
Contents

List of figures and tables	ix
Preface and acknowledgements	xv
1 The role motivation theories	1
<i>Distinguishing characteristics of organizational types</i>	1
<i>Roles and motivations</i>	9
<i>Hypothesized criterion relationships</i>	25
<i>Portraits of the ideal</i>	29
<i>Chapter summary and overview of the book</i>	31
2 Role motivation theory in the wider theoretical context	33
<i>The limited domain approach</i>	33
<i>The value of parallel theorizing</i>	40
<i>Role motivation theories and substitutes for leadership</i>	42
<i>Validity of limited domain theories</i>	44
<i>Chapter summary</i>	55
3 Operationalizing role motivation theory variables	57
<i>Historical development of the Miner Sentence Completion Scales</i>	57
<i>The Oliver Organization Description Questionnaire (OODQ)</i>	69
<i>Reliability of the Miner Sentence Completion Scales</i>	75
<i>Examples of MSCS and OODQ scores</i>	86
<i>Chapter summary</i>	89
4 Validation of the hierarchic role motivation theory	91
<i>Validity within the theory's domain</i>	91
<i>Validity outside the theory's domain</i>	102
<i>Related literatures</i>	108
<i>Construct validation</i>	114
<i>Chapter summary</i>	126
5 Validation of the professional role motivation theory	129
<i>Validation within the theory's domain</i>	129
<i>Validity outside the domain and related literatures</i>	140

Construct validity	141
Chapter summary	143
6 Validation of the task role motivation theory	145
Validation within the theory's domain	147
Validity outside the domain and related literatures	163
Construct validity	165
Chapter summary	171
7 Changing role motivation experimentally	173
Managerial role motivation training	173
Effects of the experimental intervention	179
Effects outside the domain	193
Related literatures	198
Chapter summary	206
8 Changes in managerial talent supplies over time	207
Evidence of decline from the MSCS – Form H	208
Related literatures	218
The dynamics and etiology of decline	230
Chapter summary	236
9 International comparisons	238
Thailand, Iran, Nigeria, India, and varied Pacific nations versus the United States	239
Mexico versus the United States	245
Research in the People's Republic of China	250
Additional findings from beyond U.S. borders	255
Chapter summary	260
10 Age, race, and gender differences	262
Age differences	262
Race differences	270
Gender differences	275
Chapter summary	287
11 Looking back and looking forward	288
Criticism and controversy	288
Toward a single integrated theory: filling in the gaps	296
Putting role motivation theories to use	302
Chapter summary and concluding thoughts	311
References	313
Name index	338
Subject index	345

Figures and tables

FIGURES

1.1	Outline of the hierarchic role motivation theory	11
1.2	Outline of the professional role motivation theory	15
1.3	Outline of the task role motivation theory applied to entrepreneurial organization	18
1.4	Outline of the group role motivation theory	22
2.1	Locke and Henne's (1986) model of motivation	38
7.1	How the diagnosis and corrective action emphasis in managerial role motivation training relates to other human resource management activities	175
7.2	Tables of contents from books presenting managerial role motivation training	177
7.3	Outline of an achievement motivation training program	202

TABLES

2.1	Evaluations of 32 scientific theories	47
2.2	Frequency of nomination for high humanistic orientation theories, medium humanistic orientation theories, and low humanistic orientation theories by scholars with varying levels of humanistic values	52
2.3	Frequency with which scholars with strong, moderate, and weak humanistic values nominate high humanistic orientation, medium humanistic orientation, and low humanistic orientation theories	53
2.4	Estimated scientific validity and frequency of nomination for 32 theories for scholars with varying levels of humanistic values	54
3.1	Correlations between Kuder Preference Record Scales and management appraisal ratings	60
3.2	Correlations between the standard MSCS and an altered multiple-choice MSCS, and means for both measures	64

3.3	Correlations between free response MSCS and multiple-choice version in a sample of 64 General Motors Company managers – mean interval between administration: three months	65
3.4	MSCS – Form H multiple-choice version scores for managers in sociotechnical and traditional plants within the same company	68
3.5	Validation of the MSCS – Form H multiple-choice version in the Georgia Department of Human Resources – total and administrative samples	69
3.6	Mean OODQ scores in theory relevant samples	71
3.7	Reliability data for OODQ	71
3.8	MSCS scorer reliability data	77
3.9	Test–retest reliabilities over 10 plus weeks for the MSCS – Form H in a mixed sample of business managers, undergraduate business students, and undergraduate education students	79
3.10	Test–retest reliability data for the MSCS – Form H in a sample of 40 SUNY-Buffalo MBA students	81
3.11	Test–retest reliability data for the MSCS – Form H multiple-choice version and correlations with the Crowne–Marlow Social Desirability Index in a sample of 111 Clemson University undergraduate business students	81
3.12	Test–retest reliability data for the MSCS – Form T in a sample of 39 SUNY-Buffalo MBA students	81
3.13	Internal consistencies for the various MSCS measures	83
3.14	Validation of the MSCS – Form H multiple-choice version among Clemson University undergraduates	85
4.1	Concurrent validation within the domain of the hierarchic theory	92
4.2	Correlations between MSCS – Form H measures and the degrees of theory-congruent managerial orientation indicated in career planning documents	96
4.3	Predictive validation within the domain of the hierarchic theory	98
4.4	Correlations between MSCS – Form H scores at the beginning of army officer candidate school and end-of-course criterion measures	99
4.5	Percent of predictor–criterion relationships significant ($p < .05$) in each decade	100
4.6	Concurrent validation outside the domain of the hierarchic theory	103
4.7	Predictive validation outside the domain of the hierarchic theory	106

4.8	Results of a meta-analysis using MSCS-H total and subscale scores within and outside the hierarchic domain and combined across both domains	111
4.9	Results of a meta-analysis using MSCS-H total scores within the hierarchic domain	112
4.10	Correlations between MSCS – Form H measures and self-report items in two samples of graduate business students	116
4.11	Relationships between Miner Sentence Completion Scale – Form H and Ghiselli Self-Description Inventory	120
4.12	Correlations between MSCS – Form H total score and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, Gough Adjective Check List, and Myers–Briggs Type Indicator in a sample of 117 scientists and engineers	122
4.13	Results of a meta-analysis using MSCS-H total score in relation to certain of the ‘big five’ personality dimensions	123
4.14	Correlations between the MSCS – Form H and an experimental situation specific version	127
4.15	Correlations among MSCS – Form H subscale scores within the standard MSCS – Form H and its situation specific version in a sample of 138 automobile company managers	128
5.1	Correlations between MSCS – Form P and success measures among Academy of Management members	131
5.2	MSCS-P and OODQ scores of labor arbitrators working from various professional organizational contexts	134
5.3	Correlations between MSCS – Form P and success measures for labor arbitrator sample	135
5.4	Correlations between MSCS – Form P and success measures for arbitrators with a law degree and arbitrators considering law the primary occupation	137
5.5	OODQ and MSCS – Form P scores for special educators	138
5.6	Correlations between the MSCS – Form P and criteria within and outside the professional domain in Saudi Arabian samples	139
6.1	Comparison of MSCS – Form T scores for high growth entrepreneurs, low growth entrepreneurs, and manager-scientists in small firms	148
6.2	Correlations between MSCS – Form T and indexes of company growth and success	149
6.3	MSCS – Form T scores for entrepreneurs who at follow-up were no longer operating their firms, could not be located, and still remained with their firms	151
6.4	Comparison of MSCS – Form T scores of high growth entrepreneurs and managers	152

6.5	MSCS – Form T differences between entrepreneurs and managers in various countries	153
6.6	MSCS – Form T scores related to level of planning sophistication of the firm and to firm survival in the electronics industry	156
6.7	Questions used to measure entrepreneurial propensity	158
6.8	Relationships between MSCS – Form T scores and entrepreneurial criteria among business graduate students	159
6.9	OODQ and MSCS – Form T scores for entrepreneurs of different types	161
6.10	MSCS – Form T score levels in a single entrepreneurial firm	162
6.11	Differences between entrepreneurs who did and did not use various sources of start-up capital on the MSCS – Form T	167
7.1	Changes attributable to managerial role motivation training	180
7.2	Comparisons of experimental and control subjects at pretest and post-test on MSCS – Form H total score	183
7.3	Percent of significant ($p < .05$) improvements in experimental groups in different time periods	186
7.4	Subsequent success of managers with and without managerial role motivation training	187
7.5	Changes in MSCS – Form H scores when the hierarchic theory is and is not taught within managerial role motivation training	190
7.6	Mean amount of change from pretest to post-test across managerial role motivation training for individuals with different personality characteristics	192
7.7	Changes across the motivation to manage development course	197
7.8	Results of achievement motivation training in India	204
8.1	Changes in MSCS – Form H scores among University of Oregon undergraduate business students	209
8.2	Changes in MSCS – Form H scores among University of Maryland undergraduate business students	210
8.3	Changes in MSCS – Form H scores among Georgia State University undergraduate business students	211
8.4	Changes in MSCS – Form H scores among Portland State University undergraduate business students	212
8.5	Mean MSCS – Form H scores for older students who completed the MSCS during the 1970s	213
8.6	MSCS – Form H total scores obtained in student samples during the 1970s	214
8.7	MSCS – Form H scores for graduate business student samples in the 1980s	217

9.1	Comparison of MSCS – Form H scores for United States students and students from Thailand, Iran, Nigeria, India, and varied Pacific nations	241
9.2	Correlations between MSCS – Form H measures and self-report items in samples of students from outside the U.S.	244
9.3	Comparability analysis of the English and Spanish versions of the MSCS – Form H	247
9.4	Comparisons of MSCS – Form H scores for United States students and Mexican students studying in Mexico and in the United States	248
9.5	Correlations between MSCS – Form H measures and self-report items in samples of Mexican students	249
9.6	MSCS – Form H (revised) scores of Chinese and Hong Kong students	251
9.7	Comparison of the MSCS – Form H and the culturally adapted Chinese version	252
9.8	Culturally adapted MSCS – Form H scores adjusted to approximate standard Form H scores and percentile equivalents for U.S. managers	254
9.9	Relationship between MSCS – Form H measures and position level in Chinese samples	256
9.10	MSCS – Form H results for European students	259
9.11	Mean MSCS – Form P and Form H scores for employees of three Saudi Arabian organizations	260
10.1	Correlations between age and MSCS – Form P variables in different samples	267
10.2	Correlations between age and MSCS – Form T variables in different samples	269
10.3	Comparisons between black and white male managers at General Motors on various free response versions of the MSCS – Form H	271
10.4	Comparisons between black and white vocational educators in Georgia on the multiple-choice MSCS – Form H	273
10.5	Comparisons between black and white undergraduate students from 25 institutions on the multiple-choice MSCS – Form H	273
10.6	Comparisons between black and white management majors at 4 institutions on the multiple-choice MSCS – Form H	274
10.7	Comparisons between black and white managers at General Motors on various multiple-choice versions of the MSCS – Form H	274
10.8	Comparisons between the MSCS – Form H scores of male and female business students at the University of Oregon	276

10.9	Differences between males and females for MSCS – Form H measures	280
10.10	Categorical models for versions of the MSCS – Form H and status of subjects	281
10.11	Item-level analysis results for MSCS – Form H in six samples	284