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ABSTRACT. Employees face an array of moral issues in their everyday decision making. Environmental concerns, employee and community welfare, and the interests of other companies (competitors, customers, and suppliers) are only a few examples. Yet, businesses do not always address the issue of how employees should assess the moral import of their actions and incorporate these considerations into their decisions. As a result, moral considerations are often ignored, leading to unethical practices which may hurt the long-term interests of the company. In this paper, we present a model to help eliminate this problem. Our model uses expectancy theory, a process theory of motivation, to show that teaching employees to engage in moral reasoning, and creating a corporate culture in which ethical behavior is both encouraged and rewarded, can increase the likelihood that a company’s employees will act ethically.

I. Ethical dilemmas and business culture

In the January/February, 1968 volume of the Harvard Business Review, Albert Carr argued that business is a game and, like other games, is played by its own set of rules (Carr, 1968). In particular, he argued that business bluffing (i.e., lying) is a convention which the rules of business both support and encourage. More significantly, Carr argued that, because business bluffing is conventional, it is not and should not be subject to norms applicable outside the business realm. Any plausibility this position might have comes at the expense of ignoring the moral implications which business activities have for non-economic concerns. The effects of the 1980's Wall Street insider trading scandals and the environmental impact of business operations are just two examples of what can happen when these concerns are ignored. Business is not a self-contained institution, and this fact should be reflected in its moral norms.

We take it as axiomatic that businesses and their employees should consider the ethical implications of actions in their decision making. The growing number of businesses which have explicit ethics codes, training programs, ombudsmen, and/or ethics committees suggests that we are not alone in our convictions. However, many businesses still face the challenge of turning their moral principles into practice. Part of this challenge involves developing an explicit method to motivate employees to act ethically, thereby preserving not only the integrity of business conventions and institutions, but also the personal, cultural, and environmental concerns which fall outside of them.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a process by which ethical reasoning and behavior may be implemented, encouraged, and applied in organizational settings. Our paper is directed towards business executives and managers who must daily confront increasingly complex issues in an already complex world; we hope to present a practical, yet theoretically sound approach to these issues. We begin by presenting an experi-
mentally well-supported motivational model (specifically, expectancy theory). We then discuss specific kinds of programs organizations have used to teach moral reasoning to their employees. These programs are discussed in the context of expectancy theory to demonstrate that improving moral reasoning skills is not sufficient to motivate ethical behavior; a culture which encourages these behaviors must also be developed. To this end, we present a three-step process for developing such a culture. Finally, we demonstrate our model’s explanatory power by applying it to specific examples.

II. Expectancy theory

Motivational models are commonly divided between those which focus on an individual’s internal attributes (content theories) and those which focus on the individual’s interactions with her environment (process theories). Expectancy theory is a process theory of motivation, according to which motivation is a function of individuals’ perceptions of their environment and the expectations they form based on these perceptions. While the organizational psychology literature includes a number of motivational theories, we have selected expectancy theory as our “implementation mechanism” for several reasons. First, the theory has been subjected to rigorous academic testing and has been shown to have strong support. Second, the theory is straightforward and easily understood. Third, one of the authors has found the approach particularly useful in helping to refocus behaviors and the corporate culture within several organizations with which he is associated in a consulting capacity. Finally, and most important, the theory is complex enough to suggest a number of strategies an organization can employ to encourage ethical behavior from its employees.

First developed by Vroom (1964), expectancy theory identifies three factors which play an interactive role in motivation. The first of these factors, effort-performance expectancy (referred to hereafter as “E-P expectancy”), concerns the individual’s perception that effort is positively correlated with level of performance. An experienced office clerk who believes he can increase the number of words he types per minute by exerting greater effort has a high E-P expectancy. A less experienced typist may realize that no matter how much effort she puts into typing, her performance is fixed at a low level; this latter clerk has a low E-P expectancy. Expectancy theory predicts that, ceteris paribus, the person with high E-P expectancy will be more motivated to perform than will the person with low E-P expectancy.3

Now consider Helen and Lois, who perform similar jobs. Although Helen is an inexperienced employee who can only minimally improve her productivity by working harder, she believes that her productivity increases dramatically when she works hard. Lois, on the other hand, is a much more experienced worker whose productivity varies widely with her level of effort. However, she believes that her productivity remains virtually unchanged, no matter how much effort she expends. Because E-P expectancy is a measure of the perceived correlation between effort and performance, Helen has a higher E-P expectancy than does Lois; hence, expectancy theory predicts that Helen will be more motivated to work harder than will Lois.

The second factor in expectancy theory, performance-outcome expectancy, or instrumentality, concerns a person’s expectations that the rewards he will receive are closely tied to his level of performance. A paradigm example of someone who ought to have high instrumentality is a salesperson paid on straight commission. At the other extreme, a person who works for straight wages and who has no prospect of receiving a performance bonus, no matter how good his performance, will have a very low instrumentality. As with E-P expectancy, the perceived (not actual) correlation between performance and reward is relevant. So, a person who wrongly believes he will receive a raise for working hard has a higher instrumentality than someone who is unaware she will be promoted for her performance. Again, expectancy theory predicts that the former person will be more motivated to perform than will the latter.

Valence, the degree to which an individual values a particular reward, is the third compo-
ponent of expectancy theory. The more a person values the reward she will receive for her effort, the more motivated she will be to receive the reward. Rewards for which people generally have a high valence include salaries, bonuses, promotions, and recognition. Nevertheless, different individuals will value certain rewards differently. As Lewin notes, “what valence a certain object or activity has depends partly upon the nature of that activity and partly upon the state of the needs of the person at that time” (Lewin, 1951, p. 273). This suggests that lower-paid employees will tend to have a higher valence for bonuses than will wealthier employees. There are, of course, exceptions to this claim.

Figure 1 depicts an expectancy theory model constructed from E-P expectancy, instrumentality, and valence.

As mentioned above, employers can increase the effort employees expend on their assigned tasks by increasing the expectation that greater effort will lead to a higher level of performance, by strengthening the perceived link between results and rewards, and by ensuring that employees value the rewards given for high performance.

A virtue of expectancy theory is that each of its components has been experimentally confirmed as having a positive influence on motivation. Klein (1991), Pritchard and Sanders (1973), and Arvy (1972) give support for the link between E-P expectancy and effort. The link between instrumentality and effort seems to be the best supported of the components and has been empirically established by Hope and Pate (1988) and measured by Lawler and Porter (1967), Pritchard and Sanders (1973), Jorgenson et al. (1973), and most famously by Georgopoulos et al. (1957). Finally, Snead and Harrell (1994), Klein (1991), Harrell and Stahl (1984), and Pritchard and Sanders (1973) have verified the motivational link between valence and effort. We will not summarize these studies here, but cite them in support of our model.

Expectancy theory models are more or less complex, depending on the number of factors recognized as affecting the three basic components. The model we adopt for the remainder of the paper is comparatively complex and is based on a model developed by Lawler (1970) (Figure 2).

Lawler first modifies the basic expectancy theory model by introducing two variables that affect E-P expectancy. The first, ability, refers to the individual’s skill level at performing a given task. Training and experience both affect an employee’s skills, and the more an employee’s skills improve, the more she is likely to perceive a strong correlation between effort and performance. However, an employee not only must possess the skills necessary for completing a task, but must also be able to apply these skills. Lawler calls this ability the employee's problem-solving approach. Again, the more confidently an employee believes she can apply her skills to solve new tasks, the higher will be her E-P expectancy.

A related complexity Lawler builds into his model involves the individual’s observed and actual experiences in similar situations. In Figure 2, this variable is shown to affect both the employee’s problem-solving approach and her motivation. First, past experience provides a basis on which one develops a problem-solving approach. Past success at solving relevantly similar tasks will increase confidence in one’s problem-
solving approach, whereas past failures suggest that one’s approach may need to be changed or refined. Past experience, then, indirectly affects E-P expectancy by directly affecting a person’s confidence in her problem-solving approach.

Past experience also directly affects motivation. Suppose John’s skills and problem-solving approach have been inadequate historically to solve a certain kind of problem, x; however, John has just been retrained and again faces a problem of kind x. His past experiences may negatively affect his motivation to approach and solve the task, even though he is confident in the efficacy of his new abilities.

Unlike the basic expectancy model, Lawler’s model distinguishes intrinsic from extrinsic rewards. Expectancy theory models that do not make this distinction tend to focus primarily on extrinsic rewards, including salary, bonuses, and promotions. Lawler, however, suggests that intrinsic rewards (for example, a feeling of accomplishment) show “a more direct connection between performance and rewards. . . . It is because of this close connection and the strong [performance-outcome] connections it causes that intrinsic rewards can be such significant motivators” (Lawler, 1970, p. 234). We will not consider the issue of whether extrinsic or intrinsic rewards are better motivators, but will assume that both are important.

Satisfaction, the final variable in the model, is a measure of how well the rewards for performing a job satisfy the individual’s needs and desires, and it is a product of the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards an individual receives. There is not a feedback loop between satisfaction and motivation because, while satisfaction has been shown to have a positive effect on absenteeism and turnover (Brayfield and Crockett (1955); Herzberg et al. (1957); Schuh (1967); Vroom (1964)), “satisfaction influences the motivation to perform a job effectively only very indirectly” (Lawler, 1970, p. 225).

III. An expectancy theory based model

Our challenge is to apply Lawler’s expectancy theory model to the problem of how to motivate employees to act ethically. The model we present within the expectancy theory framework includes two parts (see Figure 3). First, employees must be taught the rudiments of moral theory so they can make informed decisions within the organization. This will positively impact employees’ E-P expectancy that attempts to act ethically will in fact result in ethical behavior. Second, a work environment must be fostered in which employees feel encouraged to act ethically. If implemented properly, this step can increase employees’ expectations that ethical action will be rewarded, as well as ensure that employees value the rewards they receive. Because these steps satisfy each of the components of Lawler’s expectancy theory model, we argue that they are singly necessary and jointly sufficient to motivate ethical behavior.

Developing moral reasoning skills

The first step of our process involves teaching employees the rudiments of moral theory and teaching them to apply these principles to specific cases. Organizations have used a number of approaches in ethics training, including...
orientation sessions, training videos, and even board games (see Brothers, 1991, pp. 19–34, and Berenbeim, 1992, pp. 19–21 for discussion). We argue that the most successful programs are those which encourage active participation in evaluating and discussing particular cases. Consider, for example, Citibank’s board game, *The Work Ethic*. The game is composed of 100 questions dealing with a variety of issues germane to the banking industry. Teams of employees discuss these issues, vote among four imperfect solutions to them, and are scored based on their answers. Most noteworthy about the game is that it encourages discussion both within and between teams, teaching not only which answers are the best, but why. We share Citibank’s justification for this approach: “I hear and I forget; I see and I remember; I do and I understand” (Nelson, 1991, p. 27). Because the purpose of learning ethics is to gain skills which can be applied to real-world cases, ethics training should include practice at applying moral principles to particular cases. Training programs which emphasize the application of moral reasoning, then, are prima facie more complete and effective than those which do not.

Of course, no training program can cover every kind of moral issue an employee may face. Consequently, trainees should become familiar with the basic principles advanced by the major moral theories. At the very least, these principles include the following:

1. **Act Utilitarianism** – When faced with a choice of actions, choose that action which will produce the greatest balance of pleasure (happiness) over pain (unhappiness).
2. **Rule Utilitarianism** – When faced with a choice of actions, choose that action, the general practice of which produces the greatest balance of pleasure (happiness) over pain (unhappiness).
3. **Kant’s Categorical Imperative**
   First Version – Never act except in such a way that I can also will that my maxim should become a universal law.
   Second Version – Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of another, always

A number of contemporary ethicists, including Baier (1985) and Stocker (1973, 1976) have raised important issues concerning the limitations of traditional ethical theories. We acknowledge these limitations, but nevertheless argue that these theories have an important heuristic value. In particular, they illuminate considerations which are important in most, if not all, moral contexts (for example, the importance of actions’ consequences, and our duties to each other). Learning these theories, then, provides a basis from which employees can evaluate the morality of innumerable actions.

If implemented properly, ethics training programs may contribute to an employee’s motivation to act ethically. In particular, training programs affect motivation by increasing an employee’s E-P expectancy, where E (effort) refers to the employee’s attempt to act ethically, and P (performance) refers to the ethical act. To increase E-P expectancy in this context, then, is to increase the employee’s expectation that his efforts to do what is morally right will in fact result in moral behavior. As Lawler’s model states, this expectation is increased by improving both ability and the individual’s problem-solving approach. Loosely, we will distinguish these as referring to the ability to identify all the morally relevant considerations of a particular case and the ability to weigh these considerations and arrive at a morally acceptable conclusion. Because increasing E-P expectancy positively affects motivation, we have further support for our claim that training programs which emphasize the importance of developing a problem-solving approach are more effective than those that do not.

A training program may also serve as a basis for providing experience on which employees may draw in relevantly similar real-world situations. An employee who has discussed particular problems concerning (say) sexual harassment in a training session will be better able to deal with actual instances of sexual harassment than will someone without such experience. This suggests that training programs which cover a wide range at the same time as an end and never simply as a means.
of issues are better than those with a narrow focus. Again, the expectancy theory model predicts that this experience will positively affect motivation, both directly and by helping to shape the employee’s problem-solving approach.

The above discussion suggests that ethics codes (and similar policy statements) are limited in their ability to motivate ethical behavior. In general, ethics codes state the broad moral principles to which the organization adheres. However, they say nothing concerning how these principles should be used in practice. This is not to say, however, that ethics codes are without value. Just as particular moral theories have basic principles from which individual moral judgments are derived, so ethics codes set out basic values of the organization which may guide employees in their moral decision-making. Nevertheless, ethics codes cannot and should not replace moral training, even though they may provide a background against which the training is conducted.

Creating a motivational environment

While increasing employees’ moral reasoning skills is a necessary component in increasing their motivation to act ethically, it is far from sufficient. In a series of interviews with 30 recent graduates of the Harvard M.B.A. program, Badaracco and Webb (1995) found that, while approximately half worked for companies with formal ethics programs, these programs were ineffective at motivating ethical behavior unless the company’s culture actively encouraged such behavior. Summing up the testimony of their subjects, the authors concluded that:

The handful of young managers who found themselves in cultures they believed to be ethical did respect their organizations’ ethics efforts. In essence, what many young managers were criticizing were ethics programs that existed in vacuums. For them, the main value of these devices was confirming and reinforcing an ethical climate that already existed, not creating one (1995, p. 15).

Our model for creating a motivational environment follows a three-step expectancy theory based method suggested by Nadler and Lawler (1977) (we again refer the reader to Figure 3). The first step is to determine which performance rewards have the highest valence for employees. As Lawler’s model shows, these rewards can be either intrinsic (like job satisfaction) or extrinsic (pay, bonuses, etc.). Questionnaires, surveys, informal discussion, etc. may help determine which rewards employees most desire, as well as their rank ordering. These findings will help determine the incentives which may be used to reward ethical behavior.

The second step in fostering a motivational environment is to define and communicate the kinds of behavior the organization expects from its employees. These expectations may be communicated both implicitly and explicitly. Implicitly, an organization can communicate values by manifesting them in behaviors at the highest levels of the organization. The managers interviewed in the above-mentioned Badaracco and Webb (1995) study reported that their feelings of obligation to act ethically were strongly determined by the examples set by their superiors. When higher-level managers acted contrarily to the stated values of the organization, the interviewees felt less inclined to adhere to these values. On the other hand, those managers whose superiors unwaveringly followed the organization’s values were themselves more inclined to follow them.

Values may be communicated explicitly via ethics codes and policy statements; for convenience, we will limit our discussion to ethics codes. As mentioned above, ethics codes cannot replace ethics training, and in that sense their function is limited. Nevertheless, ethics codes can effectively communicate the company’s basic stand on such issues as non-discrimination, environmental protection, sexual harassment, etc. If displayed prominently throughout the organization, instead of relegated to the pages of a policy manual, the ethics code can serve as a constant reminder of the values the organization wishes to inculcate. Further, the code can outline certain basic principles from which employees can reason and make ethically-informed decisions.

The final step in fostering a motivational environment is to link behaviors desired by the organization to outcomes or rewards desired by
the employees. Operating under the assumption that employees wish to benefit both the organization and themselves, we will discuss the link between performance and both organizationally and individually desired outcomes and will argue that employees should be made aware of both.

Consider first the link between ethical behavior and organizationally desirable outcomes. Unethical behavior may sometimes be easy to justify because of the short-term benefits that accrue to the organization. For example, in 1986 Drexel Burnham Lambert’s earnings of more than $500 million from revenues of $5.3 billion made it Wall Street’s most profitable firm (Fromson, 1990, p. 88). However, because many of their profits were generated by Michael Milken’s insider trading, Drexel was fined $650 million in 1989 and declared bankruptcy in March, 1990. Thousands of people subsequently lost their jobs. The lesson to be learned is that organizationally desirable outcomes are not generally served by unethical behavior, even though such behavior may seem profitable in the short run.

The Drexel example is an extreme case; however, we can easily demonstrate that less dramatic examples of unethical behavior can also harm an organization. Consider the seemingly trivial act of stealing a box of staples from the office. Though this one indiscretion seems to have a negligible impact on a large company, the same act, if widespread, could cost the company thousands of dollars each year. Ultimately, any unethical behavior has the potential to harm the company’s profits, which may lead to lower salaries, bonuses, etc. Because employees have a prima facie interest in the company’s success, communicating the link between ethical behavior and the company’s goals is an important step in developing an ethics-centered culture.

A salient link should also be established between ethical behavior and personal rewards. Examples of morally questionable and laudable behavior should be recorded in employees’ files and used in performance appraisals. Behavior which may limit company profits in the short run, if motivated by the desire to do what is right, would be favorably evaluated and rewarded. Serious breaches of ethics would be grounds for limiting employees’ future raises, bonuses, and promotions, and may even result in termination. Such standards are not unheard of – Susan Spagnola of Chemical Bank reports that “Violation of our Code of Ethics is grounds for dismissal” (Spagnola, 1991, p. 20). Companies which take seriously the morality of behavior as a basis for rewarding and sanctioning employees communicate a more serious commitment to ethics than do those companies which do not.

The link between moral behavior and intrinsic rewards is not as easy to identify or to influence. Nonetheless, it seems relatively uncontroversial to assume that the average person gets satisfaction from knowing that he has acted ethically in a given situation. A manager may be able to strengthen this link by recognizing appropriate behavior through positive feedback concerning the moral consequences of employees’ actions. Again, such feedback communicates a commitment to fostering ethical behavior.

Expectancy theory predicts that developing an environment in which ethical behavior is both encouraged and rewarded will motivate behavior in two ways. First, explicitly rewarding employees for acting ethically will increase employees’ instrumentality. Second, ensuring that employees value the rewards given for acting ethically will increase valence. Because both of these variables positively affect motivation, expectancy theory predicts that developing a culture where ethical behavior is encouraged and rewarded can have a strong, positive impact on employee behavior.

Applications of the model

We conclude this section with two examples of how our model may be applied. The first example is contrived and illustrates the importance of ethics training. Steve, a marketing manager for a company which knowingly sells a line of potentially deadly, yet highly profitable consumer goods, has just discovered a suppressed internal memo detailing the harmful effects of the good in question and is considering his moral duty. He has brought the memo to the attention of his supervisor, who told him to ignore it. Steve now must choose between blowing the whistle on his company and staying silent.
Although Steve has received no ethics training he recognizes that whistle-blowing will affect himself, his company, and his customers. First, Steve has an intuitive sense that in many, if not most, organizations, whistle-blowers are often informally ostracized and even formally sanctioned, their careers negatively impacted. He anticipates that blowing the whistle will similarly affect him. Second, Steve predicts that blowing the whistle will harm his company, first by eliminating the profits it will make from selling the dangerous products, and second by hurting the company's overall reputation. Finally, whistle-blowing will reduce the risk of death for the product's consumers. At this point, Steve is stuck; he has never learned how different moral theories might weigh these factors against one another, nor does he properly understand why these considerations are morally relevant. As a result, he does not form any firm convictions about which of his options is morally correct. He lacks the ability to determine which of his choices is the most ethical, he is less likely to try to do what is right and, consequently, to do what really is right.

Now consider Jennifer, a sales manager at a different company, who finds herself in a situation similar to Steve's. Unlike Steve, however, Jennifer has received extensive ethics training and, therefore, is more prepared to identify and weigh the morally relevant considerations of her situation. Further, she is more prepared to determine the long-run moral implications of her choices. For example, she may realize that, while whistle-blowing may harm company profits in the short-run, she may be preventing lawsuits which may in the long-run cost her company more than will the lost short-run profits. Applying her knowledge to this case, Jennifer reaches the following conclusions:

1. There are act utilitarian reasons for staying silent; namely, to protect herself and her company’s short-term interests. However, these seem to be defeated by the company’s long-term interests as well as (most importantly) the deaths that may be prevented by whistle-blowing.

2. A rule utilitarian will point out that, if adopted as a general practice, whistle-blowing will likely produce better long-term consequences than will silently allowing unsafe consumer products into the marketplace.

3. Knowingly selling unnecessarily unsafe products is to treat customers as mere means for the end of making profits. This violates the second formulation of Kant’s categorical imperative.

This analysis clearly demonstrates that Jennifer’s moral duty is to blow the whistle on her company. Because Jennifer recognizes this, expectancy theory predicts that she will be much more likely than Steve to blow the whistle.

Our second example relates to recent revelations at Bausch & Lomb, the vision products company. In an October, 1995 Business Week article, Daniel Gill, Bausch & Lomb's C.E.O., acknowledges certain problems within the corporate culture (Maremont, 1995). Specifically, the company was driven to maintain double-digit sales and earnings growth, which in turn created pressures which led to unethical behavior throughout the company:

• Bausch & Lomb's Hong Kong unit allegedly inflated revenues by faking sales to real customers and moving product through the gray market at cut rate prices.

• A Miami warehouse owned by Bausch & Lomb made a practice of accepting cash payment and third party checks, a method of payment which often signals money laundering activities.

• Contact lenses were often shipped to doctors who had placed no orders. In addition, distributors were forced to take up to two years of unwanted inventories in order to inflate sales figures.

• U.S., Asian, and Latin American managers routinely sold Ray-Ban sunglasses through gray market distributors in an effort to meet quotas.

While the company insists that it has policies which prohibit these kinds of behaviors, interviews with present and former managers of the
company from around the world paint a clear picture – managers who “make the numbers” prosper; those who do not, fail.

What does this example suggest? Most significantly that the motivational structure in place at Bausch & Lomb was designed to reward questionable behavior and, in particular, behavior which “made the numbers” at all costs. If a manager worked hard to force distributors to assume unwanted inventories or to sell through the gray market, then revenues would increase, which would lead to handsome and substantial bonuses and job security for the manager.

Again Figure 3 is instructive. The organization clearly understands what motivates employees – bonuses and job security! It also has, it says, a code or “policies” regarding suitable (i.e., ethical) behavior. Whether or not it communicates these policies effectively to employees and trains them in the application of the policies, however, is not at all clear. Finally, and most damning, it is clear that short-run economic performance was viewed as significantly more important than how that performance was obtained. Rewards and reinforcement were provided for a series of unethical acts which ran counter to the code which Bausch & Lomb professed to observe.

In short, we have an example of an organization with a code of ethical behavior ineffectively communicated to employees and not reinforced by an appropriate system of rewards. An expectancy theory model, combined with sufficiently explicated moral principles, would help to restore an ethical balance within the organization.

IV. Conclusion

In summary, this article has proposed a two-step process for operationalizing the application of ethical reasoning within a motivational model to the culture of an organization. First, employees must be taught the principles of moral reasoning, possibly through the use of workshops, discussion groups, etc. Concurrently, the organization can be identifying those rewards, both intrinsic and extrinsic, which provide the greatest motivational incentives for employees. The corporate environment must be structured in a way which links ethical decisions, i.e. ethical performance, to those rewards. This is accomplished by further directing employees’ efforts to desired ethical outcomes through the provision of appropriate education, tools, and resources. Such a process clearly includes elements of orientation, training, executive development, and performance review. We argue that if an employee is given a sufficiently broad exposure to ethical theories and has the opportunity to apply these theories to specific cases, that employee, if properly encouraged within a motivational structure, will likely include ethical considerations in her decision making, which in turn will be reflected in her behavior.

Notes

1 For a selection of responses to Carr’s provocative article, see Blodgett (1968).
2 Berenbeim (1992) reports that 84% of medium- to large-sized U.S. companies have an ethics code, of which 45% were adopted or revised between 1987 and 1992. During the same period, nearly one quarter of the companies surveyed sponsored new ethics training programs, ethics committees, or ombudsman’s offices.
3 From here on, every comparative claim we make about motivation should be understood as implicitly including a ceteris paribus clause.
4 For more on these theories, see Bayles (1968) and Kant (1785).
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