satisfaction and performance in a changing environment. *Library Trends*, 41 (2), 299-315.

Singh, M. (1998). *Job motivation and organizational climate in libraries*. New Delhi: Mittal Pubs.

Smith, A.D., & Rupp, W.T. (2003). Knowledge workers: Exploring the link among performance rating, pay and motivational aspects. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7 (1), 107-124. Retrieved December 21, 2005, from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Smith, G. (1999). *How to attract, keep and motivate today's workforce?* Retrieved May 20, 2002, from [http://www.speaking.com/articles-html/Gregsmith\\_935.html](http://www.speaking.com/articles-html/Gregsmith_935.html)

Steers, R. M., & Porter, L.W. (1991). *Motivation and work behavior* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Stolovitch, H. D., Clark, R.E. & Condly, S.J. (2002). Incentives, motivation and workplace performance. *Performance Newsletter*, Winter/Spring. Retrieved March 24, 2005, from [http://www.hsa-lps.com/Performance\\_WS\\_2002.htm](http://www.hsa-lps.com/Performance_WS_2002.htm)

Stum, D. L. (2001). Maslow revisited: Building the employee commitment pyramid. *Strategy and Leadership*, 29(4), 4-9. Retrieved April 20, 2002 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Thapsia, A. P. N. (1992). Work, its significance, meaning and challenges among library assistants. *Journal of Library Administration*, 16 (4), 19-43. Retrieved May 21, 2000 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Thapsia, A. P. N. (1993). Structure, efficiency and motivation among librarians. *Library Management*, 14 (5), 20-26. Retrieved May 21, 2000 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Thapsia, A.P.N., & Jain, P. (2000). Bio-factor analysis of library productivity. *Library Management*, 21(2), 86-93. Retrieved September 10, 2000 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Thiedke, C.C. (2004). *What motivates staff?* Retrieved April 23, 2005 from <http://www.aafp.org/fpm/2004/100/54what.html>

Tietjen, M.A., & Myers, R.M. (1998). Motivation and job satisfaction. *Management Decision*, 36 (4), 226-231. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Uma J., & Kamalanabhan T. J. (1998). A tool for measuring achieving motivation. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 24, 49-57.

University of Michigan Library. *Performance criteria and factors for determining performance/merit levels for librarians*. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from <http://www.lib.umich.edu/hr/lib/form lib criteria pdf>

Usherwood, B. (1982). Management and the meaning of work. In A. Vaughan (Ed.), *Studies in Library Management*, Vol. 7 (pp.61-77). London: Clive Bingley.

Viwshamohan, V., & Ramakrishna, D. (1991). Developing performance standards in library and information system of India. *ILA Bulletin*, 27 (3), 102-106.

Voleck, J. (1995). Job satisfaction among support staff in Michigan Academic libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, 66 (2), 157-159.

Wiley, C. (1997). What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys? *International Journal of Manpower*, 18 (3), 263-280. Retrieved April 20, 2004 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>

Williams, J. (2003). *Effective workforce management*. Retrieved May 12, 2004, from [www.ravenworks.com/leadership/workforce.htm](http://www.ravenworks.com/leadership/workforce.htm)

Williamson, J., & Stephens, J.M. (1998). Happily ever after? Motivating staff in times of change. *Serial Librarian*, 34(3/4), 361-365.

Wofford, J.C. (1971). Motivational bases of job satisfaction and job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 24, 501-518.

Yang, Z. Y. (1999). Present-day attitudes of African American librarians towards their profession and work environment. *Public Library Quarterly*, 17 (2), 35-45.