

MOTIVATION, TRAINING AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION - THE FUNDAMENTAL FACTORS OF PERFORMANCE

<https://doi.org/10.47743/jopafl-2022-24-11>

Ionel - Gabriel DOBRIN
Drăgan European University Lugoj,
Lugoj, România
gabriel.dobrin@deu.ro

Abstract: *The factors that are meant to trigger the energy of the action and to maintain it afterwards in a state of productive engagement are very diverse, being able to be identified by manifestations such as intentions, tendencies, goals, ideals, interests, winnings, aspirations, etc. Needs or affairs, as essential for initiating and sustaining behavior, may be considered to have a direct influence on the individual, since they determine thoughts and actions. However, a person's needs are determined by their perceptions of the situation, and perceptions are determined by previous learning processes.*

Keywords: *Motivation, Training, Organizational communication, Work, Factors, Entrepreneurship.*

Introduction

Most theories of motivation have identified and described the main conditions that can influence the set of needs of a person in relation to:

1. Medium/heredity.
2. The level of training/education.
3. The person's self-conception.
4. Life experience.

The interaction between the conditions or factors influencing the set of needs of a person will lead to the choice of the objectives that allow their satisfaction. The brief presentation of the most important explanatory perspectives and models revealed how complex and difficult to research the field of motivation is. Not only is there a great multitude and diversity of variables that should be considered in an interrogatory model, but the very permanent, sometimes radical changes that have occurred at the level of social organization and the organizational design are likely to further complicate any effort to systematize the information and data research.

Motivation, training, and organizational communication

If we admit that motivation cannot be analyzed exclusively by reference to human needs, being largely determined by individual and cultural values, specific to the society in which they live, people are confronted with various work experiences in a particular organizational context. The social, economic, or cultural changes produced at the level of the societies will influence the way of setting up the motivations and the process of motivation for work.

Inglehart argues, for example, that the motivation for achievement is part of a cultural developmental syndrome. The author suggests that motivation for achievement is a cultural dimension that, along with others, has proved to play an important role in economic development. The author's statement is based on the results of a comparative research, conducted in 43 companies, which tried to identify the dominant values, specific to each society. After interpreting the results, he argued that some cultures emphasize the motivation to achieve more than others, and those that emphasize this motivation have been shown to have higher economic growth rates. Inglehart also discovered that the motivation for achievement correlates strongly with economic development, which reflects, in the author's interpretation, the transition from the value systems of pre-industrial society, the transition related to the process of modernization. The direct link between motivation for achievement and development reflects, in the author's conception, the effects of motivational factors on entrepreneurship.

However, it should be noted that Inglehart associates economic development with the presence of materialistic values (centered mainly on physical and economic security), arguing that post-materialistic values (which value the capacity for expression and quality of life) tend to be negatively correlated with economic development.

The processes of motivation, training and organizational communication have a decisive role in the behavioral approach of the manager, the training function being strongly based on it. Based on an efficient communication process, it is possible to draw the course of the evolution of the activities in the company, to transmit the responsibilities, tasks, and action plans. In past periods, this component of the training function has been classified in the management process as a command function. Currently, the essence of the function consists in the ability to initiate actions, to train and mobilize the company's employees in the work process.

Through the training functions, the plans and forecasts drawn up in advance are translated into reality. Training-motivation is the only attribute of leadership that considers only the human resources of the organization, which means that it only deals with people. The new vision presupposes the ability to influence the employee's work behavior in the direction of obtaining high performance, which is precisely training-motivation. It designates all the actions carried out by the managers, by which all the employees are determined to make full use of their availability (intellectual and physical) to achieve the performances established for each compartment or employee. The perspective adopted by the management of the organizations regarding human nature, but also on the social, cultural, economic contexts in which they operate, the policies adopted to stimulate the performance can be focused either on the priority use of financial rewards, careful supervision and sanctions, or on the use of psychological principles aimed at identifying beliefs, the values, perceptions, attitudes or emotions of employment, with a view to their use, modeling or change as a means of generating a deep commitment to the values and culture of the organization. Obviously, each of the two approaches is designed and adopted with the explicit purpose of determining the maintenance or increase of performance and results of work.

One of the reasons still widely valued as having a strong strength to influence people's behavior in organizations to increase labor efficiency or performance is to be related to material incentives and rewards. It is obvious that this type of motivation is focused on the context of work or on what Herzberg called hygiene factors, just as it is

equally obvious that the assumption underlying the adoption of this strategy of motivation is based on the economic model of human behavior. Another aspect that needs to be considered in the study of the remuneration-performance relationship concerns the extremely different reward practices used within different cultures. It has been shown that, within the same culture, there are highly efficient firms that do not employ any meritocratically form of reward, as others successfully use such systems.

There are countries such as Japan and North Korea where the remuneration system is largely based on the principle of seniority and is also linked to the hierarchical position. In some countries and companies, the system of financial remuneration is used as the main mechanism for controlling and guiding behavior, while in others, this system does not enjoy appreciation, instead adopting forms of reward and recognition of a symbolic nature. The results of another study, conducted by Konrad and Pfeffer, suggest that the relationship between remuneration and productivity seems to really work in areas where there are less uncertainty and ambiguities about how performance is measured, such as research.

Another research that aimed to look at how to distribute remuneration in more than 1800 academic departments, Pfeffer and Langton discovered the existence of greater inequality between the salaries of academic staff in private colleges. The interpretation of these results leads to the conclusion that the higher frequency of contracts and the visualization, responsible for the public nature of the information, contribute to reducing the inequality of salaries in the organizations.

In a new study, also conducted in colleges, Pfeffer and Langton found that greater dispersion and higher pay inequality contributed to lower job satisfaction. Remuneration directly related to performance and high wage inequality were both associated with lower levels of productivity. The authors conclude that organizational engagement should not be seen as a linear, rational process, which implies that a high level of commitment automatically leads to the adoption of a single type of behavior in a predictable manner. Another important suggestion is the need to study engagement in close connection with the cultural context in which organizations operate.

Conclusions

Beyond the fact that focusing on determining commitment and loyalty raises several ethical issues related to the use of mechanisms to control and manipulate people's behavior, the real contribution of commitment to maintaining or raising organizational performance is still quite ambiguous. In other words, inducing engagement as a motivational factor of performance could have positive consequences only in certain situations and, especially, in the context of the association with other motivational factors. Therefore, as has emerged from the results of the research presented, inducing commitment is an important mechanism used to build strong cultures, rather than an actual factor in motivating performance.

References

1. Agence Canadienne de Développement International (2018) – Leadership efficace, Convivium, Hull, Quebec;

2. Buzea C., Moasa H. (2021) - Human resource management, European Institute Publishing House, Bucharest;
3. Handy C. (1993) - Understanding organizations, London, Penguin Books;
4. Hodgetts R.M. (1980) - Modern human relations, The Dryden Press, Hinsdale, Illinois;
5. Inglehart R. (1997) - Modernization and postmodernization, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution - Non Commercial - No Derivatives 4.0 International License.