ทบทวนวรรณกรรมเกี่ยวกับทฤษฎีการหามูลเหตุจูงใจ
A Critical Review on Classical Theories of Motivation

สมชาติ วิศิษฐชัยชาญ[*]

Somchat Visitchaichan, Ph.D.

บทคัดย่อ

โดยทั่วๆ ไปได้มีการแบ่งแยก ทฤษฎีเกี่ยวกับการหามูลเหตุจูงใจออกเป็น 2 กลุ่มใหญ่ ๆ คือ ทฤษฎีเนื้อหาของการหามูลเหตุจูงใจ และทฤษฎีกระบวนการของการหามูลเหตุจูงใจ ทฤษฎีกลุ่มแรกคือ ทฤษฎีเนื้อหาของการหามูลเหตุจูงใจ ได้ถูกพัฒนาและค้นคว้า ขึ้นมาเพื่อทำการอธิบายลักษณะการหามูลเหตุจูงใจโดยเชื่อมโยงถึงประเภทของความต้องการที่มนุษย์แสวงหา ทฤษฎีเนื้อหาของการหามูลเหตุจูงใจเหล่านี้ประกอบไปด้วย ทฤษฎีลำดับขั้นของความต้องการ ของ นักจิตวิทยา อับบราแฮม มาสโลว์ ทฤษฎีไม้แข็ง และทฤษฎีไม้นวม ของ ดักกลาส แมคเกรกเกอร์ ทฤษฎี อี อาร์ จี (ความต้องการที่จะมีชีวิตอยู่, ความต้องการที่จะมีความสัมพันธ์กับผู้อื่น และ ความต้องการที่จะมีความเจริญงอกงาม) ของ เคลย์ตัน แอลเดอร์เฟอร์ แห่งมหาวิทยาลัยเยล ทฤษฎีความต้องการในการเรียนรู้ของเดวิด แมคเคิลแลนด์ และทีมงานของเขา และ ทฤษฎีปัจจัยจูงใจ - ปัจจัยสุขวิทยา เฟดเดอริกค์ เฮอร์ซเบอร์ก สำหรับทฤษฎีเนื้อหาของการหามูลเหตุจูงใจเป็นทฤษฎีที่พยายามจะชี้ให้เห็นว่า ความต้องการของมนุษย์เป็นเครื่องกระตุ้นและนำทางพฤติกรรมของพนักงานในอันที่จะปฏิบัติงานให้สำเร็จ ทฤษฎีกลุ่มที่สองคือทฤษฎีกระบวนการของการหามูลเหตุจูงใจ เป็นทฤษฎีที่พยายามจะอธิบายว่า จะกระตุ้นและนำทางพฤติกรรมของพนักงานอย่างไร จึงจะทำให้บุคคลเหล่านั้นทำงานอย่างไร ทฤษฎีกระบวนการของการหามูลเหตุจูงใจเหล่านี้ ประกอบไปด้วย ทฤษฎีกำหนดเป้าหมาย ของ เอ็ดวิน ลอกค์ ทฤษฎีความเสมอภาค ของ แจ สเตซี่ แอดัมส์ และ ทฤษฎีความคาดหวัง ของ วิคเตอร์ วรูม ในขณะที่นักทฤษฎีด้านเนื้อหามูลเหตุจูงใจให้ความสำคัญกับการค้นหา

[*] อาจารย์ประจำคณะการจัดการ มหาวิทยาลัยอัสสัมชัญ

ความต้องการภายในของมนุษย์เป็นหลัก แต่ นักทฤษฎีด้านกระบวนการของการหามูลเหตุ
จูงใจ กลับพยายามมุ่งเน้นที่จะอธิบาย แง่ของกระบวนการซึ่งสลับซับซ้อน และมีการเปลี่ยน
แปลงอยู่ตลอดเวลา ดังนั้นจุดประสงค์หลักของบทความนี้ คือ การประเมินผลงานทางวิชา
การที่เกี่ยวกับทฤษฎีการหามูลเหตุจูงใจ และประโยชน์ของทฤษฎีเหล่านี้ในการ อธิบายพฤติ
กรรมมนุษย์ ในองค์กรปัจจุบันในเชิงวิพากษ์วิจารณ์ ในบทความฉบับนี้ จะมีการวิเคราะห์
ทั้งเหตุผลสนับสนุน และเหตุผลโต้แย้งที่เกี่ยวกับทฤษฎีการหามูลเหตุจูงใจ ผ่านการนำ
เสนอแนวความคิดและทัศนคติ ของ ผู้เชี่ยวชาญทางวิชาการในสาขา การจัดการและการ
บริหารองค์กรที่เกี่ยวข้อง ในส่วนท้ายของบทความ ผู้เขียนได้ สรุปสาระสำคัญและนำ
เสนอแนวความคิดและทัศนคติของตนเอง

Abstract

Generally speaking, it has widely been accepted that there are two distinctive categories of classical theories of motivation; content theories and process theories. The first type is referred to as content theories of motivation which have been formulated and developed to explain the nature of motivation in terms of the types of needs that people experience. These content theories include the need hierarchy theory proposed by a clinical psychologist; Abraham Maslow, Theory X and Theory Y developed by Douglas McGregor, the ERG (existence, relatedness and growth) theory by Clayton Alderfer of Yale University, the learned needs theory developed by David McClelland and his associates and the "motivator-hygiene" theory of Frederick Herzberg. The term content theories is used to characterize those approaches to motivation which focus on the premise that people have some core set of basic needs which provide the motive force for their actions. The second type is often described as process theories of motivation which aim to explain the cognitive processes whereby individuals make decisions as to how to act. These process theories include the goal-setting theory proposed by Edwin Locke, the equity theory developed by J. Stacy Adam's and Victor Vrooms expectancy theory. Rather than being concerned to identify innate needs, in the manner of the content theorists, the process perspective is to direct attention to explain motivation as a dynamic process. The main objective of this paper is therefore to critically evaluate the various classical theories of motivation and their usefulness in explaining human behaviors in today's organizations or environments. In this article, both arguments for and against these classical theories of motivation will be made at great length, elucidating view points of relevant academic scholars in the fields of management and organizational studies. Finally, the concluding section then summarizes the arguments and presents the author's personal view points.

Introduction

Generally speaking, it has widely been accepted that there are two distinctive categories of theories of motivation. The first type of theories is referred to as content theories. The term content theories is used to characterize those approaches to motivation which focus on the idea that people have some core set of basic needs which provide the motive force for their actions. The second type is called as process theories which seek to explain the cognitive processes whereby individuals make decisions as to how to act. Rather than being concerned to identify innate needs, in the manner of the content theorists, the process perspective is to direct attention to explaining motivation as a dynamic process. [Deresky, 2002; Clawson, 2003; DeCenzo and Robbins, 2003; Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart and Wright, 2003; Robbins 2003; Schermerhorn, 2003]

The historical development of the study of motivation may be seen as the evolution of an effort to understand how and why employees act as they do within organizations. A major line of inquiry has been based on the premise or belief that behavior can be explained in terms of the underlying needs, wants or expectations of those involved and the process whereby these are behavioral outcomes. To be more precise, the focus of such studies is on explaining behavior on the basis of the motivation of those concerned. The main objective of this article is therefore to critically evaluate the various classical theories of motivation and their usefulness in explaining human behaviors in today's organizations or environments. In this paper, attention is hence given to a range of subsequent approaches which have attempted to characterize the

essence of human motivation, in particular as it relates to behavior in work organizations.

CONTENT THEORIES OF MOTIVATION

Let's now deal with the approaches to motivation that conforms to the content theories perspective. A number of theories have been formulated and developed to explain the nature of motivation in terms of the types of needs that people experience. Such theories believed that people in general have certain fundamental needs and that people are motivated to engage in behavior that will lead to the satisfaction of these needs. From an organization analysis perspective, the implication thus lies in the ability to create the situation at work that will result in the satisfaction of employees' most important needs when employees are performing effectively.

Perhaps, the first major attempt to classify needs relevant to organization behavior was that of Abraham Maslow [1954]. Based on his experience as a clinical psychologist, Maslow formulated a theory that explains human behavior in terms of a hierarchy of five general needs. He hypothesized that everyone possesses a common set of five universal needs that are ordered in a hierarchy of importance form the lowest-level basic needs through the highest-level needs. These basic needs are the physiological needs, the safety needs, the belongingness and love needs, the esteem needs, and last but not least the need for self-actualization [Maslow, 1954, p.p. 80-92].

Based on Maslow's theory, physiological and safety needs are described as lower-level and social, esteem, and self-actualization as higher-level needs. In his term, these basic human needs are organized into a hierarchy of relative prepotency. According to

Maslow, higher-level needs are satisfied internally to the person, whereas lower-level are predominantly satisfied externally. Higher-level needs are not important and are not manifest until lower-level needs are satisfied. Once lower-level needs are satisfied, needs at the next highest level emerge and influence behavior. The levels of the need hierarchy are not rigidly separated but overlap to some extent. Therefore, a lower-level need does not have to be fully satisfied before the higher-level need is activated. In essence, two major postulates follow from Maslow's need hierarchy: 1) A satisfied need is not a motivator of behavior. A person lacking economic security will devote much time and effort to attain it; but once this goal has been reached, it will have little or no effect on behavior. 2) As lower-level needs are satisfied, higher-level needs become more important determinants of behavior. A work force that has come to take job security for granted will increasingly seek to satisfy the needs for self-esteem, achievement, or self-fulfillment [Maslow, 1954, p.p. 92-106]

Although the need hierarchy theory has probably been one of the most popular and widely known theories of motivation among practicing managers, it has not been faring so well among systematic scientific researchers. To be more specific, research does not generally validate the theory. [Lawler and Suttle, 1972; Miner, 1973; Wahba and Bridwell, 1976; Rauschenberger, Schmitt and Hunter, 1980; Hofstede, 1980, Adler, 1986; and Watson, 1986] It has been argued by several researchers that Maslow provided no empirical substantiation, and several studies that sought to validate the theory found no support. Conceptually, there seems to be two basic problems with the need hierarchy. Firstly, there appears to be

little evidence in favor of Maslow's argument that there are five distinct categories of human needs and that needs are structured into a hierarchy. Secondly, there is disagreement about whether the satisfaction of one need automatically activated the next need in the hierarchy.

There is no definitive proof that once a need has been satisfied, its strength diminishes. In a study at American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (AT&T) in which individual attitudes (need satisfaction and strengths) were measured through annual unstructured interviews over a five year time span, Maslow's concept has not been well supported. Little evidence were found to support that increasing satisfaction of a need results in either the decreased strength of the need itself or an increased strength of the next higher need. [Lawler and Suttle, 1972, p.p. 266-268] Furthermore, the hierarchy is a simplified theory of human needs and in order to be useful it must be used in a very rigid form. People in general tend to be quite complex, and therefore it seems very difficult to relate a particular behavior to a single need at a given time. This may be one of the reasons why the hierarchy has failed to confirm its existence through research.

One piece of work that gives evidence of fundamental problems associated with Maslow's theory is that by Wahba and Bridwell [1976]. They reviewed twenty-two studies that attempted to test three crucial elements of the theory; Maslow's need classification scheme, the deprivation/domination preposition and the gratification/ activation preposition. They argued that the most problematic aspect of Maslow's theory is the needs concept itself. There is no shortage of evidence to support that people seek objects and engage in

behavior that are in no way related to the satisfaction of needs. The data suggest that there are a cluster of related lower-level needs and a different cluster of overlapping higher-level needs. In essence, they found little support for the prediction that need structures are organized along the dimensions proposed by Maslow, the prediction of a negative relationship between the level of need gratification and the activation of that need, or the prediction of a positive relationship between the level of need gratification and the activation level of the next higher need. However, they found in eighteen of the twenty-two studies that the strength of the self-actualization need was associated with a deprivation of that need. [Wahba and Bridwell, 1976, p.p. 212-240]

Another study on need hierarchy theory that came to the same conclusion is that of Rauschenberger, Schmitt and Hunter [1980]. They [1980, p. 668] have tested the need hierarchy concept in the light of its conceptual and methodological problems identified by Wahba and Bridwell and concluded that

"the high positive correlations between needs clearly disconfirm the need dominance concept, which is the logical precursor to the need hierarchy."

Maslow's theory appears to be a simple enough model, yet is also of highly dubious validity. It has been suggested that the theory does not hold for workers outside of the United States. As Hofstede [1980, p.55] strongly argued that the hierarchy

> *"is not the description of a universal human motivation*
> *process - it is the description of a value system, the*
> *value system of the U.S. middle class to which the*
> *author belonged."*

From this perspective, Maslow's theory seems to be more like a social philosophy than a psychological theory. Suffice it to say, Maslow may simply have reflected American middle-class values and the pursuit of the good life, and may not have hit on fundamental universal truths about human psychology.

In addition, a number of research studies have been undertaken to test the hierarchy of needs in countries other than the United States and have been revealed that the variation in results strongly suggests that human needs are at least partly culturally specific that is the ways in which people express themselves is different in different culture and therefore that we should not assume Maslow's hierarchy to hold universally. [Adler, 1986, p.p. 128-129]

Another criticism of the need hierarchy derives from the individual difference that exists among people. Some individual have a great, and continuing, need for safety. Many people who work in bureaucracies, for example, prefer jobs in which their tenure is assured to positions in highly competitive industries where salaries, promotions and other rewards are much greater, but so, too, is the likelihood of dismissal or replacement. Miner [1973, p.319] has described differences between individuals and suggested that

> *"self-actualization might be a dominant motive for one person and thus determine a large part of his behavior, but another individual working under essentially the same circumstances might well be guided primarily by social, safety, or even physiological motives much of the time"*

According to Miner, motive hierarchies do differ depending on particular individual learning experience. The initial Maslow's formulation emerged as a theoretical statement rather than an abstraction from field research which may pose considerable difficulties for the researcher when the time comes to operationalize the concepts and test the theory. It seems difficult to see how Maslow's theory can predict and explain behavior. Basically, the amount of satisfaction that has to be achieved before one may progress from one step to the next in the hierarchy is difficult to define and measure. If we could take measurements, the extent to which different people emphasize different needs would make our predictions shaky. The theory is rather vague.

Despite these criticisms, Maslow's work has become virtually the foundation stone of the discussion of job satisfaction in a wide range of applied areas of study. His work has been extremely influential and has stimulated a lot of thinking and research. The hierarchy of needs does not make a significant contribution in terms of making management aware of the diverse needs of humans at work. What is important in Maslow's theory is that hierarchical concept, that is, humans in the workplace have diverse motives, some of which are 'high level'. Maslow is the only theorist who

made the first clear statement that management should recognize the importance of higher level needs. His work began to shift the attention of organization theorists from the more traditional lower order motivators (such as job promotion, salary and so on) to higher order motivators (such as job responsibility, autonomy and challenge). As Watson [1986, p.110] summarized Maslow's contribution and stressed that

> *"the significance of Maslow's work does not lie in its scientific validity. It clearly has little. It role has really been a propaganda device: propaganda in a good and humanistic cause, but propaganda nonetheless ".*

It is quite conceivable that the need hierarchy theory cannot provide the practicing manager with a complete or adequate basis for understanding and dealing with motivational problems. Nevertheless, the need categories suggested by Maslow may be helpful to the manager as he or she attempts to understand the factor most important to a particular employee who may not be performing up to the expectations.

As a matter of fact, Maslow's need hierarchy may have some validity if the theoretical concepts served as a basis in understanding and diagnosing sources of motivational problems. In brief, the hierarchy serves to give us a general perspective on motivation if used as an abstraction of individual behavior. As a consequence, there is no doubt that Maslow has demonstrated his ability to contribute theoretical framework in this study and moreover produced

some valuable material for discussions on the nature of job satisfaction and human behaviors at work.

One of the early theorists who provided the expansion of the need hierarchy concept into the analysis of management and job satisfaction is that by Douglas McGregor. McGregor [1990, p.358] explicitly argued that

"behind every managerial decision or action are assumptions about human nature and behavior"

Basically, there are two distinct views of human being; one basically negative, labeled Theory X, and the other basically positive, labeled Theory Y.

According to McGregor, the following set of assumptions he labels Theory X: 1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if possible, 2. Because of this most people must be coerced, controlled, directed and threatened with punishment to get them to put adequate effort into the achievement of organizational objectives. 3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition and wants security above all [McGregor, 1990, p.p. 358-359].

It has been claimed that the Theory X is widely held but based on a self-fulfilling and inadequate understanding of motivation. If employees are treated in ways consistent with this set of assumptions, their behavior will come to reflect those assumptions. Suffice it to say, if they are treated as lacking in ideas and initiative, this is precisely the behavior they will manifest. Furthermore, if only

monetary rewards are offered, employees will couch demands in monetary terms. In such cases, it becomes more important than ever to buy the material goods and services which can provide limited satisfaction of the needs [McGregor, 1990, p.p. 360-365].

In contrast to these negative views toward the nature of human being, McGregor listed six other positive assumptions that he referred to as Theory Y: 1) Work is as natural as play or rest. 2) External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means of bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. People will tend to exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which they are committed. 3) Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. 4) The average human being learns under proper conditions not only to accept but also to seek responsibility. 5) The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population. 6) In most work organizations the abilities of most employees are only partially utilized [McGregor, 1990, p.p. 367-368]. Similar to that of Maslow, McGregor implied that Theory X would assume that lower-order needs dominate individuals while Theory Y would assume that higher-order needs dominate individuals.

Based on McGregor, the assumptions of Theory Y were preferable and more valid than those of Theory X. [DeCenzo and Robbins, 2003, p.47] McGregor further argued that Theory Y should guide managers in the way that they designed their organizations and motivated their employees. Accordingly, such ideas as participation in decision making, responsible and challenging jobs, and good

group relations that would maximize an employee's job motivation have been proposed. [Robbins, 2003, p. 157] The message from McGregor is that both employees and the organization stand to benefit from a style of management consistent with Theory Y assumption.

Nevertheless, Theory X and Y is not without its criticisms. As a matter of fact, there is a lack of evidence that actions consistent with Theory Y assumptions lead to more motivated workers. In other words, there is no evidence to confirm that either set of assumptions is valid or that accepting Theory Y assumptions and altering one's actions accordingly will make one's employees more motivated.[Robbins, 2003, p.p.157-159]

Clayton Alderfer of Yale University has provided a revision of Maslow's need-based theory of motivation in which the basic needs are reduced to three: existence, relatedness and growth (ERG). Existence needs are for material factors such as health and living standards and are manifest by such things as a concern for working conditions and pay. Relatedness needs are for interpersonal relationships, and growth needs are those for personal development. [Alderfer, 1969, p.p. 142-147]

These needs are arranged in a hierarchy as in the Maslow model but the relationship between the levels is more complex. Rather than there being a one-way progression up the hierarchy as needs are satisfied, Alderfer argues that if an individual is not able to satisfy needs at a particular level this frustration leads to regression - that is, a return to a focus on further satisfying needs at a lower level (the frustration-regression effect). There is a regression from a more abstract (and therefore uncertain and ambiguous) higher

level to a more concrete lower level; from a more to a less cognitively demanding task. This provides a rationale for the frustration-regression effect. [Alderfer, 1969, p.p. 148-175]

As has been criticized by many writers, ERG theory has not received much more empirical support than Maslow's original foundation. Although several studies have supported the ERG theory, but there is also evidence that it doesn't work in some organizations. [Wanous and Zwany, 1977, p.p. 78-97]. Nevertheless, from macro perspective, the theory represents a good conceptual foundation from which contemporary theories have grown and unarguably represents a more valid version of the need hierarchy.

Another well-known theory of motivation is the learned needs theory developed by David McClelland and his associates. It is believed that needs were learned or acquired by the kinds of events people experienced in their culture. These learned needs represented behavioral predispositions that influence the way individuals perceive situations and motivate them to pursue a particular goal. Individuals who acquire a particular need behave differently from those who do not posses it.

McClelland's theory is based on the view that people have three needs: for achievement, for affiliation and for power. The need for achievement (nAch) is indicated by such things as liking to set goals and having responsibility for reaching them, liking problem-solving and getting feedback on performance. The need for affiliation (nAff) is the need to have close, friendly relations with other people and is associated with an ability to empathize with opposing views, a preparedness to consult and discuss and a preference for consultative practices. The need for power (nPow) is

the need to influence. This may be self-serving, with personal gain the driving force (personal power), or it may be based on seeking to improve the performance of staff and, with it, management objectives for the organization (social power) [McClelland, 1961, p.p.29-41].

McClelland focused on studying the connection between these needs and management performance. He strongly argued that high-performing managers rated highly on achievement needs, although without at least a moderate level of affiliation need, such individuals would sometimes strike trouble due to their inattention to interpersonal aspects of managing. A reasonably high need for power was also deemed to be critical for managers, although it is power of social nature which has been found to correlate with successful management [McClelland and Burnham, 1976, p.p. 100-110].

As a major cross-cultural study by Hofstede [1980, p.p. 42], it has been concluded that "McClelland's motivation model could not be seen as universally valid".

Nevertheless, based on an extensive number of researches, some reasonably well supported predictions can be made based on the relationship between need for achievement and job performance. For instance, individuals with a high need to achieve prefer job situations with personal responsibility, feedback, and an intermediate degree of risk. The evidence from other studies also suggested that high achievers are successful in entrepreneurial activities such as running their own businesses, coping with a self-contained department within a large organization and so on. By the same token, individuals with a high achievement need are particularly

interested in how well they do personally but they do not necessarily influence others to do well. Moreover, it has been argued that a high power need may occur as a function of one's level in a hierarchical organization. To be more specific, the higher the level an individual rises to in the organization, the greater is the incumbent's power motive [Robbins, 1994, p.p. 470-471].

One piece of work that is almost as widely cited as Maslow's hierarchy of needs is the 'two-factor' theory of Frederick Herzberg. He and his teams had reviewed available literature on attitudes to work and concluded that there seemed to be a difference between those factors that lead to satisfaction and those that lead to dissatisfaction. As a matter of fact, they have found that job satisfaction depended on five major factors; achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. On the other hand, job dissatisfaction was related to company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions. Suffice it to say, the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction but no satisfaction; similarly, the opposite of dissatisfaction is not satisfaction but no dissatisfaction. The factors causing dissatisfaction is called 'hygiene' factors, and the factors associated with job satisfaction is termed motivators [Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959, p.p.140-146].

Their arguments were consistent both with the underlying hypothesis and with Herzberg's own beliefs that people had certain basic needs. The latter existed in two categories, the first being centered on the avoidance of loss of life, hunger, pain, sexual deprivation and related basic drives, the second being an individual's compelling urge to realize his or her own potentiality by

continuous psychological growth. For Herzberg, the duality that he saw within the nature of people made sense of the duality of hygiene and motivator. Therefore, he argued that it is clear why the hygiene factors fail to provide for positive satisfactions: they do not possess the characteristics necessary for giving an individual a sense of growth [Herzberg, 1968, p.p. 56-68].

Herzberg acknowledges that there was some evidence in the study of individuals who do seem to associate satisfaction with hygiene factors but this he explains as not having reached a stage of personality development at which self-actualizing needs are active; that they are fixated at a less mature level of personal adjustment. In essence, job satisfaction is functionally related to the productivity, stability and adjustment of the industrial working force. Hence, given that satisfaction is due to the motivator factors, the message to managers is clear: do not expect hygiene factors to do the job that only motivators can do [Herzberg, 1968, p.p. 80-89].

The message for managers implied by Herzberg's theory was that greater performance was to be gained from employees not through improvements in pay and job conditions, but through designing workplace processes and practices that enhanced senses of achievement, of autonom, of personal growth, and so one, that is, undertaking job enrichment.

Robbins [2003] has provided a good summary of the criticisms of the motivation-hygiene theory. They are as follows:

• The procedure that Herzberg used was limited by its methodology. When things are going well, people tend to take the credit themselves. They blame failure on extrinsic factors.

- The reliability of Herzberg's methodology was questionable. Since raters had to make interpretations, they might have contaminated the findings by interpreting one response in one manner while treating another similar response differently.

- No overall measure of satisfaction was utilized. A person may dislike part of his or her job yet still think the job is acceptable.

- The theory is inconsistent with previous research. The motivation-hygiene theory ignores situational variables.

- Herzberg assumed that there is a relationship between satisfaction and productivity, but the research methodology he used looked only at satisfaction, not at productivity. To make such research relevant, one must assume a close relationship between satisfaction and productivity.

Regardless of these criticisms, Herzberg's theory has been widely popularized, and most managers are familiar with his recommendations. In particular, much of the enthusiasm for job enrichment can be attributed to his findings and recommendations. [Robbins, 2003, 160-161] As with Maslow and McGregor, the value in Herzberg's approach has not been in the specific details of the theory per se, because of the substantial problems just listed, but because it refers to as a sensitizer bringing to managers' attention the motivational prospects of intrinsic job factors. The content approaches to job satisfaction so far examined have in common the notion that job satisfaction is to be understood through a focus on the structure of needs which it is presumed drive human behavior. Needs approaches assume the existence of a general set of human needs applicable across time and space. Watson [1986, p.97] sometimes referred this to as *psychological universalism*. All need

theories share the common assumption that normal healthy individuals seek intrinsic rewards from their work organization. There is no allowance made for differences that may exist on the basis of gender or class or any number of other factors.

In addition, it has been argued that Needs-based theories are particularly blind to cultural variations, leading to the accusation that they are expressions of the high individualism characteristic of American culture with limited universal application [Hofstede, 1980, p.59]. Content approaches to motivation focus on what are supposedly the basic motives influencing behavior. This approach ignores the process aspect of motivation. That is, in content models the connection between needs and behavior is assumed to be unproblematic, rather than as a process to be investigated.

PROCESS THEORIES OF MOTIVATION

In contrast to the five content theories discussed earlier, process theories of motivation seek to explain the cognitive processes whereby individuals make decisions as to how to act. Rather than being concerned to identify innate needs, in the manner of the content theorists, the process perspective is to direct attention to explaining motivation as a dynamic process. In the following discussion, we will now deal with the process approached to motivation that conform to this perspective.

In the late 1960s, Edwin Locke proposed the goal-setting approach to motivation which focused on the role of goals in determining behavior. In this approach the motivation process involves the conscious intentions of an individual that is, his or her goals being the critical intervening variable between an incentive and actual performance [Locke, 1968, p.p. 157-162].

Key basic assumptions within the goal-setting approach are summarized as follows:

- Specific goals motivate more than general ones such as the exhortation to 'do your best'.

- Difficult but attainable goals motivate more than those that are easily attainable.

- Participation in the setting of a goal is likely to lead to a higher level of motivation than goals issued as directives, but primarily due to its effect on increasing the chances of a goal being accepted as a target for action.

- Feedback on performance enhances the motivational effect.

- Acceptance of the goal is the critical factor, that is, the effect of all other factors that may affect the motivational process is filtered through this factor. For instance, it is argued that if a person accepts a goal as his or her target, then whether or not this was arrived at by participative means becomes of little significance in terms of its motivational effect [Locke, 1968, p.p. 163-189].

Research evidence has substantially supported the goal-setting approach, although there are certainly reservations as to whether acceptance deserves to be given quite overwhelmingly dominant role as a causal factor that is assigned [Robbins, 1994, p.p. 471-472]. For example, Pfeffer [1982] in his work on *organizations and organizational theory* provides a useful and succinct discussion of this and other reservations about the goal-setting model of motivation.

Another process theory of motivation which deserves careful attention is equity theory developed by J. Stacy Adam's in 1965.

The equity theory is based on the belief that employees' behavior is influenced by their perception of the degree of equity in the outcomes (such as salary, position) they receive for the input (such as effort, experience) they make. Equity is assessed in a continuing process of comparison with the inputs and outputs of someone they see as in an equivalent position. It is claimed that workers who believe that their outcome-to-input ratio is either higher or lower than those with whom they compare will have resulting feelings of inequity that lead them to take action. to remove the inequity. Those who feel deprived may take action such as asking for higher pay (increased output), reducing the effort they put into their work (decreased input), revising downward their assessment of the difficulty of their job, or changing the person they use as their point of comparison. Alternatively, they may focus on the others, hoping to bring about a reduction in their pay, or an increase in their effort or a reassessment of the difficulty of that job.

If the other's job is newly perceived as more demanding the inequity may disappear. If none of these solve the problem, or are simply not tried, the perceived inequity may be resolved by internal transfer or resignation. It is argued that parallel reactions also exist for those whose assessment of equity leads them to believe that they are relatively privileged. In such cases, according to equity theory, the privileged will also seek to restore equity [Adams, 1965, p.p. 267-300].

Equity is not without its problems, it has also been criticized that the theory fails to provide specific methods for restoring equity [Greenberg, 1988, p.p.606-613]. This omission leaves the how-to-correct activities up to managers or to those who must usually guess

about what should be done. The fact that most research on equity theory has been focused on pay is also questionable. Since pay is just one of a list of valued rewards, other rewards (both financial and non-financial rewards) should also be taken into considerations [Donnelly, Gibson, and Ivancevich, 1995, p.316].

Furthermore, Robbins has raised a number of important questions regarding the equity theory. They are: how do employees define inputs and outcomes? How do they combine and weigh their inputs and outcomes to arrive at totals? When and how do the factors change over time? [Robbins, 1994, p.475]. Although these questions seem unclear and require further clarification, equity theory has however a considerable amount of empirical research that support and offer us some fundamental truth to better understand employee job satisfaction. A detailed review of the evidence on the validity of equity theory found that there was support in laboratory tests but the studies in actual organizations provided little clear evidence of such validity [Carrell and Dittrich, 1978, p.p.202-210].

Perhaps, the most comprehensive explanation of motivation is Victor Vroom's expectancy theory. Though it has its critics, most of the research evidence supports the theory. Expectancy theory assumes that at any given point in time a person has preferences among outcomes and that behavior is affected both by these preferences and by the degree to which it is believed that the desired outcome can be achieved. To be more precise, the motivational process requires the availability of a desired outcome, the belief that a certain act will lead to that outcome, and the belief that one has the ability to complete the required act successfully. The motivational effect will hence depend on the strength of each of these that is the

level of desirability, the probability assigned to the act leading to the outcome, and the probability assigned to being able to complete the act successfully [Vroom, 1964, p.p. 45-78].

Psychologists Lyman Porter and Edward Lawler build on an expectancy theory basis to provide a model of motivation that incorporates performance and satisfaction as variables. The logic of the model is as follows. The value attached to reward, and the likelihood of effort leading to this reward, determines the effort put into it. Nevertheless, performance does not depend on effort alone, it depends also on the ability of the employee and their understanding of what they are required to do. That is, effort alone is insufficient if the employee does not have the required level or type of skill. By the same token, if they have either misinterpreted what is required, or been misinformed, effort is likely to be misdirected and therefore performance impaired. The level of performance determines the rewards which in turn lead to satisfaction via the intervening matter of the perception of the equity of the reward provided. That is, inadequate rewards do not satisfy [Porter and Lawler, 1968, p.p.11-22].

Expectancy theory with its focus on process provides a useful alternative perspective to content theories, but because it does not deal with the latter it cannot ever provide more than a partial understanding of job satisfaction. In addition, it gives the impression that people always act on the basis of a clear and logically thought-out assessment of the situation as they perceive it. This may be unrealistic as it ignores the effects of such factors as conditioned responses, intuition, whim and coercion [Landy and Becker, 1987, p.p. 22-27]

Expectancy theory is one of the most complex theories of motivation. There seems to be problems of measuring and studying the main variables in the model [Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, and Wright, 2003] For example, how should preferences be determined? How should expectancy be determined? Nevertheless, despite the lack of tested validity, the expectancy theory provides insight into the role that perception plays in choices, expectancy, and preferences [Donnelly, Gibson, and Ivancevich, 1995, p.p. 318-319].

It has further been argued that expectancy theories work best in cultures that have a high level of internal attribution, that is , where individuals believe that outcomes are largely the result of their own behavior. That is said to be characteristic of American managers far more so than those from many other countries. In the latter, external attribution is the dominant mode, that is, the belief that things happen due to some force outside the individual such as fate or god's will. [Adler, 1986, p.p.25-44].

CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, in today organizational complexity, motivation has no doubt been a central topic in attempts to understand human behaviors and employees' performance in organizations. Content theories focus on the identification of certain basic human needs as the way to understand motivation and job satisfaction. Notwithstanding this, content theories have been criticized as being insufficiently sensitive to the existence of variation both between and within societies, and as not giving due to attention to the process whereby motivation operates. In contrast to content theories, process theories of motivation, such as the goal-setting approach,

equity theory and expectancy theory, seek to clarify the process dimension.

In conclusion, we have so far explored a number of theories of motivation in this article. And it is true that many of the ideas underlying the theories are complementary (although we could view them independently), and our understanding of how to motivate people is maximized when we see how the theories fit together. Either content or process theory, whatever the differences and limitations of using one approach, it is quite conceivable that motivation involves the matching of the individual's needs, values and expectations to what the job offers. In such a complex field as job behavior, it seems logical to stress that no single theory accounts for all the phenomena all the time. It is therefore important that we all understand the fundamental premise and the logic of both content and process theories of motivation.

REFERENCES

Adams, J, S., "Inequity in Social Exchanges" in L. Berkowitz (ed), 1965. **Advances in Experimental Social Psychology**, (Academic Press, New York), p.p. 267-300.

Adler, N.J., 1986. **International Dimension of Organizational Behavior**, (Kent Publishing Company, Boston), p.p. 25-44, 123-148.

Alderfer, C, P., 1969. "An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs", **Organizational Behavior and Human Performance**, (May), p.p. 142-175.

Clawson, J, G., 2003. Level Three Leadership: Getting Below the Surface, (Prentice Hall, U.S.A.), ch ch 6, p.p. 73-74.

Correll, M, R., and Dittrich, J, E., 1978. "Equity Theory: The Recent Literature, Methodological Considerations and New Directions", **Academy of Management Review**, (3), p.p. 202-210.

DeCenzo, D, A., and Robbins, S, P., 2003. **Human Resource Management**, (John Wiley & Sons, Inc, U.S.A.).

Deresky, H., 2002. **Global Management: Strategic and Interpersonal** (Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle, New Jersey), ch 10, p.p. 287-315.

Donnelly, J, H, Jr., Gibson, J, L., and Ivancevich, J, M., 1995. **Fundamentals of Management**, (Richard D. Irwin Inc, U.S.A.), ch 11, p.p. 301-341.

Greenberg, J., 1988. "Equity and Workplace Status: A Field Experiment", Journal of Applied Psychology, (November), p.p. 600-613.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B,B., 1959. **The Motivation to Work,** (John Wiley & Sons, New York).

Herzberg, F., 1968. **Work and The Nature of Man**, (Crosby Lockwood, London).

Hofstede, G., 1980. "Motivation, Leadership and Organization: do American theories apply abroad?" **Organization Dynamics** (no. 9), p.p. 42-63.

Landy, F, and Becker, W, S., 1987. "Motivation Theory reconsidered" in Cummings L, L, and Staw, B, M, (ed) **Research in Organizational Behaviour**, (Greenwich CT : JAI press), p.p. 1-38.

Lawler III, E, E., and Suttle, J, L., 1972. "A Causal Correlation Test of the Need Hierarchy Concept", **Organizational Behavior and Human Performance**, (April), p.p. 265-287.

Locke, E, A., 1968. "Towards a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives", **Organizational Behavior and Human Performance**, (3), p.p. 157-189.

Maslow, A.H., 1954. **Motivation and Personality**, (Harper & Brothers, New York).

McClelland, D, C., 1961. **The Achieving Society**, (Van Nostrand, Princeton).

McClelland, D, C., and Burnham, D, H., 1976. "Power is The Great Motivator", **Harvard Business Review**, (54), p.p. 100-110.

McGregor, D., 1990. "The Human Side of Enterprise" in D.S. Pugh., (ed), **Organization Theory: Selected Readings**, (Penguin Books, England), p.p. 358-374.

Miner, J, B., 1973. **The Management Process: Theory, Research, and Practice** (The Macmillan Company, New York).

Noe, R, A., Hollenbeck, J, R., Gerhart, B., and Wright, P, M., 2003. **Human Resource Management: Gaining A Competitive Advantage**, (McGraw-Hill, Irwin, U.S.A.), ch12, p.p. 494-496.

Pfeffer, J., 1982. **Organizations and Organizational Theory**, (Pitman, Boston).

Porter, L, W., and Lawler, E,E., 1968. **Managerial Attitudes and Performance**, (Homewood, Richard D. Irwin)

Rauschenberger, J., Schmitt, N., and Hunter, J. E., 1980. "A Test of the Need Hierarchy Concept by a Markov Model of Change in Need Strength", **Administrative Science Quarterly**, (December), p.p. 654-670.

Robbins, S, P., 1994. **Management**, (Prentice-Hall International Inc, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey), Ch 16, pp.463-492.

Robbins, S. P., 2003. **Organizational Behavior** (Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey), Ch 6, p.p. 154-179.

Schermerhorn, J, R, Jr., 2003. **Management**, (John Wiley & Sons, Inc. U.S.A.), ch 14, p.p. 360-385.

Vroom, V, H., 1964. **Work and Motivation** (John Wiley & sons, New York).

Wahba, M, A., and Bridwell, L, G. 1976. "Maslow Reconsidered : A Review of Research on the need Hierarchy Theory". **Organizational Behavior and Human Performance**, (April), p.p. 212-240.

Wanous, J, P., and Zwany, A, 1977. "A Cross-Sectional Test of Need Hierarchy Theory", **Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance**, (May), p.p. 78-87.

Watson, T, J., 1986. **Management Organization and Employment Strategy** (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London).