

# Motivation and Personality

Dr Punam Kumari

## 1. Introduction

There has been a great controversy with regard to the concept of personality. The study of personality could not attain scientific stature for long due to differences between theory and experiment. On the one hand, the experiment titlists concerned themselves with the hair-splitting of details of processes which bore only marginally on the organizational properties of personality. On the other hand, the theorists' emphasized the dynamism in personality and they theorized without any sound basis of experimental facts. Thus due to these two divergent view points, namely the behavior approach and the dynamic approach no unanimity could be reached in the definition of personality. Watson, the champion of the behavior approach viewed personality as the sum total of all activities that can be discovered by observation. The dynamic approach of personality was represented by Morton prince who held : personality is the sum-total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, appetites and instincts of the individual, and the acquired dispositions and tendencies acquired by experience from the close examination of these two divergent views it appears that neither of the two views is adequate to explain the nature of Personality. The activities are nothing unless there is a unifying concept which abstracts the common features from a number of activities, similarly, in order to understand the latent organizations of dispositions, impulses and tendencies some measures of manifest behavior are necessary. Allport has made an exhaustive survey of the literature on personality while discussing the concept of personality he distinguishes its 50 meanings including omnibus, integrative, hierarchical adjective distinctive and finally he (1937) states that "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment". By using term "dynamic organization" Allport views personality as developing system. To be clearer, personality traits do not exist independently, rather they are interrelated and act in an organized manner. From the use of the term "Psychophysical systems", It is clear that he recognized the fact that personality traits are neither exclusively mental nor exclusively physical, rather it refers to habits, attitudes, motives, etc which under lie behavioural acts. The term "Unique" refers to the uniqueness and individuality of the person. The term adjustment in Allport's definition has been taken to be Vagueness incarnate by William James and others, In order to remove these difficulties he modified his definition and used characteristic behaviour and thought in place of unique adjustment. Thus, he (1963) states that personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho physical systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought." Eysenck, in his famous book "Dimensions of personality" discusses the nature and meaning of Personality in detail. He begins his discussion by

considering two groups of definitions, namely, persona or Mask definition and Anima or substance definition. The first group emphasizes on superficial, outward and observable appearances and the second on inner organization within the individual. The first is associated with the behaviouristic non-mothetic approach, approach and the second with the analytical, ideographic approach.

Eysenck (1947) does not consider these two approaches antagonistic, rather he thinks them to be complementary. He explains clearly that inner organization of individual's fundamental needs and drives can be explained only on the basis of activities of the individual and observed behaviour can be accounted for by some kind of inner organization within the individual. So he agrees with warrens definition of personality which embraces both these view points. Warren (1934) speaks of Personality as "the integrated organization of all cognitive affective, cognitive, and physical characteristics of an individual as it manifests itself in focal distinctness to others. His own definition views personality as more or less stable or enduring organization of a person's character, temperament intellect and feeling, which determines his unique adjustment to the environment. In his researches Eysenck has adapted operational definition of personality. Catlell has also done the same thing, they have conceptualized personality in terms of certain dimension, and they have studied personality in terms of an individual's score on each of the dimensions. The author has preferred this view-point and studied certain personality dimensions to see their effects on risk- taking and son of behaviour of sons of service holders businessmen. After defining personality, it appears necessary to present here the main characteristic of neuroticism support the view held by Jung.

Almost everyone has achievement motive to some extent, but some people are consistently more oriented toward achievement than others. They are likely to surpass all others in their enthusiasm to improve their performances, particularly when they are challenged to do so. They demand more. It has been found that the stronger the achievement motive, the greater the probability that the individual will demand more of himself, the most outstanding aspect of the achievement motive is that it seems to make itself. That is why, the accomplishment and end in achievement motivated person does not always work for rewards only, but because he finds special joy in accomplishment. In fact, it means more to him than monetary reward. He finds great delight in doing difficult things and so he does not need to be bribed to do them. Money seems to be significant to him primarily because it is achievement with others, rather than as status symbol. Given a choice between a lucrative but easy course of action and challenging one that brings only a modest monetary reward, he is other things being equal, likely to choose the latter, For him the lure of profit is that of an objective measure of success in accomplishing a difficult task

and not one of making the most money for the least risk and effort. The latter course, which is by far the more economical or the two would more likely appeal to the person whose drive for achievement was rather low. It has been found in McClelland's research that while it would stretch the truth outrageously to claim that most venture some managers have been motivated solely by the desire for sheer accomplishment, it would not be far from the truth to that accomplishment accompanied by profit is a far stronger incentive to them a safe or easy profit by itself, McClelland has tested his theory by measuring levels of achievement among executives in several countries. The results show that the higher the level of achievement motivation, the more likely for the executives to rise to positions of greater power and responsibility. It can be pointed out that the achievement motive is related to managerial success because of the individual's attitude toward rewards. Most people are inclined to a particular degree of risk. Some people prefer a conservative approach that minimizes their exposure to losses. People with the high degree of achievement often fall in between the two. They prefer to incur a moderate degree of risk which is big enough to offer some excitement and the hope of a worthwhile gain but not so big that their own efforts would have less of an influence on the outcome than sheer luck. People having a weak achievement motive, prefer the extremes of risk-taking apparently because the outcome is far beyond their reach, so that they may not feel any sense of personal responsibility for what happens. They can account for their losses to chance and gains to their shrewdness. On the other hand, there are people who are likely to choose small risks where the gains are small but secure. Thus it is obvious that one's attitude toward

risks depends mostly on whether he likes to assume some degree of accountability for the results of the task he undertakes. A truly achievement-oriented person favors a moderate degree of risk, neither too high nor too low. While choosing a task for himself he likes to be fully aware of the influence he can exert on the outcome. He feels himself accountable for what happens. Naturally, therefore, he prefers to seek such a risk which is, of course, hard but not unattainable. This is precisely the chief characteristic of the achievement-oriented person. Achievement motivation makes people more realistic about themselves and about the goals they want to attain; they are aware of the fact that achievements do not come easily. They are likely to calculate their chances of success in a cool and detached manner; they do not behave like romanticists who think that they can master every challenge but like realists who happen to be fond of winning. So they select the challenges with a view not to waste energy on improbable adventures. They exhibit boldness in the face of the unknown and prudence in the case of the familiar. Hence they are better adapted by temperament to exploratory or competitive ventures than to well-established organizations which have matured to the point of smoothly operating traditions. Once they are committed to a certain task, they become pre-occupied with it until it has been completed. If, at all, they begin a task they must finish it because unfinished tasks weigh very heavily on their conscience. McClelland (1958) is of the opinion that in general, people with a high degree of achievement are realistic and action-minded than people with other kinds of motivational patterns. When the task requires personal initiative the achievement-motivated person is likely to surpass his competitors.

## Reference

1. Eysenk, H.J. (1947), *Dimension of personality*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited.
2. McClelland, D.C., (1958), "Risk Taking in children with high and low need for achievement" In Atkinson (Ed.) *Motives in fantasy, action and Society*, Princeton; Van Nostrand.
3. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 986-999.
4. Vidmar, N. (1970). Group Composition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 6, 153-166.