

## **THE STRATEGIC VISION OF LEADERS AND THE MOTIVATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES, THE CASE OF SMES IN MADAGASCAR**

*Elsie Liza Holiarivony Raveloson*

*Research Scholar, Department of Management Development, Higher Institute of Technology of Antananarivo,  
Catholic University of Madagascar, East Africa*

### **ABSTRACT**

*The typology of the Malagasy private sector shows a large majority of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). Indeed, the study of SMEs proves to be very relevant in order to contribute to the economic development and a sustainable development of the country. Currently, SMEs suffer from both financial and managerial problems, but this study concerns those relating to management and more specifically, the motivation of human resources. In order to try to solve these problems, the study was oriented towards the search of other motivating factors, besides the improvement of the working conditions or the factors of the environment, the satisfaction of the needs. The hypothesis was based on the assertion that the strategic vision of SME managers helps to motivate their employees. A conceptual analysis proposed a test of clarification on the relationship that can exist between the motivation of human resources and the strategic vision of their leaders. Several relevant questions were addressed in this study, such as what can be the existing sources of motivation? To what extent does the vision of leaders motivate their employees? What role would tension play in motivation?*

**KEYWORDS:** *Human Resources, Leaders, Motivation, SMEs in Madagascar, Strategic Vision*

---

### **Article History**

**Received: 20 Nov 2019 | Revised: 26 Nov 2019 | Accepted: 23 Dec 2019**

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

The typology of the Malagasy private sector shows a large majority of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)<sup>1</sup>. The study of SMEs turns out to be relevant in order to contribute to the sustainable development of the country. Currently, in Madagascar, despite a state-led support for the private sector, including SMEs and recent incentives for investment, a variety of factors still affect and significantly reduce the competitiveness of the SMEs<sup>2</sup>: financial problems (obtaining loans, reimbursement of loans, technical and financial capacities, equity contributions, etc.) and managerial skills (managerial capacities, management tools, human resources capacity, motivation of human resources, etc.)<sup>3</sup>. The study focused on the managerial problems currently afflicting SMEs in Madagascar. In particular, the problems relating to the motivation of human resources were considered, because motivation plays an important role in the productivity and

---

<sup>1</sup>DMD (Dans le Média Demain), N°981, in [www.dmd.mg](http://www.dmd.mg), 13 December 2006/Personal survey in 2016 based on the sample of DSE/INSTAT businesses.

<sup>2</sup>Id.

<sup>3</sup>FTMH firm survey of Malagasy SMEs in collaboration with the DSE (Direction de la statistique des entreprises / Institut National de la Statistique), in [www.instat.mg](http://www.instat.mg), 2006/ RFI Afrique, 16/08/2011/Madonline, Difficultés des PME, Revue de presse, in [www.madonline.com](http://www.madonline.com).

performance of human resources and contributes to the development of the companies studied. These motivation problems of the human resources considerably reduce their competitiveness and their profitability<sup>4</sup>. The profitability of the surveyed SMEs is decreasing on an average by more than 8% per year. Given this observation, some questions deserved a special attention: How to motivate the human resources of SMEs in the Malagasy context? Which factors, besides the remuneration, the improvement of the working conditions, the organizational justice, could contribute to the motivation of these human resources of the SMEs in Madagascar?

The research hypothesis was that the strategic vision of the leaders can contribute to the motivation of human resources at the level of Malagasy SMEs. The strategic vision was primarily chosen as a source of motivation for human resources because of its relevance in the development of SMEs (Bayad and Nebenhaus, 1993). The second reason is to give a touch of originality to this article. The third mobile is to make a contribution to the development of Malagasy SMEs.

The purpose of this study was to determine another source of motivation for human resources and to propose a model through the conceptual studies and analysis of SMEs in Madagascar.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Materials**

#### **Importance of Human Resources in Business Development**

The human aspect represents the greatest productive potential of the company (Plane, 2000). Human resources (HR) are sources of economically attractive competitive advantages (Savall and Zardet, 1987). For HR to be productive, one must take into account their motivation, (Galambaud, 2002).

#### **The Concept of Motivation of Human Resources/Different Sources of Motivation**

Motivation at work is a process that activates, guides, energizes and maintains the behavior of individuals towards the achievement of the expected objectives (Roussel, 2000). Over the last decades, there have been studies of sources of motivation at work (Kanfer 1990, Levy-Leboyer 1998 and Roussel 2000). These authors classified several categories of theories with affective, cognitive and self-regulation, metacognition characteristics. These theories are from Maslow (1954), Alderfer (1969), Murray (1962), Atkinson (1964), McClelland (1961), Herzberg (1966), Deci (1975), Miner (1979), Ronen (1980), Hackman and Oldham (1980), Vroom (1964), Porter and Lawler (1968), Raynor and Weiner (1979), Adams (1965), Locke (1975), Locke and Latham (1984), Carver and Schreier (1981), Bandura (1977), Deci and Ryan (1991), Al Akremi (2000); Amabile (1993), Weiss and Adler (1992) and Humphreys *et al.* (1993). Adams (1965) theory was used in the search for a possibility of a close relationship between the motivation and the strategic vision of the leaders. This theory states that an individual observes his professional environment to know if he is treated with equity or not in his company. If the individual at the end of this comparison is dissatisfied with his situation, the inequity he perceives creates a tension that he will seek to reduce. This tension leads him to trigger his behavior towards a goal, to deploy the necessary efforts to reduce the feeling of iniquity that animates him. He is then considered to be motivated (Roussel, 2000). It is, therefore, the motivation by the tension or more precisely, the tendency to reduce the tension. .

---

<sup>4</sup> Id.<sup>5</sup> Bennis et Nanus (1985); Hamel et Prahalad (1995); Senge (1991); Condor (2004), D elignieres (1993)

## **The Concept of Strategic Vision**

Vision is envisaged as a fundamental lever for the development of the company (Métais and Roux-Dufort, 1997). The strategic vision implies the ability of the leader to project the consequences of current decisions into the future and to think strategically about them (Bayad and Garand, 1998). In concrete terms, this vision largely determines the nature, complexity, diversity and level of formalization of management activities in SMEs (Bayad and Nebenhaus, 1993). There is also the assertion that vision presents itself as a factor creating tension (Métais and Roux-Dufort, 1997). This is the theory used to explain the relationship between the strategic vision and the motivation of human resources.

## **Strategic Vision and Motivation of Human Resources**

For the development of the model, the inspiration came from the theories of Métais and Roux-Dufort (1997). Robbins and Duncan (1988) already support the hypothesis to validate. Another innovative way was proposed in this study for the theoretical validation of the initial hypothesis. The definition that states that the strategic vision is a factor creating tension (Métais and Roux-Dufort, 1997) was retained in the context of this work. Tension arises from the gap between present reality and the desired future (Senge, 1991). The tension as well as the creativity that it engenders is the engine and the energy of the growth and vitality of the company (Hamel, 1991). Tension was already mentioned as a source of motivation in Adams' theory of organizational equity in 1965 (Roussel, 2000). From all of this, it could be argued that the strategic vision is a source of motivation for human resources, and this is what theoretically confirms the initial hypothesis of this study. The details on this relationship are yet to be presented.

It has already been mentioned above that it is the tension created by the strategic vision of the leaders that causes the motivation of their collaborators. However, this tension must be well managed for it to be motivating. Two dimensions of tension are to be taken into account, including the creative tension involving positive anxiety and the inhibitory tension leading to negative anxiety (Métais and Roux-Dufort, 1997). It has also been confirmed theoretically that the motivation of human resources would be the product of a creative tension resulting from the strategic vision of the leader. Tension is a solution that aims to reduce the gaps between reality and the futures envisioned in the vision (Schmidt, 1993). The vision thus creates tension and subsequently encourages the effort of the collaborators to achieve the goals that are set for them. "The gap between the present and the future must be large enough to maintain high tension and prevent the elastic band from relaxing" (Métais and Roux-Dufort, 1997). If this gap between the reality and the desired future state is too great, i.e., if the vision is unrealistic, the tension becomes important and it could be impossible to achieve the objectives set by the collaborators. Therefore, the tension becomes inhibitory and the vision of the leader will not allow to motivate his collaborators. The concept of tension may include anxiety and this factor may be an important source of motivation at work, although anxiety can be a brake in the case of too much tension (Humphreys *et al.*, 1993). On the other hand, if the objective imposed on employees is a feasible, desirable and ambitious vision, then a creative tension occurs among the workers with whom the leader shared it. It gives rise to the desire to surpass oneself as quickly as possible, to modify one's ways of acting to improve one's skills and performances (Métais and Roux-Dufort, 1997). The following table shows the model that synthesizes all that have been said above:

**Table 1: Linking the Strategic Vision of Managers and the Motivation of Human Resources at the SME Level**

|  |  |                    |                  |  |
|--|--|--------------------|------------------|--|
| VISION =<br>(Gap between the desired future state and the present) | Excessive gap between ambition and resources: excessive or unachievable vision       | Inhibitory tension | Negative anxiety | No employee motivation to achieve the objectives of the vision   |
|  | Reasonable (strong) gap between ambition and resources: achievable vision, desirable | Creative tension   | Positive anxiety | Motivation caused by the tendency to reduce the gap between dream and reality, to reduce tension by seeking solutions. |

Source: Table inspired by the analyzes of Allali (2002) and Métais and Roux-Dufort (1997)/Personal research, 2018

## METHODS

In the analysis process, the hypothetico-deductive methodology was chosen. A review of the literature for a conceptual analysis was carried out to theoretically formalize the research hypothesis, which explains the relationship between the motivation of the human resources of SMEs and the strategic vision of their leaders and to identify the variables to be studied. These variables were studied in an empirical study in order to deduce the confirmation or the denial of the research hypothesis. For the collection of the theoretical data, investigations were carried out with documentation centers and via the Internet to search for books, articles and journals corresponding to the study. As for the collection of empirical data, a survey was performed. The first master sample is related to the survey frame developed by the INSTAT (National Institute of Statistics) of Madagascar in 2005 and represents until now the list of companies (secondary and tertiary sectors) in the capital. To have the most up-to-date sample possible, there was the request for an additional list of companies created between 2006 and 2016, located in Greater Antananarivo. From these two lists, the sampling was carried out according to the probabilistic method. However, after a first field visit, the majority of the companies to be visited have proven to be untraceable. A new list of companies was added to the parent population. The list came from TELMA's telephone directory (Télécom Malagasy) which updates the details of the companies listed on an annual basis. All in all, 218 (two hundred and eighteen) companies were expected to be visited during a first survey for their stratification according to their size. Among the 218 visited, 110 (one hundred and ten) could be located and the rest were not found. Among the 110, 85 (eighty-five) were classified as SMEs, with a staff of between 10 and 100 people. A second survey was conducted for the study of the hypothesis.

Survey data, of a qualitative type, could be quantified by using the Likert numerical scale in the survey questionnaire and by using Stat Box version 6.5 statistical data processing software of the Michigan University. The attitude scale has levels from 1 to 5 (1 = very low, 2 = low, 3 = medium, 4 = strong, 5 = very strong). For the variables, the one that was explained concerns the motivation of human resources (**Variable 1**) of the hypothesis. As for the explanatory variables<sup>5</sup>, they were respectively: Achievability of the objective (of the strategic vision imposed by the managers of the company perceived as achievable by the HR considering the current resources, which are held by them) (**Variable 2**); Creative psychological tension perceived by employees while performing their tasks (**Variable 3**); Inhibitory psychological tension perceived by the collaborators in the accomplishment of their tasks (**Variable 4**); Feelings of positive anxiety perceived by employees in carrying out their tasks (**Variable 5**); and feelings of negative anxiety perceived by employees in the performance of their tasks (**Variable 6**).

For all these variables, several indicators were identified to develop the survey questionnaires in order to be able to measure them and to lead to the confirmation or rejection of the research hypothesis.

<sup>5</sup> Bennis et Nanus (1985); Hamel et Prahalad (1995); Senge (1991); Condor (2004), Délignières (1993)

Indicators for measuring the motivation of human resources (**Variable 1**)<sup>6</sup> are the degree of willingness of the individual without special calculations, out of duty or guided by the affect (**Indicator 1.1.**); the level of research by the individual to achieve the objectives of the enterprise (level of commitment of the individual towards the objective) (**Indicator 1.2.**); the level of interest of the individual towards his task (**Indicator 1.3.**); the level of effort deployed by the individual (**Indicator 1.4.**); and the level of the individual's search for adaptation to environmental events or constraints (**Indicator 1.5.**).

The indicators of the feasibility of the objective (of the strategic vision imposed by the managers of the company perceived as achievable by the HR considering the current resources which are held to them) (**Variable 2**)<sup>7</sup> are respectively: the level of achievability of the business objective perceived by the HR surveyed, given the current financial resources held by them (**Indicator 2.1.**); the level of achievability of the business objective perceived by the HR surveyed, given the current material and technological resources held by them (**Indicator 2.2.**); the level of achievability of the business objective perceived by the HR surveyed, given the current information resources held by them (**Indicator 2.3.**); and the level of achievability of the business objective perceived by the HR surveyed, given the current skill resources held by them (**Indicator 2.4.**).

Indicators for measuring the creative psychological stress perceived by the respondent (**Variable 3**)<sup>8</sup> are the level of the individual's ability to transform the current reality into the desired (future) vision (**Indicator 3.1.**); and the level of the individual's enthusiasm to achieve the set objectives (**Indicator 3.2.**). Indicators for measuring the psychological inhibitory tension perceived by the respondent (**Variable 4**)<sup>9</sup> are the level of the individual's ability to cope with the demands of the environment (**Indicator 4.1.**); and the level of the individual's ability to cope with the difficulties they encounter (**Indicator 4.2.**). Indicators measuring the feeling of positive anxiety perceived by the respondent (**Variable 5**)<sup>10</sup> are the level of the individual's ability to pay attention in the performance of their tasks (**Indicator 5.1.**) and the level of activation and alertness of the individual in the performance of their tasks and in the pursuit of the achievement of the objectives assigned to them (**Indicator 5.2.**) The indicators for measuring the feeling of negative anxiety perceived by the respondent (**Variable 6**)<sup>11</sup> are, the level of attribution of chances by the individual to the achievement of the assigned objectives (**Indicator 6.1.**); the level of the individual's ability to respond to difficulties related to their tasks (**Indicator 6.2.**); and the level of confidence of the individual in their ability to solve problems and achieve assigned goals and the level of confidence in uncertain situations (**Indicator 6.3.**). For the next three figures at the level of the indicators to be studied, e.g., 1.1.3, the first concerns the variable understudy; the second relates to the rank of the measure of the variable; for the third, it is related to the level of appreciation of the measurement indicator by the respondents according to the attitude scale of 1 to 5.

---

Hauw (2006), Rivaleau (2003), Roussel (2000), Charles-Pauvers, Commeiras, Peyrat-Guillard & Roussel (2007), Mitchell et Daniels (2003)

Allaire & Firsirotu (1988) ; Métais et Roux-Dufort (1997); Humphreys et coll. (1993) ; Allaire & Firsirotu (1988) ; Métais et Roux-Dufort (1997) ; Humphreys et coll. (1993) ; Allaire & Firsirotu (1988) ; Métais et Roux-Dufort (1997) ; Hellemans et Karnas (1999) ; Rosnet (1999)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Principles of Interpretation of the Results

To measure and interpret the variables, some principles were established. Chi-square tests identified levels of non-significant indicator responses that were excluded from the study: 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.4. 2, 1.5.1, 2.4.1, 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 4.1.2, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.2, 6.3.1, 7.1.1, 7.2.1, 7.3.1, 7.4.1, 7.5.1, 8.1.1, 8.2.1, 8.3.1, 8.5.1 and 9.1.1. The following table proposes **the principle of interpretation n°1** of the results:

**Table 2: Principles of Interpretation of the Results**

| Variables   | Variable Codes | Code Indicators         | Principles of Interpretation   | Level of Perception of the Indicator According to the Principles of Interpretation                      |
|---|----------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| Taking into account the existence of motivation among the human resources surveyed  | 1              | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 | The motivation of the HR surveyed is confirmed by responses ranging from 3 to 5 of the attitude scale at the level of the indicators.  | 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5, 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.3.5, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 1.5.3, 1.5.4, 1.5.5 |
| Not taking into account the existence of motivation at the level of the human resources surveyed                                | 1'             | 1.1, 1.4, 1.5           | The motivation of the HR surveyed does not assert from responses ranging from 2 to 1 of the attitude scale at the level of the indicators  | 1.1.1, 1.4.1, 1.5.2   |
| Existence of perception by the human resources surveyed of the feasibility of the strategic vision imposed by their leaders     | 2              | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4      | The strategic vision imposed by the leaders perceived by the HR is qualified as feasible from the answers ranging from 3 to 5 of the scale of attitude at the level of the indicators              | 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.4.3, 2.4.4, 2.4.5                      |
| Existence of perception by the surveyed human resources of the non-feasibility of the strategic vision imposed by their leaders | 2'             | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4      | The strategic vision imposed by the leaders perceived by the HR is qualified as unachievable from the answers ranging from 2 to 1 of the attitude scale at the indicator level                     | 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4.2   |
| Existence of perception of creative psychological tension by the surveyed human resources                                       | 3              | 3.1, 3.2                | The existence of creative psychological tension perceived by the HR surveyed is confirmed by the responses ranging from 3 to 5 of the attitude scale at the level of the indicators.               | 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5  |
|   | 4'             | 4.1, 4.1                |  | 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5  |
| Existence of perception of inhibitory psychological tension by the human resources surveyed                                     | 3'             | 3.1                     | The existence of psychological inhibitory tension perceived by the HR surveyed is confirmed if the answers of the interviewers go from 2 to 1 of the attitude scale at the level of the indicators | 3.1.2   |
|   | 4              | 4.1, 4.2                |  | 4.1.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.2   |



**Table 3 Contd.,**

|   |           |                      |  |  |
|---|-----------|----------------------|--|--|
| Existence of perception of feeling of positive anxiety by the human resources surveyed  | <b>5</b>  | <b>5.1, 5.2</b>      | The existence of positive feelings of anxiety perceived by the HR surveyed is confirmed by responses ranging from 3 to 5 of the attitude scale at the level of the indicators. | <b>5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.5, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.2.5</b>                      |
|   | <b>6'</b> | <b>6.1, 6.2, 6.3</b> |  | <b>6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.5, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, 6.3.5</b> |
| Existence of perception of feelings of negative anxiety by the human resources surveyed | <b>5'</b> | <b>5.2</b>           | The existence of feelings of negative anxiety perceived by the HR surveyed is confirmed by responses ranging from 2 to 1 on the attitude scale at the level of the indicators. | <b>5.2.1, 5.2.2</b>  |
|   | <b>6</b>  | <b>6.1, 6.2, 6.3</b> |  | <b>6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.3.2</b>                             |

Source: Personal Research, 2018

The variables described in this table were then studied in pairs, according to the logic of the research hypothesis. The aim was to find new sources of motivation in the field of study, hence the hypothesis to be studied concerns the second relation in Table 1. If one of the relations studied is not significant, this second assumption will be invalidated (**interpretation principle no. 2 of the results**). Other types of relationships or possible correlations (positive or negative) in Pearson's paintings may be the subject of further scientific studies.

**Presentation and Interpretation of Results**

Study of the First Relationship: "Existence of Perception by the Human Resources Surveyed on the Feasibility of The Strategic Vision Imposed by their Leaders" - "Existence of Perception of Psychological Tension by the Human Resources Surveyed" "

After data processing, the following Pearson correlation coefficient table was obtained:

**Table 3: Table of Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Study of the First Relationship**

|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|       | 3.1.3 | 3.1.4 | 3.1.5 | 3.2.3 | 3.2.4 | 3.2.5 | 4.1.3 | 4.1.4 | 4.1.5 | 4.2.3 | 4.2.4 | 4.2.5 |
| 2.1.3 | 0,15  | 0,14  | -0,38 | 0,11  | 0,18  | -0,36 | 0,12  | 0,13  | -0,33 | 0,13  | 0,08  | -0,30 |
| 2.1.4 | -0,19 | -0,08 | 0,46  | -0,20 | -0,03 | 0,26  | -0,21 | -0,10 | 0,42  | -0,21 | -0,06 | 0,36  |
| 2.1.5 | 0,00  | -0,01 | 0,02  | 0,00  | -0,21 | 0,29  | -0,01 | 0,02  | -0,01 | -0,01 | 0,04  | -0,03 |
| 2.2.3 | 0,21  | 0,10  | -0,40 | 0,15  | 0,15  | -0,37 | 0,14  | 0,10  | -0,34 | 0,15  | 0,13  | -0,36 |
| 2.2.4 | -0,19 | -0,08 | 0,46  | -0,20 | -0,03 | 0,26  | -0,21 | -0,10 | 0,42  | -0,21 | -0,06 | 0,36  |
| 2.2.5 | -0,07 | 0,02  | 0,07  | -0,07 | -0,16 | 0,29  | -0,08 | 0,05  | 0,02  | -0,08 | -0,08 | 0,16  |
| 2.3.3 | 0,06  | 0,13  | -0,25 | 0,06  | 0,19  | -0,33 | 0,02  | 0,12  | -0,19 | 0,03  | 0,17  | -0,27 |
| 2.3.4 | 0,01  | 0,02  | -0,02 | -0,03 | 0,08  | -0,07 | 0,02  | -0,01 | -0,01 | 0,01  | 0,04  | -0,05 |
| 2.3.5 | -0,08 | -0,20 | 0,49  | -0,13 | -0,26 | 0,49  | -0,10 | -0,17 | 0,39  | -0,10 | -0,22 | 0,42  |
| 2.4.3 | 0,08  | 0,14  | -0,30 | 0,08  | 0,11  | -0,23 | -0,01 | 0,15  | -0,23 | 0,01  | 0,08  | -0,14 |
| 2.4.4 | 0,01  | 0,02  | -0,02 | -0,03 | 0,08  | -0,07 | 0,02  | -0,01 | -0,01 | 0,01  | 0,04  | -0,05 |
| 2.4.5 | -0,11 | -0,17 | 0,48  | -0,15 | -0,22 | 0,46  | -0,12 | -0,14 | 0,37  | -0,13 | -0,11 | 0,28  |

*In bold, significant values (off diagonal) at the alpha threshold = 0.05 (two-sided test)*

Source: Personal Research, 2018

Regarding this table and taking into account the significance level of 5%, a total of 144 values were listed, 71 significant (49.3%) against 73 (50.7%) not significant. The analysis of the Pearson correlation coefficients between the variables then made it possible to identify 49.3% of significant dependence versus 50.7% not significant. This relationship can, therefore, be estimated as significant at 49.3% and not significant at 50.7%. It should be noted that the significance at the alpha threshold represents the existence of a correlation or a link between the two variables. **Another interpretation principle n°3** is formulated for the bivariate study of the variables: If at least one indicator of one variable is correlated

with only one of the indicators of the other variables, both are considered to be related. However, at the level of significant values in bold, there are positive and negative values. Positive values imply a positive correlation between indicators and variables; on the other hand, negative values show a negative correlation or opposition between them. For this first relationship, it could clearly be observed that at least one indicator of the variable “existence of perception by the human resources surveyed the feasibility of the strategic vision imposed by their leaders” , at a given level of the attitude scale, is positively correlated with at least one indicator of the variable. "Existence of perception of creative psychological tension by surveyed human resources" at a given level of the attitude scale. Then, referring to the principle of interpretation n3, it can be concluded that the variables “existence of perception by the human resources investigated on the feasibility of the strategic vision imposed by their leaders” and "existence of perception of psychological tension by the human resources surveyed” are positively correlated.

Study of the Second Relationship: “Existence of Perception by the Surveyed Human Resources on the Feasibility of the Strategic Vision Imposed by their Leaders” - “Existence of Perception of Feeling of Positive Anxiety by the Human Resources Surveyed”

Data processing yielded the following Pearson correlation coefficient table:

**Table 4: Table of Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Study of Second Relationship**

|       | 5.1.3 | 5.1.4 | 5.1.5 | 5.2.3 | 5.2.4 | 5.2.5 | 6.1.3 | 6.1.4 | 6.1.5 | 6.2.3 | 6.2.4 | 6.2.5 | 6.3.3 | 6.3.4 | 6.3.5 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 2.1.3 | 0,11  | 0,12  | -0,26 | 0,18  | 0,10  | -0,32 | 0,14  | 0,06  | -0,20 | 0,11  | 0,11  | -0,32 | 0,19  | 0,03  | -0,26 |
| 2.1.4 | -0,19 | -0,06 | 0,26  | -0,23 | -0,05 | 0,33  | -0,19 | -0,03 | 0,26  | -0,22 | -0,01 | 0,37  | -0,20 | -0,06 | 0,32  |
| 2.1.5 | -0,04 | -0,04 | 0,10  | -0,07 | -0,04 | 0,13  | -0,10 | 0,07  | 0,02  | 0,07  | -0,08 | 0,05  | -0,10 | 0,11  | -0,04 |
| 2.2.3 | 0,15  | 0,15  | -0,34 | 0,18  | 0,09  | -0,32 | 0,16  | 0,01  | -0,18 | 0,08  | 0,16  | -0,40 | 0,15  | 0,10  | -0,31 |
| 2.2.4 | -0,19 | -0,06 | 0,26  | -0,23 | -0,05 | 0,33  | -0,19 | -0,03 | 0,26  | -0,22 | -0,01 | 0,37  | -0,20 | -0,06 | 0,32  |
| 2.2.5 | -0,06 | -0,15 | 0,24  | -0,09 | -0,03 | 0,15  | -0,11 | 0,10  | 0,00  | 0,08  | -0,18 | 0,20  | -0,07 | -0,04 | 0,14  |
| 2.3.3 | -0,07 | 0,27  | -0,27 | 0,09  | 0,17  | -0,29 | 0,05  | 0,09  | -0,19 | 0,01  | 0,17  | -0,28 | 0,02  | 0,19  | -0,30 |
| 2.3.4 | 0,07  | 0,04  | -0,12 | 0,00  | 0,04  | -0,07 | -0,01 | 0,12  | -0,12 | -0,06 | 0,12  | -0,05 | 0,04  | 0,03  | -0,07 |
| 2.3.5 | -0,11 | -0,28 | 0,46  | -0,15 | -0,18 | 0,43  | -0,15 | -0,10 | 0,31  | -0,05 | -0,30 | 0,59  | -0,16 | -0,17 | 0,42  |
| 2.4.3 | -0,03 | 0,13  | -0,14 | 0,02  | 0,10  | -0,20 | 0,05  | 0,05  | -0,14 | 0,05  | 0,07  | -0,21 | 0,02  | 0,06  | -0,12 |
| 2.4.4 | 0,07  | 0,04  | -0,12 | 0,00  | 0,04  | -0,07 | -0,01 | 0,12  | -0,12 | -0,06 | 0,12  | -0,05 | 0,04  | 0,03  | -0,07 |
| 2.4.5 | -0,13 | -0,21 | 0,39  | -0,12 | -0,14 | 0,40  | -0,14 | -0,19 | 0,39  | -0,08 | -0,20 | 0,40  | -0,18 | -0,06 | 0,29  |

Source: Personal Research, 2018

Regarding this table of Pearson correlation coefficients and taking into account the significant level of 5%, 180 values were listed, of which 88 (48.89%) significant versus 92 (51.11%) not significant. There was therefore 48.89% significant dependence against 51.11% not significant. This relationship can, therefore, be estimated as significant at 48.89% and not significant at 51.11%. For this second relationship, it can be observed that the variables “existence of perception by the human resources surveyed on the feasibility of the strategic vision imposed by their leaders” and “existence of perception of feeling of positive anxiety by the human resources surveyed” are positively correlated.

Study of the Third Relationship: “Existence of Perception by the Human Resources Surveyed on the Feasibility of the Strategic Vision Imposed by their Leaders” - “Taking into Account the Existence of Motivation at the Level of the Human Resources Surveyed”

Data processing yielded the following Pearson correlation coefficients table:



**Table 5: Table of Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Third Relationship Study**

|       | 2.1.3 | 2.1.4 | 2.1.5 | 2.2.3 | 2.2.4 | 2.2.5 | 2.3.3 | 2.3.4 | 2.3.5 | 2.4.3 | 2.4.4 | 2.4.5 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1.1.3 | 0,09  | -0,16 | -0,02 | 0,05  | -0,16 | 0,01  | 0,14  | -0,23 | -0,09 | 0,07  | -0,23 | 0,08  |
| 1.1.4 | 0,27  | -0,09 | -0,28 | 0,32  | -0,09 | -0,37 | 0,17  | 0,23  | -0,36 | 0,13  | 0,23  | -0,42 |
| 1.1.5 | -0,40 | 0,26  | 0,37  | -0,42 | 0,26  | 0,45  | -0,34 | -0,07 | 0,53  | -0,21 | -0,07 | 0,42  |
| 1.2.3 | 0,05  | -0,15 | 0,04  | 0,06  | -0,15 | -0,03 | 0,19  | -0,22 | -0,12 | 0,20  | -0,22 | -0,13 |
| 1.2.4 | 0,26  | -0,08 | -0,31 | 0,27  | -0,08 | -0,32 | 0,13  | 0,24  | -0,32 | -0,02 | 0,24  | -0,22 |
| 1.2.5 | -0,34 | 0,22  | 0,33  | -0,36 | 0,22  | 0,41  | -0,30 | -0,11 | 0,47  | -0,14 | -0,11 | 0,37  |
| 1.3.3 | 0,10  | -0,17 | -0,09 | 0,09  | -0,17 | -0,05 | 0,16  | -0,24 | -0,13 | 0,14  | -0,24 | 0,03  |
| 1.3.4 | 0,26  | -0,04 | -0,28 | 0,27  | -0,04 | -0,25 | 0,07  | 0,28  | -0,31 | 0,03  | 0,28  | -0,36 |
| 1.3.5 | -0,39 | 0,19  | 0,40  | -0,39 | 0,19  | 0,34  | -0,21 | -0,13 | 0,47  | -0,15 | -0,13 | 0,40  |
| 1.4.3 | 0,06  | -0,15 | -0,07 | 0,07  | -0,15 | -0,03 | 0,11  | -0,21 | -0,07 | 0,18  | -0,21 | -0,09 |
| 1.4.4 | 0,23  | -0,09 | -0,11 | 0,26  | -0,09 | -0,22 | 0,22  | 0,09  | -0,30 | 0,07  | 0,09  | -0,18 |
| 1.4.5 | -0,30 | 0,22  | 0,19  | -0,35 | 0,22  | 0,28  | -0,36 | 0,06  | 0,42  | -0,21 | 0,06  | 0,26  |
| 1.5.3 | 0,08  | -0,16 | -0,08 | 0,06  | -0,16 | -0,09 | 0,25  | -0,22 | -0,12 | 0,10  | -0,22 | 0,01  |
| 1.5.4 | 0,24  | -0,07 | -0,18 | 0,19  | -0,07 | -0,09 | 0,09  | 0,14  | -0,17 | 0,10  | 0,14  | -0,26 |
| 1.5.5 | -0,34 | 0,22  | 0,28  | -0,29 | 0,22  | 0,19  | -0,28 | 0,03  | 0,31  | -0,22 | 0,03  | 0,31  |

Source: Personal Research, 2018

Based on this table of Pearson correlation coefficients and taking into account the 5% significance level, a total of 180 values were listed, of which 121 significant (67.22%) versus 59 (32.78%) non-significant. The analysis of the Pearson correlation coefficients between the variables then made it possible to identify 67.22% of significant dependence versus 32.78% not significant. This relationship can, therefore, be estimated as significant at 67.22% and not significant at 32.78%. For this third relationship, it can be stated that the variables “existence of perception by the surveyed human resources on the feasibility of the strategic vision imposed by their leaders” and “taking into account the existence of motivation at the level of the human resources surveyed” are positively correlated.

Study of the Fourth Relationship: “Existence of Perception of Creative Psychological Tension by the Human Resources Surveyed” - “Existence of Perception of Positive Feeling of Anxiety by the Human Resources Surveyed”

Data processing yielded the following Pearson correlation coefficients table:

**Table 6: Table of Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Study of the Fourth Relationship**

|       | 5.1.3 | 5.1.4 | 5.1.5 | 5.2.3 | 5.2.4 | 5.2.5 | 6.1.3 | 6.1.4 | 6.1.5 | 6.2.3 | 6.2.4 | 6.2.5 | 6.3.3 | 6.3.4 | 6.3.5 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 3.1.3 | 0,70  | -0,41 | -0,17 | 0,71  | -0,52 | -0,17 | 0,69  | -0,44 | -0,15 | 0,76  | -0,58 | -0,11 | 0,70  | -0,46 | -0,15 |
| 3.1.4 | -0,61 | 0,61  | -0,17 | -0,59 | 0,70  | -0,22 | -0,60 | 0,63  | -0,21 | -0,64 | 0,73  | -0,33 | -0,60 | 0,65  | -0,23 |
| 3.1.5 | -0,11 | -0,37 | 0,57  | -0,14 | -0,36 | 0,66  | -0,11 | -0,35 | 0,60  | -0,13 | -0,33 | 0,75  | -0,12 | -0,38 | 0,65  |
| 3.2.3 | 0,70  | -0,46 | -0,10 | 0,68  | -0,53 | -0,09 | 0,69  | -0,50 | -0,03 | 0,67  | -0,52 | -0,04 | 0,70  | -0,47 | -0,12 |
| 3.2.4 | -0,47 | 0,72  | -0,44 | -0,50 | 0,78  | -0,48 | -0,50 | 0,69  | -0,42 | -0,52 | 0,68  | -0,36 | -0,48 | 0,65  | -0,37 |
| 3.2.5 | -0,14 | -0,46 | 0,70  | -0,07 | -0,46 | 0,75  | -0,08 | -0,37 | 0,60  | -0,03 | -0,35 | 0,53  | -0,12 | -0,36 | 0,64  |
| 4.1.3 | 0,85  | -0,50 | -0,19 | 0,83  | -0,59 | -0,19 | 0,75  | -0,46 | -0,16 | 0,83  | -0,60 | -0,12 | 0,89  | -0,58 | -0,19 |
| 4.1.4 | -0,65 | 0,75  | -0,31 | -0,60 | 0,81  | -0,39 | -0,54 | 0,61  | -0,25 | -0,58 | 0,74  | -0,42 | -0,65 | 0,80  | -0,38 |
| 4.1.5 | -0,15 | -0,46 | 0,71  | -0,15 | -0,44 | 0,82  | -0,15 | -0,31 | 0,58  | -0,17 | -0,31 | 0,78  | -0,16 | -0,44 | 0,77  |
| 4.2.3 | 0,83  | -0,48 | -0,19 | 0,81  | -0,57 | -0,19 | 0,76  | -0,50 | -0,17 | 0,80  | -0,62 | -0,12 | 0,84  | -0,57 | -0,19 |
| 4.2.4 | -0,62 | 0,80  | -0,41 | -0,59 | 0,82  | -0,42 | -0,51 | 0,64  | -0,28 | -0,57 | 0,84  | -0,47 | -0,62 | 0,88  | -0,48 |
| 4.2.5 | -0,13 | -0,54 | 0,79  | -0,17 | -0,44 | 0,81  | -0,16 | -0,35 | 0,62  | -0,19 | -0,40 | 0,78  | -0,17 | -0,54 | 0,93  |

Source: Personal Research, 2018

Regarding this table of Pearson correlation coefficients and taking into account the significance level of 5%, a total of 180 values were listed, of which 167 were significant (92.78%) versus 13 (7.22%) were non-significant. The analysis of Pearson correlation coefficients between the variables identified a 92.78% significant dependence versus 7.22% non-significant. This relationship can, therefore, be estimated as significant at 92.78% and not significant at 7.22%. For

this fourth relationship, it can be deduced that the variables “Existence of perception of creative psychological tension by the human resources surveyed” and “Existence of perception of feeling of positive anxiety by the human resources surveyed” are positively correlated.

Study of the Fifth Relationship: “Existence of Perception of Creative Psychological Tension by the Human Resources Surveyed” - “Taking into Account the Existence of Motivation at the Level of the Human Resources Surveyed.”

Data processing yielded the following Pearson correlation coefficients table:

**Table 7: Table of Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Fifth Relationship Study**

|       | 3.1.3 | 3.1.4 | 3.1.5 | 3.2.3 | 3.2.4 | 3.2.5 | 4.1.3 | 4.1.4 | 4.1.5 | 4.2.3 | 4.2.4 | 4.2.5 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1.1.3 | 0,24  | -0,25 | -0,05 | 0,28  | -0,23 | -0,01 | 0,30  | -0,20 | -0,08 | 0,35  | -0,24 | -0,10 |
| 1.1.4 | -0,09 | 0,32  | -0,35 | -0,04 | 0,38  | -0,47 | -0,07 | 0,31  | -0,34 | -0,11 | 0,42  | -0,47 |
| 1.1.5 | -0,10 | -0,17 | 0,47  | -0,20 | -0,28 | 0,59  | -0,17 | -0,21 | 0,50  | -0,18 | -0,31 | 0,67  |
| 1.2.3 | 0,23  | -0,23 | -0,09 | 0,52  | -0,32 | -0,14 | 0,33  | -0,20 | -0,12 | 0,42  | -0,28 | -0,13 |
| 1.2.4 | -0,05 | 0,27  | -0,30 | -0,22 | 0,54  | -0,48 | -0,09 | 0,35  | -0,39 | -0,14 | 0,48  | -0,51 |
| 1.2.5 | -0,12 | -0,13 | 0,43  | -0,16 | -0,38 | 0,68  | -0,17 | -0,25 | 0,56  | -0,17 | -0,34 | 0,71  |
| 1.3.3 | 0,22  | -0,21 | -0,10 | 0,30  | -0,20 | -0,05 | 0,28  | -0,15 | -0,13 | 0,33  | -0,22 | -0,14 |
| 1.3.4 | -0,11 | 0,29  | -0,27 | -0,06 | 0,37  | -0,43 | -0,11 | 0,30  | -0,29 | -0,14 | 0,40  | -0,38 |
| 1.3.5 | -0,06 | -0,17 | 0,40  | -0,18 | -0,26 | 0,55  | -0,11 | -0,23 | 0,45  | -0,11 | -0,29 | 0,57  |
| 1.4.3 | 0,29  | -0,28 | -0,09 | 0,44  | -0,26 | -0,13 | 0,32  | -0,29 | -0,03 | 0,41  | -0,36 | 0,00  |
| 1.4.4 | -0,09 | 0,30  | -0,31 | -0,16 | 0,38  | -0,34 | -0,07 | 0,37  | -0,43 | -0,13 | 0,50  | -0,52 |
| 1.4.5 | -0,12 | -0,14 | 0,44  | -0,16 | -0,25 | 0,51  | -0,16 | -0,21 | 0,53  | -0,17 | -0,31 | 0,62  |
| 1.5.3 | 0,22  | -0,22 | -0,09 | 0,47  | -0,31 | -0,11 | 0,36  | -0,28 | -0,04 | 0,34  | -0,24 | -0,06 |
| 1.5.4 | -0,04 | 0,27  | -0,33 | -0,25 | 0,51  | -0,42 | -0,10 | 0,41  | -0,46 | -0,08 | 0,38  | -0,44 |
| 1.5.5 | -0,15 | -0,13 | 0,47  | -0,11 | -0,35 | 0,59  | -0,19 | -0,23 | 0,59  | -0,20 | -0,23 | 0,55  |

Source: Personal Research, 2018

Regarding this table of Pearson correlation coefficients and taking into account the 5% significance level, a total of 180 values were listed, of which 144 (80%) were significant versus 36 (20%) were non-significant. The analysis of Pearson correlation coefficients between the variables then made it possible to identify 80% of significant dependence versus 20% of non-significance. This relationship can, therefore, be estimated as significant at 80% and not significant at 20%. For this fifth relationship, it can then be observed that the variables “Existence of perceived psychological tension by the human resources surveyed” and “Taking into account the existence of motivation in the human resources surveyed” are positively correlated.

Study of the Sixth Relationship: “Existence of Perception of Positive Feeling of Anxiety by the Human Resources Surveyed” - “Taking into Account the Existence of Motivation at the Level of the Human Resources Surveyed”.

Data processing yielded the following Pearson correlation coefficients table:

**Table 8: Table of Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Study of the Sixth Relationship**

|       | 5.1.3 | 5.1.4 | 5.1.5 | 5.2.3 | 5.2.4 | 5.2.5 | 6.1.3 | 6.1.4 | 6.1.5 | 6.2.3 | 6.2.4 | 6.2.5 | 6.3.3 | 6.3.4 | 6.3.5 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1.1.3 | 0,35  | -0,24 | -0,04 | 0,32  | -0,28 | 0,00  | 0,31  | -0,36 | 0,10  | 0,33  | -0,23 | -0,12 | 0,32  | -0,30 | -0,01 |
| 1.1.4 | -0,13 | 0,53  | -0,54 | -0,09 | 0,41  | -0,48 | -0,14 | 0,48  | -0,42 | -0,14 | 0,44  | -0,34 | -0,09 | 0,46  | -0,49 |
| 1.1.5 | -0,15 | -0,45 | 0,71  | -0,17 | -0,27 | 0,60  | -0,10 | -0,25 | 0,43  | -0,11 | -0,33 | 0,53  | -0,17 | -0,32 | 0,62  |
| 1.2.3 | 0,38  | -0,17 | -0,16 | 0,41  | -0,26 | -0,14 | 0,38  | -0,32 | -0,03 | 0,36  | -0,27 | -0,11 | 0,35  | -0,23 | -0,14 |
| 1.2.4 | -0,12 | 0,57  | -0,60 | -0,16 | 0,49  | -0,52 | -0,18 | 0,50  | -0,43 | -0,16 | 0,48  | -0,42 | -0,10 | 0,51  | -0,53 |
| 1.2.5 | -0,17 | -0,54 | 0,84  | -0,14 | -0,36 | 0,73  | -0,09 | -0,33 | 0,53  | -0,11 | -0,35 | 0,59  | -0,16 | -0,41 | 0,74  |
| 1.3.3 | 0,33  | -0,19 | -0,08 | 0,29  | -0,23 | -0,05 | 0,36  | -0,41 | 0,09  | 0,34  | -0,26 | -0,12 | 0,33  | -0,27 | -0,05 |
| 1.3.4 | -0,10 | 0,44  | -0,45 | -0,13 | 0,39  | -0,40 | -0,19 | 0,44  | -0,33 | -0,19 | 0,44  | -0,29 | -0,08 | 0,39  | -0,41 |
| 1.3.5 | -0,16 | -0,36 | 0,59  | -0,09 | -0,27 | 0,50  | -0,08 | -0,18 | 0,32  | -0,06 | -0,30 | 0,45  | -0,18 | -0,23 | 0,52  |

**Table 8 Contd.,**

|              |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>1.4.3</b> | 0,45  | -0,28 | -0,08 | 0,31  | -0,27 | -0,05 | 0,40  | -0,35 | -0,06 | 0,36  | -0,36 | -0,02 | 0,34  | -0,34 | 0,02  |
| <b>1.4.4</b> | -0,13 | 0,46  | -0,45 | -0,04 | 0,34  | -0,40 | -0,14 | 0,40  | -0,31 | -0,06 | 0,43  | -0,46 | -0,06 | 0,45  | -0,49 |
| <b>1.4.5</b> | -0,20 | -0,33 | 0,60  | -0,19 | -0,20 | 0,52  | -0,14 | -0,18 | 0,42  | -0,21 | -0,21 | 0,56  | -0,18 | -0,27 | 0,57  |
| <b>1.5.3</b> | 0,30  | -0,16 | -0,09 | 0,37  | -0,28 | -0,07 | 0,36  | -0,41 | 0,19  | 0,32  | -0,23 | -0,03 | 0,30  | -0,19 | -0,07 |
| <b>1.5.4</b> | -0,08 | 0,46  | -0,49 | -0,06 | 0,47  | -0,56 | -0,12 | 0,50  | -0,52 | -0,10 | 0,35  | -0,35 | -0,02 | 0,35  | -0,47 |
| <b>1.5.5</b> | -0,20 | -0,38 | 0,67  | -0,22 | -0,32 | 0,73  | -0,17 | -0,22 | 0,47  | -0,16 | -0,20 | 0,45  | -0,21 | -0,26 | 0,59  |

Source : Personal Research, 2018

Regarding this table of Pearson correlation coefficients and taking into account the 5% significance level, a total of 225 values were listed including 186 (82.67%) which were significant and 39 (17.33%) were non-significant. The analysis of the Pearson correlation coefficients between the variables then made it possible to identify 82.67% of significant dependence versus 17.33% of non-significance. This relationship can, therefore, be estimated as significant at 82.67% and not significant at 17.33%. For this sixth relationship, it can be deduced that the variables “Existence of perception of feeling of positive anxiety by the human resources surveyed” and “taking into account the existence of motivation at the level of the human resources surveyed” are positively correlated.

The existence of positive correlations is demonstrated between the six sub-relations relating to the second relation of table n1 (linking the strategic vision of managers and the motivation of human resources at the SME level), and by referring to the interpretation principle n°2; the hypothesis of research is thus confirmed. The possibility of a positive correlation between the sub-relations of the first relation was not detailed in this study. The strategic vision shared by leaders, seen as achievable by HR, given the financial, material and technological resources, information and current skills that are held by them, leads to a creative psychological tension at their level, and the latter thereafter leads to a feeling of positive anxiety towards their motivation at work.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrated the contribution of the strategic vision of leaders to the motivation of human resources of Malagasy SMEs, provided that this vision generates a creative tension. This contribution is limited to the search for a variable, which is the tension, resulting from a strong and desirable strategic vision shared by the leader within the SMEs in order to motivate the human resources of the Malagasy SMEs. A last survey of the sample, one year later revealed an average increase of 08.55% in the profitability of the study units at the end of their accounting year after the directors had taken into account the recommendations given in this study. This study did not emphasize the analysis of other factors generated by the strategic vision, which also may have an influence on the engagement of the employees. Indeed, further research is still needed. What other factors could generate the strategic vision of the leader apart from the tension and could contribute to the motivation of the human resources of SMEs?

## REFERENCES

1. Adams (1965); Al Akremi (2000); D'Amabile (1993); Bandura (1977); Deci and Ryan (1991); Locke (1975), Locke et al. (1981); Locke and Latham (1984), Porter and Lawler (1968), Raynor and Weiner (1979) and Vroom (1964), cited by Roussel P., *La motivation au travail, Notes du LIRHE, 2000.*
2. Allaire and Firsirotu (1988) cited by Métais E. et Roux-Dufort C., *Vision stratégique et formes d'apprentissage organisationnel: Des stratégies d'adéquation aux stratégies d'intention, Département Management et stratégie, IAE Aix-en-Provence, EDHEC 1997.*

3. Allali, B., *Vision des dirigeants et internationalisation des PME: ébauche d'un cadre conceptuel*, 6° Congrès international francophone sur la PME, Montréal, Octobre 2002.
4. Bayad, M. and Garand, J. D., *Vision du propriétaire-dirigeant de PME et processus décisionnel: de l'image à l'action*, Communication au 4° Congrès international francophone de la PME, Metz, Octobre 1998.
5. Bayad and Nebenhaus (1993) cited by Bayad, M. and Garand, J. D., *Vision du propriétaire-dirigeant de PME et processus décisionnel: de l'image à l'action*, Communication au 4° Congrès international francophone de la PME, Metz, Octobre 1998.
6. Bennis and Nanus (1985) cited by Allali, B., *Vision des dirigeants et internationalisation des PME : ébauche d'un cadre conceptuel*, 6° Congrès international francophone sur la PME, Montréal, Octobre 2002.
7. Charles-Pauvers, B., Commeiras, N., Peyrat-Guillard, D. and Roussel P. (2007), *Les déterminants psychologiques de la performance au travail: un bilan des connaissances et proposition de voies de recherche*, De Boeck.
8. Condor, R. (2004), *La tension créatrice chez le dirigeant de petite entreprise ou comment générer des projets par la contradiction*, Ecole de Management de Normandie, CAHIER DE RECHERCHE.
9. DMD (*Dans le Média Demain*), N°981, in [www.dmd.mg](http://www.dmd.mg), 13 December 2006/Personal survey in 2016 based on the sample of DSE/INSTAT businesses.
10. Delignieres, D. (1993), *Anxiété et performance*, Laboratoire de Psychologie INSEP.
11. FTMH firm survey of Malagasy SMEs in collaboration with the DSE (*Direction de la statistique des entreprises/Institut National de la Statistique*), in [www.instat.mg](http://www.instat.mg), 2006/RFI Afrique, 16/08/2011/Madonline, *Difficultés des PME*, Revue de presse, in [www.madonline.com](http://www.madonline.com).
12. Galambaud (2002) cited by Cali, J. (2004), *La gestion des ressources humaines au sein de la PME de la construction*, Centre de sociologie des organisations, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgique, 2004.
13. Hamel (1991), "Competition for competences and inter-partner learning within international strategic alliances", *Strateg. Manage. J.*, vol. 12, n° spécial, pp. 83–103.
14. Hamel and Prahalad (1995), *The Conquest of the Future*, InterEditions.
15. Hauw, N. (2006), *Un test des déterminants internes de la motivation situationnelle en contexte naturel: Approche hiérarchique de la motivation en Education Physique et Sportive*, Thèse de Doctorat, U.F.R.: Sciences et Techniques des Activités Physiques et Sportives, Sciences humaines et humanités, Université de Caen/Basse – Normandie
16. Hardy, L. (1990), *A catastrophe model of anxiety and performance* in J. G. Jones & L. Hardy (eds.).
17. Hellemans, C. and Karnas, G. (1999), "Épreuve de validation du modèle de Karasek auprès de travailleurs du secteur tertiaire. Relations du modèle avec les "tensions mentales", *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée*, 3ème trimestre, vol. 49, N° 3, pp. 215–224.
18. Kanfer (1990) citée par Roussel, P., *La motivation au travail*, Notes du LIRHE, 2000.

19. Levy-Leboyer C., *La motivation dans l'entreprise, Edition des organisations, Paris, 1998.*
20. Schmidt (1993) cited by Bayad, M. and Garand, J. D., *Vision du propriétaire-dirigeant de PME et processus décisionnel : de l'image à l'action, Communication au 4<sup>e</sup> Congrès international francophone de la PME, Metz, Octobre 1998.*
21. Maslow (1954), Alderfer (1969), Murray (1962), Atkinson (1964), McClelland (1961), Herzberg (1966), Deci (1975), Humphreys et al. (1993) cited by Levy-Leboyer, C., *La motivation dans l'entreprise, Edition des organisations, Paris, 1998.*
22. Métais, E. and Roux-Dufort, C., *Vision stratégique et formes d'apprentissage organisationnel: Des stratégies d'adéquation aux stratégies d'intention, Département Management et stratégie, IAE Aix-en-Provence, EDHEC, 1997.*
23. Mitchell, T. R. and Daniels, D. 2003, *Motivation. Handbook of Psychology, vol. 12: Industrial Organizational Psychology, eds. W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen and R. J. Klimoski, pp. 225–254. New York: Wiley.*
24. Miner (1979), Ronen (1980), Carver and Schreier (1981), Porter and Lawler (1968), Hackman and Oldham (1980), Weiss and Adler (1992) cited by Levy-Leboyer, C., *La motivation dans l'entreprise, Edition des organisations, Paris, 1998.*
25. Plane, J. M., *La gestion des ressources humaines, Dominos Flammarion, Paris, 2000.*
26. Raynor, M. E. (1998), "That vision thing: Do we need it?", *Long Range Planning, vol. 31, n°3, juin 1998.*
27. Rivaleau, C., *Les théories de la motivation, citées dans www.cadredesanté.com, 17 mai 2003.*
28. Robbins, S. R. and Duncan, R. B. (1988), "The role of the CEO and top management in the creation and implementation of strategic vision", in Hambrick, D., *The executive effect: Concepts and methods for studying top managers, JAI Press Inc., London, UK, 1988.*
29. Rosnet, E. (1999), *L'adaptation psychologique au stress dans les situations extrêmes, Habilitation à diriger les recherches, Université de Reims Champagne Ardenne, Laboratoire de psychologie appliquée : stress et société, Tome 1 : document de synthèse*
30. Roussel, P., *La motivation au travail, Notes du LIRHE, 2000.*
31. Savall, H. and Zardet, V. (1987), *Maîtriser les coûts et les performances cachés, Economica.*
32. Senge, P. (1991), *La cinquième discipline: Levier des organisations apprenantes, Broché, 29 Octobre 2015.*





