**Theory X and Theory Y**

The second theory of motivation consists of two parts, theory X and theory Y, and is based on the work of Douglas McGregor. In his seminal piece, The Human Side of Enterprise Theory X is derived from three fundamental beliefs that McGregor considers collectively as the conventional views of management: 1. Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise—money, materials, equipment, people—for economic ends. 2. Management directs the efforts of personnel, motivates them, controls their actions, and modifies their behavior to fit the needs of the organization. 3. Without active intervention by management, people would ignore—even resist—organizational needs. They must, therefore, be persuaded, rewarded, punished, controlled; their activities must be directed. This is management's task. Theory X: The belief that in order to motivate employees, they must be rewarded, punished, persuaded, controlled, and directed toward activities and tasks specified by management.    Theory X is also based on a number of ancillary beliefs about individuals in organizations: they are lazy, lack ambition, are predominantly self-centered, are resistant to change, and on the whole are not too bright. This approach to management works to the detriment of meeting the higher needs of employees, as McGregor (1978:16) states: The carrot-and-stick theory does not work well at all once man has reached an adequate subsistence level and is motivated primarily by higher needs. Management cannot provide a man with self-respect or with the respect of his fellows or with the satisfaction of needs for self-fulfillment. It can create such conditions that he is encouraged and enabled to seek such satisfactions for himself, or it can thwart him by failing to create those conditions.    As a result of the inadequacy of this approach for meeting higher human needs, of which McGregor believes ego needs, social needs, and self-fulfillment needs to be the most important, he proposes an alternative view of management—theory Y, which views the human condition in an optimistic way. Theory Y is based on the following assumptions: 1. Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise—money, materials, equipment, people—for economic ends. 2. People are not ignorant of or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of their experience in organizations. 3. Motivation, potential for development, capacity for assuming responsibility, and readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these attributes themselves. 4. The essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives. Theory Y: The belief that higher-order needs—ego needs, social needs, and self-fulfillment needs—must be addressed by management in order to achieve organizational objectives and goals. Management is central to addressing these needs in the work setting.    Theory Y suggests, fundamentally, that management has a crucial role to play in motivating employees. More important, this approach to motivation suggests that there is a definite relationship between job satisfaction among employees and management style. This management approach has been supported by many in the police field, such as Roberg (1979), who argues that theory Y is more conducive than theory X to help police deal with the demands of competing groups in today's society. Furthermore, they argue that a system of supportive management is the most effective because it provides a satisfying work environment for the individual officer (Cordner, 1978). This conclusion seems to be equally applicable to prosecution, courts, and criminal corrections. But additional research on motivation and criminal justice operations needs to be conducted.    Although theory X has been the norm in traditional criminal justice organizations, theory Y deserves increased attention both by those interested in explaining motivation in these systems and by those who seek advice on how to motivate criminal justice employees. Owen (2006:179) does provide some insight on the importance of social support systems, job satisfaction, and locus of control to correctional supervisor stress levels. For correctional supervisors who have greater levels of social support, higher levels of job satisfaction, and more input or control over their workplaces, there is a likelihood of decreased levels of stress and possible increase in commitment to the workplace (Lambert, Hogan, and Tucker, 2009).    Moreover, we do have some insight into the motivation process among higher-level public administrators. For example, Downs (1967) suggests that the motives of employees are not always consistent with those of administrators. His model of motivation in public organizations is tied to aspects of both theory X and theory Y. According to Downs (1967:84–85), public administrators, such as those in the criminal justice system, have two types of motivations that are manifested in a number of goals. First, power, money, income, prestige, convenience, and security are all manifestations of self-interest (theory X), the motivating factor for many public administrators. Second, public administrators may, however, be motivated by altruism (theory Y), where the goals of loyalty, pride, desire to serve the public interest, and commitment to a specific program of action take precedence over self-interest goals (Rainey, 2014). Achievement–Power–Affiliation Theory The achievement–power–affiliation theory of motivation was originally developed by David McClelland (1965). McClelland (1965:322) suggests that people with high achievement (nAch) values do the following: 1. Seek to achieve success through their own efforts and not have their success attributed to other factors. 2. Work on projects that are challenging but not impossible. 3. Receive identifiable and recurring feedback about their work and avoid situations where their level of achievement is in question.

**Achievement–power– affiliation theory:**

 Motivation is predicated on high achievement, and people achieve success through their own efforts, through work on projects that are challenging but not impossible, through receiving feedback on their work, and through avoiding situations where their level of achievement is in question.    This last proposition was tested by Stoller (1977) in his analysis of the effect of feedback on police performance. He examined the relationship between feedback and increased police productivity as measured by issued citations. Increased performance was achieved by forty-eight of the fifty-four officers who received the feedback. This seems to be a recurring theme in much police research: consistent feedback from upper-level managers can promote increased productivity among line officers (Roberg, 1979:114). Other research done on police has indicated that many officers need to increase their level of responsibility and participation in decision making. Hernandez (1982) found in the Mesa, Arizona, police department that a “professional model” of policing, which involved participation in problem solving and decision making, increased the officers' level of commitment to the department and their level of motivation.    The second motive associated with this theoretical position is the power motive (nPow). A growing body of literature attempts to document the role that power plays in organizations, particularly in decision-making processes (Pfeffer, 1981; Porter, Allen, and Angle, 1981; Salancik and Pfeffer, 1977). The power motive can be defined as a person's need to have some type of influence over another's behavior, and this can be expressed in two ways. First, it may be in the form of personalized power, as manifested through an adversarial relationship. Person-to-person competition is emphasized, and domination is a byproduct. People are viewed simplistically as winners and losers, with the main goal being the achievement of power over others. Second, socialized power is impersonal and is expressed through a concern for others; it is employed by individuals who are sensitive to the fact that one person's gain means another person's loss. This type of power orientation is humanistic and is employed by those in leadership roles in social organizations (Tosi, Rizzo, and Carroll, 1986:228).    The high affiliation need (nAff) is one in which persons are motivated by friendships, cooperative working relationships at work, and the development of a high degree of mutual understanding. Persons with high affiliation needs have been traditionally associated with managerial success (Robbins and Judge, 2007:194). We see this evidenced in many police organizations and correctional organizations. In many police agencies, for example, the power of affiliation is expressed in how tasks are performed and goals achieved, yet it is not clear how high affiliation translates into higher levels of motivation among police officers. Organizational behavior research has examined the dynamic tension that exists among employees who have differential levels of achievement (nAch), power (nPow), and affiliation (nAff).    This presentation of the achievement–power–affiliation theory of motivation enables us to see how the factors of achievement, power, and affiliation are instrumental in the motivation of individuals. Surely we can say that individuals are motivated by the quest for achievement, power, affiliation, or all three. Little research supports either of these positions completely, but we do know, for example, that achievement, as defined by promotion, is important in the police field. Gaines, Tubergen, and Paiva (1984) concluded that promotions are extremely important in meeting the needs of police officers. In particular, they found that for some officers, higher needs were more important than lower needs and that promotion was, in part, related to the satisfaction of those needs. In effect, the officers' desire to achieve, in this case through promotion, was crucial to their levels of motivation.    With respect to the power motive and criminal justice personnel, research has been done primarily within correctional institutions. Stojkovic (1984) documents the types of socialized power within inmate social systems and how they affect the operation of a prison. Socialized power among corrections officers was also explored by Hepburn (1985) and by Stojkovic (1987). Specific bases of socialized power were employed by both inmates and officers to complete their respective job assignments and tasks. For example, corrections officers considered the use of legitimate power—reasonable instructions and rules—a useful tool in motivating prisoners to do what is expected of them. In addition, the use of coercive power or force was not rated highly by corrections staff as a way of gaining compliance among prisoners. Power as a motivational tool has also been documented by research on corrections administrators (Stojkovic, 1986).

 **Expectancy Theory**

Expectancy theory, based on the belief that if a certain amount of effort is put forth, a calculated outcome will result, is a rational approach to motivation. This theory posits that police work, for example, relies on an expectation among police officers that their efforts will produce a reduction in crime. The individual officer's motivation to perform depends, in part, on reduced crime rates. From an idealistic perspective, rational activity on the part of the police officer should reduce crime and increase the officer's satisfaction. Expectancy theory: A rational theory of motivation that posits that a certain amount of work will result in a calculated outcome.    We summarize the concepts of expectancy theory here (Tosi, Rizzo, and Carroll, 1986:240). A basic concept is that performance equals motivation times ability. Performance is a function of the individual's ability to complete the task along with the motivation to do the task. More important, if neither motivation nor ability is present, then there will be no performance. Motivation and ability are related in a multiplicative fashion.    An expectancy is the likelihood that an event or outcome will occur. Expectancies take two forms. The first form is effort–performance expectancies, in which the person believes that a specific level of effort will result in a particular performance. The police officer, for example, may believe that a connection exists between the level of patrol activity and the crime rate in the precinct. In short, there is a correlation between the amount of work done and the end result, which in this example is the amount of crime in a specific area. The second form is performance–outcome expectancies, in which the person has an “expectation about the relationship between a particular level of performance and attaining certain outcomes” (Tosi, Rizzo, and Carroll, 1986:243). In this form of expectancy, the police officer may believe that a relationship exists between activity and a positive evaluation from superiors that is ultimately expressed in some type of reward, such as a promotion. However, the relationship between police activity and crime rates is somewhat problematic. If, for example, there is a low probability that police activity will lead to an actual reduction in crime, then it is difficult to see how one can reward individual police officers to produce the desired performance—that is, reduced crime. In addition, if it is unlikely that the officer will gain any reward from the activity, he or she will not be motivated to do the activity. As a result, we would expect that the motivational levels of individual officers would be low because there is a low probability that their work activity produces the desired performance. Therefore, the individual officer may not choose crime reduction as an outcome. More important, the officer may have a stronger desire for other outcomes, typically those that are attainable and rewarded consistently by the police organization.    Valences are the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction produced by various outcomes. In brief, they are the individual's estimate of the advantages or disadvantages of a particular outcome. In the police example, if the effort required to produce a reduction in crime does not lead to a satisfactory level of reward from the organization, this activity has a low positive valence; it is not worth the effort to pursue the activity knowing the low level of reward attached to the effort.    Tosi, Rizzo, and Carroll (1986:243–244) discuss how expectancy theory can be expanded to include other factors that affect the motivational level of employees. They argue that motivation is a function of expectancies and valences. Ability is a function of performance potential and organizational factors. Performance results from motivation and ability and leads to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The level of performance affects the effort–performance expectancies. The rewards received for performance affect performance–outcome expectancies in later periods, and rewards also affect satisfaction.    Interpreting and applying this model to police officer motivation, we can say that first, the individual motivational levels of police officers are a function of what they expect and what valence they assign to their various activities. Second, the ability of an officer to do the job is a function of the officer's performance potential or the range of skills used in the achievement of objectives (Tosi, Rizzo, and Carroll, 1986:244). These skills may be limited by structural factors, such as job descriptions, policies, and technology. Arresting all known criminals, for example, would be impossible because of the limited resources of police organizations and the policies of the organization toward full enforcement of the law (Goldstein, 1990).    Third, when police activity leads toward some performance and that performance is a function of motivation and ability, then we would expect that a reward would follow. If an increase in arrest activity leads to an increase in pay or a promotion, then the officer receives an extrinsic reward for the performance. In addition, if arresting individuals provide the community with a safe environment and give the officer a good feeling about doing the job, the officer receives an intrinsic reward; this reward is typically self-administered by the individual. Many have suggested that a clearly identified reward structure within police departments is what is needed to properly motivate officers (Gaines, Tubergen, and Paiva, 1984:265–275). However, others have argued quite persuasively that these rewards are few and far between and are limited by the structure of many police departments. Conser (1979:286) contends that motivation is difficult in police organizations because the opportunities for advancement and promotion are limited. He recommends a number of mechanisms that would raise the motivational levels of officers, including merit pay packages, extra vacation leaves, and extra pay for education. Nevertheless, some research suggests that extrinsic rewards, such as increased pay and promotion, are only a small part of the motivation of police officers. Intrinsic rewards, such as achievement (Baker, 1976), are just as valuable. More important, it seems clear that proper motivation of specific officers requires a multitude of management strategies.    Fourth, when an officer perceives that a level of performance will consistently produce a similar positive outcome from the organization, such as a reward, this perception will affect future expectancies; this process is nothing but learning by the officer and reinforcement by the organization through the reward structure. As the police officer learns that ticket writing, for example, is positively rewarded by the organization, the officer will continue to perform the activity until rewards are discontinued by the organization. In effect, the performance expectancy is a function of reinforcement and feedback by the organization (Stoller, 1977:57).    Finally, if the police officer is consistently rewarded, both extrinsically and intrinsically, then we can say that he or she has a high level of satisfaction with the organization. Conversely, if the police officer is not receiving rewards, then we can expect that dissatisfaction is high and will continue to stay at this level until modifications are made. Criminal justice managers need to be aware of and sensitive to the level of dissatisfaction if organizational objectives are to be met (Witham, 1980:10–11).    In an attempt to apply expectancy theory to policing, DeJong, Mastrofski, and Parks (2001) tested it as an explanation for variation in police office problem solving. The researchers found that the theory did well in explaining what types of officers engaged in more problem solving. In particular, this research noted that there was a clear difference between officers who were more “traditional” in their orientation when compared to officers who were community policing oriented on the dimension of problem solving. The latter type of officer was motivated by recognition that the work performed (problem solving) was valued by the police organization. By granting a community policing assignment to an officer, the department was providing great recognition, and this, in turn, allowed the officer to creatively address problems on the beat. The key determinant is the degree to which officers are granted autonomy to make decisions regarding problem selection and solution. For traditionally structured criminal justice organizations, such autonomy is problematic.    How does increased autonomy impact employee behavior such that levels of commitment and motivation stay high and are in concordance with organizational goals? The answer to this question raises not only a concern regarding employee motivation but also issues of job design, supervision, and leadership. For now, we can say that there is support for expectancy theory in the criminal justice literature, but as noted by DeJong, Mastrofski, and Parks (2001:60), more research is needed before a definitive position on expectancy theory and its application to criminal justice employee motivation can be made.

 **Equity Theory**

Equity theory holds that an individual's motivation level is affected by her or his perception of fairness in the workplace and that individual motivation must be understood in relation to how other employees are treated by management and the organization. Equity theory stresses the importance of fairness in the organization and how employees perceive its application in the workforce. In addition, equity theory rests on two fundamental assumptions: Individuals evaluate their interpersonal relationships as they would any other commodity; and individuals develop expectations about their evaluation in the organization equivalent to the amount of individual contributions they make. As such, an examination of both inputs and outputs is critical to understanding and applying equity theory. Equity theory: A theory of motivation that is based on perceived fairness among employees regarding treatment in the workplace.    Inputs are those items brought into the organization by the individual. Common examples of input include age, seniority, training, and education, to mention a few. Outputs are the visible products of individual effort. Examples of outputs are promotion, salary or pay, recognition, and benefits. All inputs and outputs are not weighted the same. For some police officers, for example, the value of experience “on the street” is weighted much more heavily than educational attainment. As an organizational input, these same officers would view the outcome of pay to be determined more by experiential level than by educational level. For them, the weighting of work experience would be higher and deserving of greater reward. For other officers, the reverse may be true. It is the differential level of attachment to various inputs and outputs that makes equity theory problematic.    Every individual in the organization determines the relative weights of inputs and outputs. It is the ratio of a person's outcomes to inputs relative to the ratio of outputs to inputs of others that determines the level of perceived equity. Inequity occurs when the individual perceives the ratio of outcomes to inputs to be unequal. The potential negative consequences of this perceived inequity concern both managers and administrators of organizations. For criminal justice organizations, the perception of inequity is fostered by a number of factors beyond the control of administrators. The rigid structure of public contracts, for example, limits the ability of criminal justice organizations to deal effectively with perceived inequities. In addition, it is difficult for employees to feel motivated if they perceive a disjuncture between their work performance and their pay in relation to the work performance and pay of similarly situated employees. As such, it is reasonable that some research has identified this perception of inequity as causing a loss of morale and motivation among public sector employees (Schay, 1988).    For criminal justice managers, this perception of inequity can have negative effects on the motivation of employees. What can be done? Research has suggested two strategies. First, criminal justice administrators can do everything in their power to see that employees are treated equitably. One of the advantages of a union contract is that it equalizes, for the most part, everyone in the organization, yet it still can produce inequity among those who feel they are performing better than most other employees but receive no greater financial payoff for their efforts. Despite this situation, criminal justice administrators can do a great deal to ensure equitable treatment of employees, including having clearly articulated policies and procedures and applying them to all employees in a fair and consistent manner. Criminal justice administrators can best reduce perceptions of inequity if employees perceive equal application of the rules and regulations, even in organizations where remuneration is perceived to be low for work performed.    Second, emphases on aspects of the job other than pay can be brought to employees' attention. Within criminal justice organizations, employees perform a number of duties that go beyond pay considerations. Pay scales as a primary motivation device for police officers, for example, are a poor incentive. Pay incentives typically do not exist in most criminal justice organizations. Instead, we can stress to subordinates that the problem-oriented focus of their work provides them with much autonomy, which can be motivating.    Such freedom allows greater individual expression and input on how tasks can be performed. Similar observations can be made about the work of probation and parole agents, as well as those who work in correctional institutions. Such considerations can be expressed to employees by administrators and managers through job design efforts, training, and employee evaluation and supervision approaches. Such efforts can mitigate the adverse effects of perceived pay inequities among employees within criminal justice organizations.    A growing body of research in organizational behavior also suggests that questions of equity must be placed in the context of larger issues of justice within organizations. Two concepts within this evolving discussion are procedural justice and interactional justice (Robbins and Judge, 2007:206–207). The former stresses the importance of process and explanation as to why certain outcomes occurred in an organization. When, for example, a correctional officer feels that an outcome concerning pay or promotion is unfair, the appropriate response on the part of management is to explain the reasons for that outcome. Employees have to feel that the outcome is explainable and thus equitable. Such a concern puts a very heavy emphasis on management to explain its decisions through a structure that is accessible to employees.    The second concept, interactional justice, regards how employees are treated and the degree to which dignity, concern, and respect are afforded them. For criminal justice employees, these issues become more relevant to their individual levels of motivation when financial remuneration and promotion are limited. Being treated fairly and with respect goes a long way in positions where the primary motivation to perform is limited and it appeals to more intrinsic rewards that are crucial to effective employee performance.    Henderson, Wells, Maguire, and Gray (2010) suggest that the issue of equity and fairness in criminal justice organizations goes a long way to increase both legitimacy and compliance among subordinates. Defined as “procedural justice,” the emphasis is on fair procedures and equal treatment of members in the community and those for whom we invoke the criminal justice process. While these authors note the methodological and measurement properties of capturing procedural justice within criminal justice organizations, they firmly support procedural justice outcomes as having benefit to managing subordinates and offenders within correctional settings.