

Why should people perform poorly at all? When people cannot perform successfully in highly motivating tasks, the fault often does not lie within them: the fault is often that they have not been supplied by management with either the knowledge or the skills necessary to perform that function properly. From this it follows that you as the manager must be aware that allocating new or changed responsibilities to a staff member must be part of a package that ensures the employee receives the knowledge, skills training, and support needed to undertake those tasks successfully.

#### The second relates to **Individual Growth Needs**

Not everyone wants the opportunities for considerable self-direction, learning, and personal accomplishment at work that go along with jobs high in motivating potential. The psychological needs of each individual vary, and it is these needs that determine how individuals respond to such jobs. Given an identical suggested change in job package, one employee may see a chance to satisfy his or her inner needs for learning, developing and growing beyond their present state, while the other may feel threatened and balk at what he or she perceives as being "pushed" or stretched too far by the work. No one but the local manager, with experience in supervising employees both directly and indirectly, can assess these factors. As a manager you should not, however, make assumptions about your staff. If by the rotational nature of the service you lack personal background knowledge of the employee, then a talk with the staff member about his or her feelings towards the work would be the proper basis for assessing the strength of these needs.

#### The third relates to **Satisfaction with the Work Context**

The work itself and the personalities of the people doing it are not the only factors in job redesign. How satisfied people are with aspects of the work context may affect their willingness or ability to take advantage of the opportunities for personal accomplishment provided by enriched work. "Work context" refers to the contextual setting within which the work has to be performed: items such as the employees' feelings as to whether they feel they are being properly paid, concerns about job security, relationships with superiors and colleagues, previous negative experiences with technology and so forth. Any these past or on going problems will be brought up during the introduction of the change and may be magnified.

It is possible for employees to be so dissatisfied with the context of their current situation that all of their energy is absorbed in coping with these issues on a daily basis. The prospect of an enriched job, perhaps with more and wider responsibilities, will hold no appeal for them, and may indeed be very threatening. Only if the contextual problems are resolved will that employee be open to benefitting from enriched work.

Each of the above three factors may in its own right affect the responses of a person to a job, but they become especially significant when taken in combination. The "worst case scenario" is of the employee who is only marginally competent at the current job and has low needs for personal growth at work and is highly dissatisfied with the work context. A substantially "enriched" job would be too much for that individual, and negative personal and work outcomes could be predicted. It would be better, for the person as well as the organization, for the individual to perform relatively simple and routine work.