De Theatro Motivarum, Motivation: In Search of Essentials. Research on a Theoretical Model of the Process of Motivation and on Critical Determinants of Interference

Mennes, M.A.

Citation

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	[Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](https://hdl.handle.net/1887/39174)
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/39174

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

Leiden University Repository

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/39174 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Mennes, M.A.
Title: De Theatro Motivarum, Motivation: In Search of Essentials. Research on a Theoretical Model of the Process of Motivation and on Critical Determinants of Interference
Issue Date: 2016-06-14

Chapter 11
De Theatro Motivarum
Implications

The Process of Motivation, analyzed and represented by a Model, produced corresponding constructs capturing Motivation, which, in turn, enabled to analyze and describe a Process of Interference, and to define optimal Conditions and Competencies to address Motivation through design of an Instrument within an Intrinsic Modality.

Following a presentation of the final conclusions in Chapter 9, this study was to expand beyond results for which empirical evidence was obtained, in an overview of so-called 'Implications', as proposed in the Pre-Fundamentals at the start of the dissertation. In Chapter 1.5., provisions were made for an 'ex post' inductive inference following the traditional deductive testing on which the final conclusions were based.

Where Fundamental Assumptions initially served to reduce a complex interaction, this reduction, both in its representation of Motivation, and in its representation of Interference, appeared to provide an adequate basis leading to significant results, as

summarized in these conclusions.

Following observations made in Chapter 1.5., from the conclusions made in this study, then, we might assume that the Process of Motivation, as represented by the Model, provides an adequate description of Motivation, and that the distinction made in the Process of Interference, in Determinants and in Extrinsic and Intrinsic Modalities provides an adequate framework for a successful approach to Management of Motivation.

If these assumptions hold true, Implications are many.

In a final and closing Chapter of this study, an overview is provided of Implications of the study for a Theatro Motivarum. The speculative nature of these Implications is reflected in a series of inspired headings given to the Chapters covering the four main fields of interest[1]. These four Chapters, expanding with further thoughts into the Epilogue, are to be this study's legacy.

May they serve to inspire further research, thought and understanding in the fields of Motivation and in Management of Motivation...

11.1. *De Homine*
The Process of Motivation: Implications for the Individual

A Model of Motivation was presented and observed on properties thought to be associated to a manifestation of presumed Mechanisms. Assuming the Model provides an adequate description of the Process of Motivation, a first Implication would entail a departure from conventional theories on human Motivation.

In the study, the Process of Motivation is represented, not in terms of a uniformistic 'status quo', or a behavioral activity instigated by needs or drives, by reinforcement, cognitions, anticipations, or learning abilities, but rather as an intricate composite of all those constructs and processes.

Motivation is assumed to be a pluriform expression of a multitude of distinct Processes of Motivation, each evolving around an objective set, each objective generating its own Process of Motivation, and proceeding, as captured by the Model, through distinct Stages according to eight Phases. Some Processes of Motivation remaining at an initial Phase 1, some Processes proceeding through Phases 1, 2 and 3, others progressing through all consecutive Phases.

---

[1] With reference to the title of the study, 'De Homine' (literally 'about man') is a free translation referring to the Individual. Chapter 11.2., 'De Societate', refers to Society; Chapter 11.3., 'De Tractatio' ('about treatment'), to management; Chapter 11.4., 'De Principes' ('about leading men') , to Leadership.

A number of key concepts appear to regulate this intricate Process of Motivation, as represented by the Model. The Goal, or objective, can be expressed in differing degrees of importance, or 'Significance', leading to various degrees of invested Effort. And these, in turn, can lead to several strategies, deterring or avoiding effects not only on personal evaluations in Phases 1, 2 and 3, but also, and especially, regulating effects of Reality in Phases 5, 6 and 7.

These concepts and associated strategies, as expressed in various 'Mechanisms', appear to have profound Implications on how the Process of Motivation unfolds and is expressed by the Individual.

1. Significance

Assigning Significance, or importance, to the objective makes one vulnerable, both to 'internal', and to 'external' influences. Internally, as assigning Significance to the objective, provides Satisfaction when one obtains one's Goal, but comes at the expense of Frustration when one fails at the attempt. Externally, the interfering repercussions of Reality become more pronounced.

The Implication is that Significance of the objective appears to regulate to a great extent the Process of Motivation.

2. Effort

In addition, investing Effort in obtaining an objective, increases chances of Achievement, leading to Satisfaction. At the same time, however, it also increases chances of Frustration, as a consequence of a possible Failure.

The Implication is that Effort appears to regulate a balance between Satisfaction and Failure. The more Effort, the more Satisfaction, at the expense of a risk of Frustration.

3. Significance & Effort

As a consequence, the relation between Significance of the objective and Effort appears to be non-linear. The more Significant an objective the less likely it becomes that Effort is invested, as the risk of Failure becomes more manifest, and, as a consequence of Significance, becomes more pronounced in perceived feelings of Frustration. With higher Significance, a resulting Satisfaction might increase, at the risk, however, that Frustration could intensify.

As a result, the relation between both entities is likely to be curvilinear, reaching towards an optimum, and then declining towards zero[1].

4. Coping

A deterring effect is assumed to occur in Mechanisms of Coping. A confrontation with Reality leads to re-attunements in a Phase of Expectancies. Having experienced the effects of Reality, Mechanisms of Anticipation are initiated to counteract these effects[2]. In these Mechanisms of Anticipation, one turns to previous experiences, especially from a Phase of Dedication. It is assumed in the Model, that in a Phase of Dedication a Representation was made of Reality as a spin-off to feelings of support and non-support as experienced by the Individual[3]. And the objective and parameters are now re-attuned, not to the 'original' version of Reality, but in response to this Representation. A Mechanism of Representation substitutes Reality and superimposes a more convenient image. The intricate interplay of Mechanisms is subsequently consolidated in Phases 5, 6 and 7, through Mechanisms of Coping, shortly referred to as 'Coping'[4].

Coping aims at reducing Impact, or a Discrepancy between Goal and perceived Reality. Mechanisms of Coping, by transposing an image over Reality obtained through Mechanism of Representation, neutralize effects of Reality in case of a negative influence, and enhance its effects in case of a positive outcome. And in doing so, the 'integrity' of the objective is preserved, and the disrupted carefully orchestrated cocoon designed around an objective, is re-installed towards its original design.

Thus, as a further Implication, it is assumed that Coping has a preserving and protective function towards the Process of Motivation. As such, it serves a restorative and therapeutic purpose for the Individual.

5. Significance & Coping

However, it appears these effective preserving and protecting properties come at a price.

---

[1] These assumptions, in turn, would have pronounced Implications in the field of economic theorizing, where linearity is assumed between concepts associated with Effort and investment or expenditure, and those associated with Significance of the objective.

[2] Reference is made to Chapter 3.3.2.1. and Appendix I, Section B.2.1. and Section B.2.2.

[3] Reference is made to Chapter 3.3.2.2., Chapter 3.3.2.4., and Appendix I, Section B.2.4, Section B.2.5., Section B.2.6., Section B.2.7. and Section B.2.8.

[4] Reference is made to Chapter 3.3.2.3., and Appendix I, Section B.2.5. and B.2.6.

Significance of the objective regulates the Process of Motivation. The more important the objective, the more one tends to preserve its 'integrity'. The more protective these measures, the more likely disruptive effects will occur at the introduction of Reality. And the more disruptive a perceived Reality, the more pronounced the effects of Coping.

Thus, Significance of the objective leads to Coping. The more Significant the objective, the more likely protective measures are used to encapsulate Reality, the more Coping is likely to occur, either in a positive, enhancing direction, or in a negative, neutralizing sense.

Through consecutive cycles in the Process of Motivation, it is assumed the Individual, through Mechanisms of Coping, will come to drift further away from Reality. The more Significant the objective, the more explicit the expressions in Coping. And the more Coping, the more Reality is changed.

The Implication, in turn, of these observations, is that the more Significant one's objective, the more adrift one's perception of Reality becomes.

6. Effort & Coping

The more Coping, the more one's Effort or investment is preserved against a disruptive interference from Reality.

The observation summarizes the various inferences made in observing the Process of Interference: the more the Individual is provided an opportunity at Coping from an outside Actor-Intervener, the more productive the Individual becomes.

The observation substantiates the 'counter-intuitive' Implication for Management of Motivation: an Intrinsic Modality of Intervention, instigated through Reality, and aiming at expressions of Coping and thereby neutralizing its Impact, results in increased Productivity at the obvious expense of Control.

7. Significance, Effort & Coping: on 'Achieving Excellence'

The more Significant an objective, then, the more cautious we appear to become in investing Effort. Despite an increased chance of obtaining Success, the risk of investing Effort also brings an increased risk of Failure, leading to more pronounced feelings of Frustration. In addition, interference from Reality becomes more prominent, resulting in more pronounced effects of Coping.

Consequently, one might assume that investing Effort at the higher extremes of Significance requires exceptional courage in fighting both fear of Failure and Impact of Reality.

The Implication appears to be that only few develop strategies to persist in investing

Effort in highly Significant objectives. If achieving excellence can be considered as an act of investing Effort in highly Significant objectives, these observations could clarify why only precious few endeavor in such attempts.

If these assumptions are true, a further Implication would be an alternative definition of excellence: achieving excellence is assumed to consist of mastering adequate personal strategies to invest Effort in highly Significant objectives, resisting fear of Failure, in view of an obstructive Reality.

8. All Things Significant are Discrepant

In summary, then, Significance assigned to an objective leads to Coping. The more Significant the objective, the more likely protective measures are used to encapsulate Reality, either in a positive, enhancing direction, or in a negative, neutralizing sense. A Mechanism of Coping changes a perception of Reality and makes one perceive Reality as more Discrepant from a 'true', or manifest Reality.

It follows, that the more Significant an objective, the more pronounced these Mechanisms of Coping, and the more Discrepant Reality becomes.

As a final conclusion, then, one might infer a tendency that 'all one holds as Significant, is Discrepant from Reality'...

11.2. *De Societate*
The Process of Motivation: Implications for Society

Mechanisms of Coping, then, are a 'natural' reaction to deal with Reality when it seems to interfere with an objective we perceive as Significant. It aims at reducing the Impact, or Discrepancy between Goal and perceived Reality. As such, it appears to have a preserving, restorative and even therapeutic purpose for the Individual.

It appears that in interaction with others, we seek confirmation for these attempts at dealing with an interfering Reality. We share Mechanisms of Coping. This sharing of a primarily 'inner dialogue' aimed at reducing a highly personal perception of Reality in relation to a highly personal Significant objective, is likely to produce a vast array of miscommunications.

However, in one instance of seeking confirmation in attempts at neutralizing interference from Reality through Coping, an interpersonal expression of Coping appears to be highly effective. When one shares a common Goal, with a comparable degree of perceived Significance, the expression of Coping is likely to be recognized and confirmed as pursuing a same intention towards neutralizing interference from Reality. In the expression of Coping, one shares a same strategy. And a reciprocal confirmation re-affirms the mutual expression of Coping, which further intensifies the interpersonal recognition.

If these reciprocal expressions, with a common origin in shared Significance of the objective and in shared perceptions of an interfering Reality, are 'channeled' through media in larger groups with equivalent views, a collectively shared expression of Coping could emerge, which, in turn, serves to further unify and strengthen communal relations.

The occurrence of so-called 'Mechanisms of Collective Coping', shortly referred to as 'Collective Coping', serve to neutralize a shared perception by a group of an interfering Reality, which is obstructing a shared Significant objective to express itself.

Collective Coping is a self-propelling communal Mechanism to preserve the integrity of a highly valued common Goal. In its expression, two tendencies occur with further important Implications.

In an Implication of findings, Collective Coping is defined as a self-propelling communal Mechanism to preserve the integrity of a highly valued common Goal by neutralizing Interference from an obstructing Reality.

Where Significance of one's objective and perception of Reality are seldom communicated, Coping tends to be the foremost expression in communication. A first Implication of this tendency would be that in large area's of interpersonal communication, where Collective Coping is expressed, one seeks to obtain support without sharing its 'origins', in terms of Significance in objective and perceptions of Reality. As a consequence, communication occurs around neutralizing Mechanisms. One is not conveying content, but rather seeking confirmation. Further miscommunication occurs when Collective Coping is manifested, pretending to be content-oriented. Public discussion and debate appear to be frequent expressions of this tendency.

A second Implication is a direct result of the inherent function of Coping: it aims at changing perceived Reality in a direction that sustains one's Significant objective. The more Significant the objective, the more explicit the expressions of Coping. And the more Coping, the more Reality is changed. The Implication for Mechanisms of Collective Coping is that in shared expressions aimed at neutralizing a common perception of Reality, people collectively alienate themselves from Reality. The more Significant the issue, the more adrift a collective perception of Reality becomes. And the less opportunities emerge for reaching adequate and lasting solutions.

11.3. *De Tractatio*
The Process of Interference: Implications for Management of Motivation

The insights obtained on the Process of Motivation produced an adequate framework for Management of Motivation, of which empirical research provided first findings in support of the assumptions made.

If we are to assume these findings can be generalized to a comprehensive approach in addressing Motivation, this could imply that the distinction made in Extrinsic and Intrinsic Modalities provides an adequate framework for a successful approach to Management of Motivation.

Within both Modalities, two distinct approaches were thought to be best in Management of Motivation: one approach among four alternatives within the Extrinsic Modality, and one approach from four within the Intrinsic Modality.

The major distinction differentiating an Extrinsic Approach to Management of Motivation from an Intrinsic Approach, lies in the aim to control the objective of an Individual by an external agency, or 'Actor-Intervener'. As such, one acquires Control at the expense, however, of Productivity. The Individual refines the Goal to accommodate an external Actor-Intervener, which manifests itself through Reality. The more an external objective is imposed, the more 'foreign' the parameters become, the less Effort, in terms of Productivity is likely to be produced. And, as stated earlier, Significance of the objective, Effort and Coping profoundly regulate these processes[1].

The major distinction, then, differentiating an Intrinsic Approach to Management of Motivation, from an Extrinsic Approach, is in the absence of Control in defining the objective of an Individual by an Actor-Intervener. One acquires Productivity at the expense, however, of regulation through Control. The Individual defines the Goal and has full power in defining Significance, Effort and Coping. As such, the integrity of the objective is optimally maintained, resulting, within personal limitations imposed by Mechanisms of Coping, in an optimal Effort, hence Productivity. Opportunities to externally Control these processes, however, are dramatically reduced. Referring to Implications made earlier, the effects of Significance of the objective, Effort and Coping are amplified, at the expense of outside interference.

However, these assumptions are not meant to categorize management techniques or a personal management style as being either Extrinsic or Intrinsic in its Approach to Management of Motivation. Rather, management techniques are to alternate between both Approaches in addressing the Individual. Thus, in Management of Motivation multiple transitions per Individual per objective are to become prevalent, rather than a current practice of uniformity in predominantly Extrinsic techniques.

11.4. *De Principes*
The Process of Interference: Implications for Leadership

If these assumptions hold true, Management of Motivation, then, consists of two opposed Modalities: the Extrinsic Modality enabling Control at the expense of Productivity, and an Intrinsic Modality propelling Productivity, at the expense of external Control.

From these observations on Management of Motivation, an approach to leadership emerges, with repercussions on classification in traditional leadership-styles.

Current leadership theories emphasize the role of context, or situation, in the

---

[1] Reference is made to Chapter 7.2.1. and Appendix XXIV, Section B.2., notably Section B.2.7.

expression of specific attributes needed, and only seldom is Motivation identified as a core competency (Latham, 2007). A 'single state' approach in leadership, be it 'directive', or 'non-directive', 'process-' or 'people-'oriented, suggests that in a multitude of activities a single approach prevails. If the assumptions that are made on an adequate Management of Motivation hold true, the approach does not do justice to the complexity of situations in which a leader is to operate. In terms of Control, effects appear to be adequate; in terms of Productivity, however and following our observations, they might appear to be superficial. Leadership is not so much dependent on context, or situation, (or, as it often does, solely on preferred leadership style), but rather on continuous alterations between control and productivity, between prevalence on leadership-oriented decision, or on member-oriented potential, as instigated by context, or situation.

Thus, leadership is to evolve and progress into a style, that is not solely depending on context, or situation, but rather on leader-instigated prevalence on either Control or Productivity by multiple, dynamic transitions between Extrinsic and Intrinsic Modalities instigated by context, or situation, and dependent on directive needs of the leader, or potential resources of the member.

In leadership, then, the interaction prevails. And depending on context, or situation, leadership continuously envisions which actor in the interaction gets preference. In an Intrinsic Modality, Control recedes and the needs of the member, or employee are addressed to their full potential, generating an optimal Productivity. In an Extrinsic Modality, Control expands and the needs of the leader prevail, thereby restraining Productivity.

Thus, leadership is oriented towards the needs of the actors within the interaction: it is an 'Interactional Leadership'.

Interactional Leadership is a leadership style that is guided primarily by the needs of its actors, where either leader-oriented Control, or member-oriented potential prevails, depending on context, or situational circumstances. Interactional Leadership is characterized by a pluriform approach with multiple, dynamic changes between Extrinsic and Intrinsic Modalities.

Within the Intrinsic Modality, a further diversification can be made into an Interpersonal Approach and an Intrapersonal Approach.

The Interpersonal Interactional Leadership Approach aims at initiating a dialogue between leader and members based on the Intrinsic Attitudinal and Technical Competencies introduced in the study.

The Intrapersonal Interactional Leadership Approach manifests itself on rare occasions in an expression of leadership using equivalent Intrinsic Determinants inducing Motivation. Only in an Intrinsic Technical Competency of Providing Passive Assistance, a leader approaches an interfering Reality differently by expressing an alternative Coping strategy. Instead of assisting a member in Coping, the leader presents an alternative voice by modeling Coping, which is left to the member to either follow, or reject.

11.5. *De Theatro Motivarum*
Summary of Principal Implications

As proposed in the Pre-Fundamentals at the start of the dissertation in Chapter 1.5., this study was to expand beyond results for which empirical evidence was obtained, in an overview of so-called 'Implications'.

In a final and closing Chapter of this study, an overview is provided of Implications of the study for a Theatro Motivarum. These Implications are considered to be this study's legacy.

From the conclusions made in this study, it was assumed the Process of Motivation, as represented by the Model, provided an adequate description of Motivation, and that the distinction made in the Process of Interference, in Extrinsic and Intrinsic Modalities provided an adequate framework for a successful approach to Management of Motivation.

In the study, the Process of Motivation, as represented by the Model of Motivation, was assumed to be an 'inner dialogue' initiated by the Individual, largely regulated by subconscious Mechanisms, where an attempt was made to reach and secure an objective set, and to limit the effects of outside interferences. It was assumed that every Process of Motivation evolved around an objective, and progressed in a number of distinct, consecutive Stages, that were organized in Phases. Significance attached to the objective set, the Effort invested and Mechanisms of Coping aimed at addressing interference from Reality, together regulated this intricate Process towards attaining the objective.

A Mechanism of Coping was assumed to be a 'natural' reaction to deal with Reality when interfering with an objective that was perceived as Significant. As such, it had a preserving, restorative and even therapeutic purpose for the Individual.

It appeared that in interaction with others, the Individual was seeking confirmation for these attempts at dealing with an interfering Reality. When one shared a common Goal, with a comparable degree of perceived Significance, the expression of Coping was likely to be recognized and confirmed as pursuing a same intention towards neutralizing interference from Reality. If these reciprocal expressions were to be 'channeled' in larger groups with equivalent views, a collectively shared expression of Coping was likely to emerge, which in turn, served to further unify and strengthen communal relations. The occurrence of so-called 'Mechanisms of Collective Coping' served to neutralize a shared perception by a group of an interfering Reality, which was obstructing a shared objective to express itself. Thus, Collective Coping appeared to be a self-propelling communal Mechanism to preserve the integrity of a highly valued common Goal.

Furthermore, in Management of Motivation, the study identified two main approaches: an Extrinsic Modality enabling Control at the expense of Productivity, and an Intrinsic Modality propelling Productivity, at the expense of Control, where management techniques were to alternate between both Approaches in addressing the Individual.

From these observations on Management of Motivation an approach to leadership emerged, with repercussions on classification in traditional leadership-styles.

Interactional Leadership was defined as a leadership style that was guided primarily by the needs of its actors, where either leader-oriented Control, or member-oriented potential prevailed, depending on context, or situational circumstances. Interactional Leadership was characterized by a pluriform approach with multiple, dynamic changes between Extrinsic and Intrinsic Modalities. Within the Intrinsic Modality, a further diversification was made in an Intrinsic Interpersonal Interactional Leadership Approach and an Intrinsic Intrapersonal Interactional Leadership Approach. The Intrinsic Interpersonal Approach aimed at initiating a dialogue between leader and members based on the Intrinsic Attitudinal and Technical Competencies introduced in the study. The Intrinsic Intrapersonal Approach manifested itself on rare occasions, in an expression of leadership modeling alternative Coping strategies.