

Intrinsic Motivation

Mission and Motivated Workers

- A bookstore may not be just interested in maximizing profits
- A bookstore worker may not be just interested in maximizing wages
- Distinguish between **utility from work** and **mission-motivated preferences**
 - a book-lover may derive utility from working in a bookstore
 - a mission-motivated bookstore worker only derives utility when he successfully achieves his mission (e.g., promote a certain type of books to customers)
- Mission-motivated workers may be particularly relevant for (some parts of) the public sector and NGOs
- They are probably quite relevant in the private sector too, especially for those workers who can exercise discretion and influence

Model

- The outcome of a project is either “success” or “failure”
- The probability of success depends on (is equal to) worker effort e
- Cost of effort is $C(e) = e^2/2$
- The organization can pay its worker depending on success or failure, but wages must be at least \underline{w} because of **limited liability constraint**
- Both principal and agent are risk neutral

Firms and Workers

- Two types of firms:
 - type $i = 0$ is purely profit-oriented—gets payoff π_0 if project is a success
 - type $i = 1$ has a mission—payoff is π_1 if project is successful
 - π_1 may include both monetary and nonmonetary components
 - π_1 may be larger than or smaller than π_0
- Two types of agents:
 - type $j = 0$ only cares about wages
 - type $j = 1$ derives nonmonetary benefit of $\theta > 0$ when project succeeds, provided that the project's mission aligns with his own mission motivation

Optimal Contract

- Consider a type 1 firm hiring a type 1 worker
- Wages are w_l if project fails and w_h if project succeeds
 - limited liability constraint suggests that the firm should just set $w_l = \underline{w}$
 - define the “bonus” upon project success by $b = w_h - \underline{w}$

- If worker participates, she chooses e to maximize

$$e(b + \theta) + \underline{w} - e^2/2$$

- First-order condition is

$$e^* = b + \theta$$

- At $e = e^*$, worker’s payoff from working with this principal is

$$u^* = e^*(b + \theta) + \underline{w} - (e^*)^2/2 = \underline{w} + (b + \theta)^2/2$$

Participation Constraint

- The **lowest** b that would induce the worker to participate is given by $\underline{w} + (b + \theta)^2/2 = \bar{u}$, so

$$\underline{b} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2(\bar{u} - \underline{w})} - \theta & \text{if } \bar{u} > \theta^2/2 + \underline{w} \\ 0 & \text{if } \bar{u} \leq \theta^2/2 + \underline{w} \end{cases}$$

- If the firm chooses $b = \underline{b}$, its payoff is

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\underline{b}) &= e^*(\underline{b})(\pi_1 - \underline{b}) - \underline{w} = \\ &= \begin{cases} \sqrt{2(\bar{u} - \underline{w})}(\pi_1 - \sqrt{2(\bar{u} - \underline{w})} + \theta) - \underline{w} & \text{if } \bar{u} > \theta^2/2 + \underline{w} \\ \theta \pi_1 - \underline{w} & \text{if } \bar{u} \leq \theta^2/2 + \underline{w} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Solution

- If the firm chooses $b > \underline{b}$, its payoff is

$$\Pi(b) = (b + \theta)(\pi_1 - b) - \underline{w}$$

- The marginal benefit of choosing b slightly above \underline{b} is

$$\Pi'(\underline{b}) = \pi_1 - \theta - 2\underline{b}$$

- this is positive if $\underline{b} < (\pi_1 - \theta)/2$
- this is negative if $\underline{b} > (\pi_1 - \theta)/2$
- **Optimal** b is given by either interior solution to first-order condition or a corner solution:

$$b^* = \begin{cases} (\pi_1 - \theta)/2 & \text{if } \underline{b} < (\pi_1 - \theta)/2 \\ \underline{b} & \text{if } \underline{b} \geq (\pi_1 - \theta)/2 \end{cases}$$

Efficiency Wages

- When $\underline{b} < (\pi_1 - \theta)/2$
 - $b^* > \underline{b}$, so workers earn a surplus above their reservation utility
 - worker effort is $e^* = (\pi_1 + \theta)/2$, and her payoff is $u^* = \underline{w} + (\pi_1 + \theta)^2/8$
 - the firm's profit is $(\pi_1 + \theta)^2/4 - \underline{w}$
- When $\underline{b} \geq (\pi_1 - \theta)/2$
 - $b^* = \underline{b}$, so workers earn no rent
 - worker effort is $e^* = \underline{b} + \theta$, and her payoff is \bar{u}
 - the firm's profit is $\Pi(\underline{b})$
- Higher intrinsic motivation θ will
 - lower the optimal bonus (low-powered incentive in mission-oriented organizations)
 - raise worker effort (worker effort is positive even when the bonus is 0)
 - raise worker utility and raise firm profit
- Size of bonus and level of effort are **negatively correlated** across firms with different values of θ

Divergent Objectives

- The principal's payoff π_1 from project success depends on the mission chosen
 - let $x \in X$ represent the mission, and let $\pi_1 = g(x)$
 - the principal prefers to choose x^p to maximize $g(x)$
- Workers also have their own idea about what the firm's mission should be
 - their intrinsic payoff depends on the mission through $\theta = h(x)$
 - their ideal mission is x^a , which maximizes $h(x)$
 - effort will fall off if the principal adopts mission x^p

Worker Empowerment

- Recall that the firm's profit is $(\pi_1 + \theta)^2/4 - \underline{w}$
- The principal is better off if he chooses a mission to maximize $g(x) + h(x)$ instead of just maximizing $g(x)$
- this is usually a **compromise** between x^p and x^a
- The principal is **empowering** the firm's workers
 - the firm is better off letting its workers provide some input on the choice of the firm's mission
 - even though the principal does not choose his ideal mission, he achieve a reasonable mission but with higher probability (higher effort) and lower cost (lower bonus)
- Workers also benefit from the compromise because bonus will be rather low if they insist on choosing x^a

Competition

- The reservation utility of a motivated worker is partly determined by the wage she could get in the for-profit sector
- An increase in π_0 for type 0 firms (or an increase in productivity in these firms) raises the outside option \bar{u}
- A higher \bar{u} increases the \underline{b} needed to induce participation in type 1 firms
- Because $b^* = \underline{b}$ when $\underline{b} \geq (\pi_1 - \theta)/2$, the bonus in type 1 firms will have to rise

Matching

- Mission-oriented firms tend to attract motivated workers
- Motivated workers are less attractive to profit-oriented firms because these workers would command a **compensating differential** to be induced to work for such firms
- Weisbrod (1988): “Non-profit organizations may act differently from private firms not only because of the constraint on distributing profit but also, perhaps, because the motivations and goals of managers and directors ...differ. ...Managers will ...sort themselves, each gravitating to the types of organizations that he or she finds least restrictive—most compatible with his or her personal preferences”

Centralization

- Imagine a centralized school system where the “mission” (or education philosophy) is dictated by a central authority
- Workers whose views about education are different from the centralized mission may be demotivated
- Allowing more decentralization where schools have more autonomy in choosing their own mission may raise productivity in those schools
- It may indirectly raise productivity in the centralized schools through the competition effect