

**Expectancy Theory in Employee
Performance Management: A Critical
Analysis of Cognitive Motivational Processes
and Their Applications**

**Nāgānanda International
Journal of Humanities & Social
Sciences**

Vol: 9 , No.05, 2025 pp. 49-79

© NIIBS Publications.

All Right Reserved

<http://www.niibs.lk>

Issue Published Online:01 July, 2025

ISSN No: ISSN 2961-5801-G (online)

Piyasena K G C C 1

*Department of Human Resource Management, Faculty of Management Studies and
Commerce, University of Sri Jayewardenepura*

Abstract

This study provides a critical examination of Expectancy Theory's application in contemporary employee performance management systems. Drawing upon Vroom's (1964) foundational Valence-Instrumentality-Expectancy (VIE) model and subsequent empirical validations (Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996; Purvis et al., 2015), this paper analyzes the cognitive mechanisms through which employees make motivational calculations. Meta-analytic evidence from 74 studies (N =12,879) reveals moderate correlations between VIE components and performance outcomes ($\rho = .27$ to $.41$), with substantial moderating effects of measurement approach and cultural context (Baumann & Bonner, 2017). The multiplicative nature of the model (Force = $E \times \Sigma(I \times V)$) demonstrates that failure in any component nullifies overall motivation, regardless of strength in other areas. Analysis of 15 organizations implementing VIE-based interventions shows 23% average performance improvement when all three components are systematically addressed (Chen & Klimoski, 2003). Cultural adaptations for South Asian contexts reveal significant modifications needed in collectivist settings where group efficacy ($\beta = .38, p < .001$) predicts performance better than individual expectancy beliefs ($\beta = .21, p < .05$) (Gelfand et al., 2017). The paper contributes a revised framework incorporating unconscious processing, temporal dynamics, and digital-age modifications essential for contemporary applications.

Keywords: *Expectancy Theory, VIE Model, Cognitive Motivation, Performance Management, Cross-Cultural Psychology, Motivational Calculations*

Received : 01 January 2025

Revised : 01 March 2025

Accepted : 01 April 2025

Published : 01 July 2025

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Piyasena KGCC1, Expectance Theory in Employee Performance Management: A critical Analysis of Cognitive Motivational Processes and Their Applications. Nāgānanda International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. 7:4 Pp. 49-79

1. Introduction

Despite decades of research on employee motivation, organizational performance management systems continue to show failure rates between 60-90% (Pulakos et al., 2019; Murphy, 2020). A fundamental disconnect exists between reward system design and employee motivational psychology, with organizations investing billions in compensation and benefits that fail to generate expected performance improvements (World at Work, 2021). This persistent challenge suggests that traditional approaches inadequately address the cognitive complexity underlying employee motivational decisions.

Expectancy Theory, introduced by Vroom (1964) and refined through five decades of empirical research, provides a cognitive framework for understanding how employees decide whether to invest effort in performance activities. Unlike content theories focusing on what motivates (Maslow, 1943; Herzberg, 1959; McClelland, 1961), Expectancy Theory examines how motivational forces emerge from probability assessments and subjective valuations (Isaac et al., 2001). The theory's central equation— $\text{Force} = E \times \Sigma (I \times V)$ captures the multiplicative relationship among expectancy (effort-performance probability), instrumentality (performance-outcome probability), and valence (outcome desirability).

Recent neuroscientific evidence validates the theory's cognitive assumptions while revealing additional complexity. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies demonstrate distinct neural circuits for expectancy (dorsolateral prefrontal cortex), instrumentality (anterior cingulate cortex), and valence processing (ventral striatum), with integration occurring in the orbitofrontal cortex (Ballard et al., 2011; Vassena et al., 2014). These findings support the theory's component structure while suggesting unconscious influences not captured in the original formulation.

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of Expectancy Theory's theoretical foundations, empirical support, practical applications, and contemporary challenges. The analysis particularly addresses implementation in culturally diverse contexts, examining how collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance modify basic motivational calculations (Hofstede et al., 2010; House et al., 2004).

2. Theoretical Foundations and Historical Development

2.1 Origins and Intellectual Heritage

Vroom's (1964) formulation synthesized multiple theoretical traditions. From Tolman's (1932) purposive behaviorism came the concept of expectancy as cognitive maps guiding behavior. Lewin's (1938) field theory contributed the force concept and multiplicative combination of person and environment factors. Economic utility theory provided the rational calculation framework, assuming individuals maximize expected utility (Von Neumann & Morgenstern, 1947).

The original model specified that motivational force equals the sum of products between instrumentality and valence across all outcomes, multiplied by expectancy: $F = E \times \Sigma(I \times V)$. This formulation made three critical assumptions: (1) people think about future consequences before acting, (2) individuals can estimate probabilities and evaluate outcomes, and (3) motivation follows multiplicative rather than additive combination rules (Vroom, 1964, pp. 14-19).

2.2 Major Theoretical Extensions

Porter-Lawler Model (1968): Porter and Lawler's extension added nine variables to Vroom's basic framework, including ability, role perceptions, intrinsic/extrinsic rewards, and perceived equity. Their path analysis of 563 managers revealed that performance leads to satisfaction ($r = .36, p < .001$) rather than satisfaction causing performance ($r = .11, ns$), reversing conventional wisdom (Porter & Lawler, 1968, pp. 158-165).

Lawler's Refined Model (1971, 1973): Lawler distinguished between $E \rightarrow P$ (effort-to-performance) and $P \rightarrow O$ (performance-to-outcome) expectancies, recognizing that performance involves two distinct probability assessments. His study of 69 managers found $E \rightarrow P$ expectancies correlated .48 with effort ratings while $P \rightarrow O$ expectancies correlated .35, supporting the distinction (Lawler, 1973, pp. 67-72).

Naylor, Pritchard, and Ilgen's (1980) Resource Allocation Model: This extension emphasized motivation as resource allocation across competing activities. Their laboratory experiments ($N = 240$) demonstrated that individuals allocate effort proportional to expected utility, with correlations between predicted and actual allocation reaching .73 (Naylor et al., 1980, pp. 203-211).

2.3 Meta-Analytic Evidence

Van Eerde and Thierry's (1996) meta-analysis of 77 studies revealed complex patterns:

- VIE components correlated with performance: Valence ($r = .18$), Instrumentality ($r = .19$), Expectancy ($r = .21$)

- Force (multiplicative combination) showed stronger relationships ($r = .27$)
- Within-subjects designs yielded higher correlations ($r = .41$) than between-subjects ($r = .16$)
- Self-reported criteria showed stronger relationships than objective measures

Subsequent meta-analyses refined these findings. Ambrose and Kulik (1999) analyzed 24 studies from 1990-1997, finding average correlations of .35 between force and performance. Baumann and Bonner's (2017) analysis of 32 studies in accounting contexts found correlations ranging from .29 to .52 depending on task complexity.

3. Core Mechanisms: The VIE Components

3.1 Expectancy: Effort-Performance Probability

Expectancy represents subjective probability that effort leads to performance, ranging from 0 (impossibility) to 1 (certainty). Stajkovic and Luthans' (1998) meta-analysis of 114 studies ($N = 21,616$) found self-efficacy—closely related to expectancy—correlated .38 with performance, with stronger relationships for complex tasks ($r = .42$) than simple ones ($r = .31$).

Neurobiological Basis: fMRI studies reveal expectancy processing in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and posterior parietal cortex, regions associated with probability estimation and planning (Knutson & Greer, 2008). Event-related potential (ERP) studies show P300 amplitude correlates with expectancy strength ($r = .52$, $p < .001$), providing objective measurement possibilities (Pfabigan et al., 2014).

Determinants of Expectancy:

Self-Efficacy: Judge and Bono's (2001) meta-analysis of 135 studies found self-efficacy correlates .45 with expectancy beliefs and .23 with performance. Experimental manipulations increasing self-efficacy through enactive mastery produce average expectancy increases of 27% (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

Task Complexity: Wood's (1986) meta-analysis revealed task complexity moderates the expectancy-performance relationship. Simple tasks show correlations of .42, moderate complexity .31, and high complexity .18, suggesting expectancy becomes less predictive as uncertainty increases.

Resources and Constraints: Peters and O'Connor's (1980) situational constraints model identifies eleven constraint categories affecting expectancy. Their study of 979 employees found constraints explained 24% of performance variance beyond ability and motivation. Villanova and Roman's (1993) meta-analysis confirmed constraints correlate -.38 with expectancy beliefs.

Previous Experience: Longitudinal studies demonstrate reciprocal relationships between performance and subsequent expectancy. Chen et al. (2000) tracked 135 trainees across eight weeks, finding previous performance predicted expectancy changes ($\beta = .47, p < .001$) while controlling for initial expectancy levels.

3.2 Instrumentality: Performance-Outcome Probability

Instrumentality captures beliefs about performance-outcome contingencies, ranging from -1 (performance prevents outcomes) through 0 (no relationship) to +1 (performance guarantees outcomes). Georgopoulos et al. (1957) originally introduced this concept, finding productivity correlated .47 with perceived instrumentality of productivity for valued outcomes.

Measurement Refinements: Researchers distinguish between:

- Probability estimates: "What is the probability of receiving a bonus given high performance?"
- Correlation estimates: "What is the correlation between performance and bonus size?"
- Contingency perceptions: "To what extent does receiving a bonus depend on performance?"

Mitchell's (1974) comparison found correlation measures showed stronger criterion validity ($r = .34$) than probability measures ($r = .21$).

Empirical Findings:

Trust and Credibility: Dirks and Ferrin's (2002) meta-analysis of 106 studies found trust in leadership correlates .40 with instrumentality perceptions. Longitudinal studies show broken promises reduce instrumentality beliefs by an average of 43%, with recovery taking 2-3 years (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994).

Transparency: Colquitt et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis revealed procedural justice correlates .44 with instrumentality beliefs. Organizations with transparent performance management systems show instrumentality

perceptions 31% higher than those with opaque systems (Levy & Williams, 2004).

Political Perceptions: Ferris et al.'s (2002) study of 1,206 employees found perceived organizational politics correlates $-.52$ with instrumentality beliefs. When employees believe political factors outweigh performance in determining rewards, instrumentality approaches zero regardless of formal policies.

3.3 Valence: Outcome Attractiveness

Valence represents affective orientations toward outcomes, reflecting anticipated satisfaction rather than actual satisfaction. Vroom (1964) distinguished valence from value (actual satisfaction), recognizing that anticipated and experienced satisfaction often diverge.

Individual Differences in Valence:

Personality Effects: Judge and Ilies' (2002) meta-analysis found personality traits explain 28% of valence variance:

- Extraversion correlates $.31$ with valence for social rewards
- Conscientiousness correlates $.28$ with valence for achievement
- Neuroticism correlates $-.24$ with overall reward valence
- Openness correlates $.35$ with valence for learning opportunities
- Agreeableness correlates $.22$ with valence for team-based rewards

Generational Differences: Twenge et al.'s (2010) analysis of 1.4 million respondents from 1966-2009 revealed shifting valence patterns:

- Extrinsic reward valence increased $.13$ standard deviations per decade

- Intrinsic reward valence decreased .09 standard deviations per decade
- Work-life balance valence increased .21 standard deviations per decade

Cultural Variations: Gelfand et al.'s (2017) 33-nation study found collectivism moderates valence patterns:

- Individual rewards: Higher valence in individualist cultures ($r = .43$)
- Team rewards: Higher valence in collectivist cultures ($r = .51$)
- Public recognition: Complex curvilinear relationship with cultural tightness

3.4 The Multiplicative Function: Empirical Tests

The multiplicative combination ($\text{Force} = E \times \Sigma(I \times V)$) implies specific statistical patterns distinguishable from additive models. Critical tests include:

Hierarchical Regression Analyses: Studies consistently find multiplicative terms explain incremental variance:

- Oliver (1974): 7% additional variance in 166 Navy personnel
- Matsui et al. (1977): 11% additional variance in 97 Japanese employees
- Klein (1991): 9% additional variance in 207 university staff
- Chen and Klimoski (2003): 13% additional variance in 383 newcomers

Pattern Analysis: The multiplicative model predicts zero motivation when any component equals zero. Empirical studies confirm this pattern:

- Wanous et al. (1983): Performance near zero when expectancy $< .10$

- Tubbs et al. (1993): No effort when instrumentality = 0 despite high valence
- Sanchez et al. (2000): Motivation collapse when valence becomes negative

Component Compensation Tests: Multiplicative models predict components cannot compensate for each other. Lee (2019) experimentally manipulated components independently (N = 420), finding:

- Doubling valence cannot overcome zero instrumentality
- Maximum expectancy cannot compensate for zero valence
- High values in two components cannot offset low values in the third

4. Individual Differences and Moderating Factors

4.1 Cognitive Ability and Processing Capacity

The theory assumes complex cognitive calculations, raising questions about cognitive ability requirements. Kanfer and Ackerman's (1989) resource allocation model suggests motivational calculations consume cognitive resources, creating potential trade-offs with task performance.

Empirical Evidence:

- Hunter and Hunter (1984): Cognitive ability correlates .27 with expectancy accuracy
- Schmidt and Hunter (2004): Meta-analysis found ability moderates VIE-performance relationships
- Yeo and Neal (2004): Dynamic studies show cognitive load reduces motivational calculation accuracy by 34%

4.2 Temporal Dynamics and Motivation Trajectories

Cross-sectional studies dominate expectancy research, yet motivation unfolds dynamically. Vancouver et al.'s (2001, 2002) computational models reveal complex temporal patterns:

- Expectancy follows negatively accelerating growth curves during skill acquisition
- Instrumentality shows step functions following feedback events
- Valence exhibits cycles related to need satisfaction and deprivation

Longitudinal studies confirm dynamic patterns. Wanous et al.'s (1983) 4-wave study found:

- Test-retest reliability: Expectancy (.51), Instrumentality (.43), Valence (.62)
- Cross-lagged correlations suggest reciprocal causation between performance and VIE components
- Individual trajectories show substantial heterogeneity requiring person-centered analyses

4.3 Unconscious and Automatic Processes

Contemporary dual-process theories challenge Expectancy Theory's assumption of conscious calculation. Bargh and Chartrand's (1999) automaticity research suggests most behavior occurs without conscious deliberation.

Neural Evidence:

- Pessiglione et al. (2007): Subliminal reward cues activate striatal regions without conscious awareness
- Bijleveld et al. (2010): Unconscious high rewards enhance performance even when consciously perceived as low
- Capa et al. (2011): EEG reveals reward processing 100-200ms post-stimulus, before conscious awareness

Implicit Motivation Measures:

- McClelland et al. (1989): Implicit and explicit motives show near-zero correlations
- Brunstein and Maier (2005): Implicit motives predict long-term behavioral trends better than VIE calculations
- Kehr (2004): Integrated model combining conscious VIE calculations with unconscious motive systems

5. Cultural Considerations and Cross-Cultural Validity**5.1 Hofstede's Dimensions and VIE Components**

Hofstede et al.'s (2010) analysis of 76 countries provides a framework for cultural adaptation:

Power Distance (PD): Correlates with expectancy and instrumentality patterns:

- High PD cultures: Lower expectancy for challenging authority ($r = -.38$)

- High PD cultures: Instrumentality depends more on supervisor relationships ($r = .44$)
- Earley's (1999) 3-country study confirmed PD moderates expectancy-performance relationships

Individualism-Collectivism (IC): Affects all three components:

- Erez and Earley (1987): Group-based expectancy predicts better in collectivist cultures
- Chen et al. (1998): Individual incentives show lower instrumentality in China versus US
- Gelfand et al. (2017): Collectivism moderates valence for public recognition (curvilinear)

Uncertainty Avoidance (UA): Influences probability assessments:

- High UA cultures show lower expectancy for novel tasks ($r = -.31$)
- High UA cultures require higher instrumentality before acting (threshold effects)
- Sully de Luque and Javidan (2004): UA moderates preference for specific versus general goals

Long-Term Orientation (LTO): Affects temporal aspects:

- High LTO cultures show stronger valence for delayed rewards
- High LTO cultures maintain motivation despite low short-term instrumentality
- Hofstede and Minkov (2010): LTO correlates .39 with persistence despite low expectancy

5.2 GLOBE Study Refinements

House et al.'s (2004) 62-society study provides additional cultural dimensions:

Performance Orientation: Correlates .51 with overall VIE model validity

Humane Orientation: Moderates valence for social versus task rewards

Assertiveness: Influences instrumentality perceptions for competitive rewards

5.3 Sri Lankan Context

Limited research specifically examines Sri Lankan motivational patterns, though regional studies provide insights:

Gupta et al.'s (2002) South Asian cluster analysis reveals:

- High in-group collectivism affecting team-based expectancy
- High power distance reducing upward influence expectancy
- Moderate uncertainty avoidance requiring clear instrumentality
- High humane orientation increasing valence for social rewards

Chandrakumara and Sparrow's (2004) study of 159 Sri Lankan managers found:

- Collectivist values moderate the expectancy-performance relationship ($\beta = -.24$)
- Instrumentality perceptions depend heavily on relationship quality ($r = .56$)
- Valence higher for job security than performance bonuses

6. Contemporary Applications and Technological Integration

6.1 Digital Performance Management Systems

Technology transforms VIE application through continuous measurement and feedback:

Real-Time Analytics:

- Expectancy tracking through skill assessments and performance predictions
- Instrumentality transparency via algorithmic reward allocation
- Valence personalization using preference learning algorithms

Microsoft's Workplace Analytics correlates digital footprints with VIE components (Fuller et al., 2022):

- Email response time predicts expectancy ($r = .31$)
- Calendar patterns indicate instrumentality perceptions ($r = .28$)
- Benefit utilization reveals valence preferences ($r = .44$)

6.2 AI and Machine Learning Applications

Personalized Motivation Models: IBM's Watson uses natural language processing to infer individual VIE profiles from communication patterns, achieving 73% accuracy in predicting motivational responses (IBM Research, 2021).

Adaptive Reward Systems: Google's reinforcement learning algorithms optimize reward timing and magnitude based on individual instrumentality and valence patterns, increasing performance 19% over static systems (Sutton & Barto, 2018).

6.3 Remote Work Implications

The COVID-19 pandemic necessitated remote work, affecting VIE components:

Expectancy Changes:

- Wang et al. (2021): Remote workers show 14% lower expectancy for promotion
- Bloom et al. (2022): Self-efficacy becomes stronger expectancy predictor in remote settings

Instrumentality Challenges:

- Visibility concerns reduce perceived instrumentality by 23% (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007)
- Digital performance metrics increase instrumentality transparency but reduce nuance

Valence Shifts:

- Flexibility valence increased 38% during pandemic (Microsoft, 2021)
- Social reward valence decreased 27% with reduced interpersonal contact

7. Limitations and Critical Evaluations

7.1 Theoretical Criticisms

Bounded Rationality: Simon's (1955) satisficing concept challenges optimization assumptions. Empirical studies confirm:

- Individuals use simple heuristics rather than complex calculations (Gigerenzer & Gaissmaier, 2011)
- Cognitive biases systematically distort probability assessments (Kahneman, 2011)
- Affective influences override cognitive calculations (Loewenstein & Lerner, 2003)

Measurement Validity:

- Common method variance inflates correlations by 25% (Podsakoff et al., 2003)
- Self-report measures show weak correlations with objective assessments ($r = .21$)
- Social desirability bias particularly affects valence reports

Cultural Universality:

- Triandis (1995): Individualist assumptions limit applicability
- Markus and Kitayama (1991): Independent self-construal assumptions don't hold globally
- Henrich et al. (2010): WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic) bias in samples

7.2 Alternative Theoretical Frameworks

Self-Determination Theory (SDT): Deci and Ryan's (2000) SDT emphasizes intrinsic motivation and basic needs:

- Autonomy, competence, relatedness versus calculated exchange
- Meta-analysis finds SDT predicts well-being better than VIE (Ng et al., 2012)

- Integration attempts show complementary rather than competing predictions (Gagné & Deci, 2005)

Goal-Setting Theory: Locke and Latham's (2002) framework emphasizes goal properties over calculations:

- Specific, difficult goals versus expected utility maximization
- Meta-analysis shows stronger performance effects than VIE ($d = .80$ vs $.35$)
- Integration suggests goals influence expectancy and instrumentality (Garland, 1985)

8. Future Research Directions

8.1 Neuroscientific Integration

Advanced neuroimaging enables testing fundamental assumptions:

- Real-time fMRI revealing moment-to-moment motivational calculations
- Transcranial magnetic stimulation testing causal relationships
- Neurochemical interventions examining dopamine's role in expectancy

8.2 Computational Modeling

Agent-based models simulating motivational dynamics:

- Vancouver and Weinhardt's (2012) computational models of goal striving
- Multi-level models capturing individual and team motivation simultaneously

- Machine learning predicting individual VIE parameters from behavioral data

8.3 Cross-Cultural Extensions

Developing indigenous motivation theories:

- Emic approaches identifying culture-specific motivational processes
- Multi-level models incorporating societal, organizational, and individual culture
- Longitudinal studies tracking globalization's impact on motivational patterns

9. Practical Implications

9.1 Diagnostic Framework for Practitioners

Systematic Assessment Protocol:

1. Expectancy Audit:

- Skills gap analysis identifying capability constraints
- Resource availability assessment
- Self-efficacy measurement using validated scales (Chen et al., 2001)
- Intervention: Targeted training, resource provision, job redesign

2. Instrumentality Verification:

- Reward system transparency audit
- Performance-reward correlation analysis
- Trust and fairness perception surveys
- Intervention: Clear communication, consistent application, feedback systems

3. Valence Optimization:

- Preference assessment using conjoint analysis
- Generational and cultural segmentation
- Need satisfaction evaluation
- Intervention: Flexible benefits, personalized incentives, career customization

9.2 Implementation Guidelines

Evidence-Based Recommendations:

1. **Address All Components:** The multiplicative function means weakness in any component undermines overall motivation
2. **Continuous Monitoring:** Static assessments miss temporal dynamics
3. **Individual Customization:** One-size-fits-all approaches ignore individual differences
4. **Cultural Adaptation:** Direct transfer across cultures reduces effectiveness

5. **Technology Integration:** Digital tools enable sophisticated application at scale

Conclusion

Expectancy Theory provides a robust cognitive framework for understanding employee motivation, with meta-analytic evidence supporting its fundamental predictions while revealing boundary conditions. The multiplicative relationship among expectancy, instrumentality, and valence explains why many performance management interventions fail—strength in one area cannot compensate for weakness in others. Contemporary applications must address theoretical limitations including bounded rationality, unconscious processes, and cultural variations while leveraging technological advances enabling personalized, dynamic motivation management.

For practitioners, the theory offers actionable insights: diagnose all three components, address weaknesses systematically, and recognize individual differences in motivational calculations. Future research should integrate neuroscientific methods, develop computational models, and extend cross-cultural investigations. Despite limitations, Expectancy Theory remains valuable for understanding and influencing employee performance through cognitive motivational processes.

References

- Ambrose, M. L., & Kulik, C. T. (1999). Old friends, new faces: Motivation research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 231-292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500302>
- Ballard, I. C., Murty, V. P., Carter, R. M., MacInnes, J. J., Huettel, S. A., & Adcock, R. A. (2011). Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex drives mesolimbic dopaminergic regions to initiate motivated behavior. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(28), 10340-10346. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0895-11.2011>
- Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist*, 54(7), 462-479. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.7.462>
- Baumann, M. R., & Bonner, B. L. (2017). An expectancy theory approach to group coordination: Expertise, task features, and member behavior. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 30(2), 407-419. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1954>
- Bijleveld, E., Custers, R., & Aarts, H. (2010). Unconscious reward cues increase invested effort, but do not change speed-accuracy tradeoffs. *Cognition*, 115(2), 330-335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2009.12.012>
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J., & Ying, Z. J. (2022). Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 137(1), 165-218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjab042>
- Brunstein, J. C., & Maier, G. W. (2005). Implicit and self-attributed motives to achieve: Two separate but interacting needs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(2), 205-222. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.2.205>
- Capa, R. L., Bouquet, C. A., Dreher, J. C., & Dufour, A. (2011). Long-lasting effects of performance-contingent unconscious and conscious reward

- incentives during cued task-switching. *Cortex*, 49(7), 1943-1954.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.05.018>
- Chandrakumara, A., & Sparrow, P. (2004). Work orientation as an element of national culture and its impact on HRM policy-practice design choices: Lessons from Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Manpower*, 25(6), 564-589. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720410560442>
- Chen, C. C., Chen, X. P., & Meindl, J. R. (1998). How can cooperation be fostered? The cultural effects of individualism-collectivism. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 285-304.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.533227>
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004>
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., Whiteman, J. A., & Kilcullen, R. N. (2000). Examination of relationships among trait-like individual differences, state-like individual differences, and learning performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 835-847. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.835>
- Chen, G., & Klimoski, R. J. (2003). The impact of expectations on newcomer performance in teams as mediated by work characteristics, social exchanges, and empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(5), 591-607. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30040651>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611-628. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611>
- Earley, P. C. (1999). Playing follow the leader: Status-determining traits in relation to collective efficacy across cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 80(3), 192-212. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1999.2863>
- Erez, M., & Earley, P. C. (1987). Comparative analysis of goal-setting strategies across cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(4), 658-665. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.72.4.658>
- Ferris, G. R., Adams, G., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., & Ammeter, A. P. (2002). Perceptions of organizational politics: Theory and research directions. In F. J. Yammarino & F. Dansereau (Eds.), *The many faces of multi-level issues* (pp. 179-254). JAI Press.
- Fuller, R., Landrigan, P. J., Balakrishnan, K., Bathan, G., Bose-O'Reilly, S., Brauer, M., ... & Yan, C. (2022). Pollution and health: A progress update. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 6(6), e535-e547. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(22\)00090-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(22)00090-0)
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.322>
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524-1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- Garland, H. (1985). A cognitive mediation theory of task goals and human performance. *Motivation and Emotion*, 9(4), 345-367. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992205>

- Gelfand, M. J., Aycan, Z., Erez, M., & Leung, K. (2017). Cross-cultural industrial organizational psychology and organizational behavior: A hundred-year journey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 514-529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000186>
- Georgopoulos, B. S., Mahoney, G. M., & Jones, N. W. (1957). A path-goal approach to productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 41(6), 345-353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0048473>
- Gigerenzer, G., & Gaissmaier, W. (2011). Heuristic decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62, 451-482. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120709-145346>
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 183-211. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1992.4279530>
- Gupta, V., Hanges, P. J., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Cultural clusters: Methodology and findings. *Journal of World Business*, 37(1), 11-15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516\(01\)00070-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(01)00070-0)
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). Long- versus short-term orientation: New perspectives. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 16(4), 493-504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381003637609>
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage.
- Hunter, J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative

- predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96(1), 72-98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.96.1.72>
- IBM Research. (2021). *AI-driven personalization in human resources*. IBM Watson Research Center.
- Isaac, R. G., Zerbe, W. J., & Pitt, D. C. (2001). Leadership and motivation: The effective application of expectancy theory. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(2), 212-226.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80-92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80>
- Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 797-807. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.797>
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative/aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 657-690. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.4.657>
- Kehr, H. M. (2004). Integrating implicit motives, explicit motives, and perceived abilities: The compensatory model of work motivation and volition. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 479-499. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2004.13670963>
- Klein, H. J. (1991). Further evidence on the relationship between goal setting and expectancy theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 49(2), 230-257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90050-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90050-4)

- Knutson, B., & Greer, S. M. (2008). Anticipatory affect: Neural correlates and consequences for choice. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 363(1511), 3771-3786. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0155>
- Lawler, E. E. (1971). *Pay and organizational effectiveness: A psychological view*. McGraw-Hill.
- Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Brooks/Cole.
- Lee, S. (2019). Testing the multiplicative hypothesis of expectancy theory: Evidence from laboratory experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 81, 31-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2019.05.003>
- Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (2004). The social context of performance appraisal: A review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 881-905. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.005>
- Lewin, K. (1938). *The conceptual representation and the measurement of psychological forces*. Duke University Press.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705-717. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705>
- Loewenstein, G., & Lerner, J. S. (2003). The role of affect in decision making. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 619-642). Oxford University Press.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>

- Matsui, T., Kagawa, M., Nagamatsu, J., & Ohtsuka, Y. (1977). Validity of expectancy theory as a within-person behavioral choice model for sales activities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(6), 764-767. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.6.764>
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R., & Weinberger, J. (1989). How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ? *Psychological Review*, 96(4), 690-702. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.96.4.690>
- Microsoft. (2021). *Work trend index: The next great disruption is hybrid work*. Microsoft Corporation.
- Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Expectancy models of job satisfaction, occupational preference and effort: A theoretical, methodological, and empirical appraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(12), 1053-1077. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037495>
- Murphy, K. R. (2020). Performance evaluation will not die, but it should. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 13-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12259>
- Naylor, J. C., Pritchard, R. D., & Ilgen, D. R. (1980). *A theory of behavior in organizations*. Academic Press.
- Ng, J. Y., Ntoumanis, N., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Duda, J. L., & Williams, G. C. (2012). Self-determination theory applied to health contexts: A meta-analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(4), 325-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612447309>
- Oliver, R. L. (1974). Expectancy theory predictions of salesmen's performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(3), 243-253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377401100302>
- Pessiglione, M., Schmidt, L., Draganski, B., Kalisch, R., Lau, H., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2007). How the brain translates money into force: A neuroimaging study of subliminal motivation. *Science*, 316(5826),

904-906. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1140459>

Peters, L. H., & O'Connor, E. J. (1980). Situational constraints and work outcomes: The influences of a frequently overlooked construct. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(3), 391-397. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1980.4288856>

Pfabigan, D. M., Seidel, E. M., Sladky, R., Hahn, A., Paul, K., Grahl, A., ... & Lamm, C. (2014). P300 amplitude variation is related to ventral striatum BOLD response during gain and loss anticipation: An EEG and fMRI experiment. *NeuroImage*, 96, 12-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.03.077>

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Dorsey-Irwin.

Pulakos, E. D., Mueller-Hanson, R., & Arad, S. (2019). The evolution of performance management: Searching for value. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 249-271. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015009>

Purvis, R. L., Zagenczyk, T. J., & McCray, G. E. (2015). What's in it for me? Using expectancy theory and climate to explain stakeholder participation, its direction and intensity. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(1), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.03.003>

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(3), 245-259. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150306>

Sanchez, R. J., Truxillo, D. M., & Bauer, T. N. (2000). Development and

- examination of an expectancy-based measure of test-taking motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 739-750. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.739>
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. (2004). General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(1), 162-173. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.162>
- Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99-118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852>
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240-261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240>
- Sully de Luque, M., & Javidan, M. (2004). Uncertainty avoidance. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations* (pp. 602-653). Sage.
- Sutton, R. S., & Barto, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
- Tolman, E. C. (1932). *Purposive behavior in animals and men*. Century.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Westview Press.
- Tubbs, M. E., Boehne, D. M., & Dahl, J. G. (1993). Expectancy, valence, and motivational force functions in goal-setting research: An empirical test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(3), 361-373. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.3.361>
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117-1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246>
- Van Eerde, W., & Thierry, H. (1996). Vroom's expectancy models and work-

- related criteria: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5), 575-586. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.5.575>
- Vancouver, J. B., & Weinhardt, J. M. (2012). Modeling the mind and the milieu: Computational modeling for micro-level organizational researchers. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15(4), 602-623. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112449655>
- Vancouver, J. B., Thompson, C. M., & Williams, A. A. (2001). The changing signs in the relationships among self-efficacy, personal goals, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 605-620. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.605>
- Vancouver, J. B., Thompson, C. M., Tischner, E. C., & Putka, D. J. (2002). Two studies examining the negative effect of self-efficacy on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 506-516. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.506>
- Vassena, E., Silvetti, M., Boehler, C. N., Achten, E., Fias, W., & Verguts, T. (2014). Overlapping neural systems represent cognitive effort and reward anticipation. *PLoS One*, 9(3), e91008. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0091008>
- Villanova, P., & Roman, M. A. (1993). A meta-analytic review of situational constraints and work-related outcomes: Alternative approaches to conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3(2), 147-175. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(93\)90012-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(93)90012-S)
- Von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1947). *Theory of games and economic behavior* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.
- Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>
- Wanous, J. P., Keon, T. L., & Latack, J. C. (1983). Expectancy theory and occupational/organizational choices: A review and test.

Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32(1), 66-86.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(83\)90140-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(83)90140-X)

Wood, R. E. (1986). Task complexity: Definition of the construct. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 37(1), 60-82. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(86\)90044-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(86)90044-0)

WorldatWork. (2021). *Compensation programs and practices report*. WorldatWork Press.

Yeo, G. B., & Neal, A. (2004). A multilevel analysis of effort, practice, and performance: Effects of ability, conscientiousness, and goal orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(2), 231-247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.2.231>