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ABSTRACT

Workplace Motivation as one of the most popular and important field of studies is receiving great attentions from researchers and Human Resource practitioners. In Content theories of Motivation, there are numerous definitions in explaining the meanings and sources of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. Hence, this paper is literally study various definitions contributed by past researchers and a critical review and comparison between Maslow, Herzberg andMcClelland's Theory of Needs. The purpose of this paper is to present a detailed review of literature of the three theories of motivation in a thematic and quasi-chronological fashion. This will permit readers to gain a thorough understanding of the many facets of motivation theories in modern literature. The literature review showed that there is a clear relationship between Maslow's Hierarchy of needs Theory, Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of motivation and McClelland's need for achievement theory. This relationship shows the overlap of higher level needs and motivators and the corresponding overlap of hygiene and lower order needs. The lower needs must be met before higher order needs can have any motivational force and Herzberg's parallel hygiene factors must be met to prevent job dissatisfaction. Maslow's higher order needs serve to motivate people and are of an intrinsic nature which corresponds to Herzberg's motivational factors that are also intrinsic in nature. The paper recommended that organizations should endeavor to adopt McClellend's theory in motivating its workforce.
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Introduction

Human motivation is a complex and well studied field that has broad roots in a diverse collection of academic disciplines including psychology, sociology, education, political science, economics and management sciences. From the very beginning, when the human organizations were established, various thinkers have tried to find out the answer to what motivates people to work. Different approaches applied by the researchers have resulted in a number of theories concerning motivation. These are discussed in brief in that order (Chand, 1998).

To every individual who exerts his/her energy towards accomplishing a particular task, we often say “This individual is Motivated”. Sometimes people use the term unconsciously to express how serious they are in accomplishing a task. But the real question still emerge, what is motivation? According to Jaja (2003) motivation is the result of the interaction of the individual and the situation. A motive (or drive) is a need that is sufficiently pressing to drive a person to act in a goal directed manner.

Although there are numerous definitions contributed by various researchers and philosophers in defining motivation, however, the common ground on variety of definitions are explaining motivation as degree which individuals want and choose to engage in certain directed activities in condition that returns from that particular activities would satisfy their needs.
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(Sansone and Harackiewicz, 2000; Ricky, Griffin & Moorhead, 2012). In order to activate individual’s specific behaviour, sources of stimulus that will encourage the particular individual to behave explicitly must be clearly acknowledged (Kian & Yusoff, 2015).

According to Flower (2014) most leaders at some point in time, have either consciously or, more likely, unwittingly based (or justified) their approach to motivation on Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Maslow’s idea that people are motivated by satisfying lower-level needs such as food, water, shelter, and security, before they can move on to being motivated by higher-level needs such as self-actualization, is the most well-known motivation theory in the world. There is nothing wrong with helping people satisfy what Maslow characterized as lower-level needs. Improvements in workplace conditions and safety should be applauded as the accurate thing to do. Considering that people have as much as necessary food and water to meet their biological needs is the humane thing to do. Getting people off the streets into healthy environments is the polite thing to do. But the truth is individuals can experience higher-level motivation anytime and anywhere.

According to Kelley (2015) Motivation in management describes ways in which managers promote productivity in their employees. Often, people confuse the idea of ‘happy’ employees with ‘motivated’ employees. These may be related, but motivation actually describes the level of desire employees feel to perform, regardless of the level of happiness. Employees who are adequately motivated to perform will be more productive, more engaged and feel more invested in their work. When employees feel these things, it helps them, and thereby their managers, be more successful.

The purpose of this paper is to present detailed review of literature of the three theories of motivation in a thematic and quasi-chronological fashion. This will permit the reader to gain a thorough understanding of the many facets of motivation theories in modern literature. A cursory view of the literature will show that there are two central categories of motivation theories: content and process theories.

Content theories are centered on the assumption that individuals all share a similar set of human needs and those human beings are all motivated to satisfy their needs (e.g., Maslow, 1946; McGregor, 1957; Herzberg, 1968; Alderfer, 1969; McClelland, 1988). Process theories are centered around the rational cognitive process and say that while most people may have similar needs, the importance and placement of those needs is different for everyone; that it is something highly subjective (e.g., Vroom, 1967; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Kahler, 1975; Locke, Latham and Smith, 1990).

Motivation can also be seen as a driving force that initiates and directs behavior. We can also say that it is a temporal or dynamic state within a person which is not concerned with his or her personality. All of these tasks fall under one or more motivational theories which will be discussed in this paper. However, this work would be comparing motivational theories of Maslow, Herzberg and McClelland with a quest to understanding their own view as well as see the criticisms and similarities connecting these theories.

**Literature Review**

**Conceptualization of Motivation**

The term 'motivation' has been derived from the word 'motive'. Motive may be defined as an inner state of our mind that activates and directs our behaviour. It makes us move to act. It is always internal to us and is externalized via our behaviour. Motivation is one's willingness to exert efforts towards the accomplishment of his/her goal. Let us consider a few important definitions on motivation that will help us understand the meaning of motivation more clearly.

Luthans (2010) defined motivation as a “process that starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates behaviour or a drive that is aimed at a goal or incentive,” According to Stephen P. Robbins “motivation is the willingness to exert high levels of efforts toward organizational goals, conditioned by the effort ability to satisfy some individual need”.

In the opinion of Gray and Starke “motivation is the result of processes, internal or external to the individual, that arouse enthusiasm and persistence to pursue a certain course of action” After going through the above definitions, motivation can be defined as the willingness to exert towards the accomplishment of goals or need. In simplified
terms, motivation can be defined as “what causes people to behave as they do” (Denhardt, Denhardt & Aristigueta, 2008). Unfortunately, this simple definition hides the dynamic intricacies of the motivation literature. There tends to be a general consensus as to the definition of motivation which reflects that: (i) motivation is goal directed (Lawler, 1994), (ii) motivation outlines the achievement and pursuit of goals (Denhardt et al., 2008) and (iii) motivation is environmentally dependent (Pettinger, 1996).

Campbell and Pritchard (1976) define motivation as being the set of psychological processes that cause the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of behavior. Because motivation is so difficult to define, it may help in determining what motivation is not. Denhardt, et al (2008) posits that motivation is not: (a) directly observable, (b) the same as satisfaction, (c) always conscious, and (d) directly controllable. Motivation is not directly observable. “Motivation is an internal state that causes people to behave in a particular way to accomplish particular goals and purposes. It is possible to observe the outward manifestations of motivation but not motivation itself” (Denhardt et al., 2008).

Motivation is not the same as satisfaction. “Put simply, satisfaction is past oriented, whereas motivation is future oriented” (Denhardt et al., 2008). While a worker may be very satisfied by the compensation of their job, there are countless instances where these workers are not entirely motivated to continue doing what they intend doing (Igalens & Roussel, 1999).

Motivation is not always conscious. Unconscious motivation is quite central to Sigmund Freud's theories of human behavior. Freud posits that most human behavior is the result of unconscious repressed memories, impulses, and desires that influence and drive many human behaviors (Freud, 1976). A manifestation of this idea is the “Freudian slip” where an accidental word slip actually betrays true internal feelings and intentions. Motivation is not directly controllable. “Motivation is not something that people do to others. Motivation occurs within people's minds and hearts. Managers can influence the motivational process, but they cannot control it” (Denhardt et al., 2008).

Most of the researchers agree that Motivation can be distinct into Intrinsic and Extrinsic. Among various researchers and philosophers that have discussed Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation, Herzberg (1959), Ryan and Deci (2000), and Calder and Staw (1975) have earned high reputation in their theories. According to Amabile (1994, 2001), individuals are intrinsically motivated when they seek enjoyment, interest, satisfaction of curiosity, self-expression, or personal challenge in their work. Sources of Intrinsic Motivations are whatever emotions and feelings attached on the work individuals are or about to conduct. On the other hand, individuals are extrinsically motivated when they engage in their work in order to obtain some goal that is apart from the work itself. Sources of Extrinsic Motivation include anything coming from an outside source that is intended to control the initiation or performance of the work.

Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) defined Intrinsic Motivation as the degree to which individuals want to work well in their respective organizations for the purpose of intrinsic satisfactions. The term intrinsic satisfaction refers to individual inner emotional demand for satisfactions. By conducting or completing tasks or works that will fulfill individuals' emotional demand are observed to have the potential to intrinsically motivate individuals. Brooks (2009) posits that Intrinsic Motivations can come from individuals themselves. This statement is parallel with Ryan and Deci (2009), where environment serves as facilitators, individuals themselves are the one to decide to response to the facilitators or not.

In terms of Extrinsic Motivation, it is widely defined as the influence from external source (Osterloh and Frey 2007). Individuals that are externally motivated are conducting their behaviours for the motives outside or separate from the behaviours they cause (Hoyenga and Hoyenga, 1984). It can be explain in a simple way, individuals are conducting behaviour for other purposes, rather than the meaning of the behaviour itself. Hennessey and Amabile (2005) also given a similar point of view, where they depict that extrinsic motivation is the motivation to do something to make sure that some external goal is attained.
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Abraham Maslow Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow's hierarchy of needs is often portrayed in the shape of a pyramid with the largest, most fundamental levels of needs at the bottom and the need for self-actualization and self-transcendence at the top (Maslow, 1943, Steere, 1988)

The most fundamental and basic four layers of the pyramid contain what Maslow called "deficiency needs" or "d-needs": esteem, friendship and love, security, and physical needs. If these "deficiency needs" are not met with the exception of the most fundamental (physiological) need, there may not be a physical indication, but the individual will feel anxious and tense. Maslow's theory suggests that the most basic level of needs must be met before the individual will strongly desire (or focus motivation upon) the secondary or higher level needs. Maslow also coined the term “meta-motivation” to describe the motivation of people who go beyond the scope of the basic needs and strive for constant betterment (Goble 1970)

Maslow portrayed the needs of individuals in the form of a pyramid with several stages of needs. At the least was the physiological needs and the highest was the self-actualization. According to Baridam (2002), Maslow based his theory of human motivation on the following assumptions:

1) Individuals have certain needs that influence their behavior, only unsatisfied needs can influence behavior, satisfied needs do not act as motivators.
2) Needs are arranged in an order of importance or hierarchy from the basic physiological to the complex self-actualization needs,
3) An individual's need at any level on the hierarchy emerges only when the lower needs are reasonably satisfied.

It is probably safe to say that the most well known theory of motivation is Abraham Maslow’s theory of Needs. Maslow hypothesized that within every human being, there exists a hierarchy of five needs which are:

a) Physiological needs such as hunger, thirst, shelter, sex and other bodily needs. Physiological needs are the physical requirements for human survival. If these requirements are not met, the human body cannot function properly and will ultimately fail. Physiological needs are thought to be the most important; they should be met first. There are the requirements for survival in all animals, including humans. Clothing and shelter provide necessary protection from the elements. While maintaining an adequate birth rate shapes the intensity of the human sexual instinct, sexual competition may also shape said instinct (Maslow, 1943).

b) Safety needs such as security and protection from physical and emotional harm. Once a person's physiological needs are relatively satisfied, their safety needs take precedence and dominate behavior. In the absence of physical safety – due to war, natural disaster, family violence, childhood abuse, etc. – people may (re-)experience post-traumatic stress disorder or trans-generational trauma. In the absence of economic safety – due to economic crisis and lack of work opportunities – these safety needs manifest themselves in ways such as a preference for job security, grievance procedures for protecting the individual from unilateral authority, savings accounts, insurance policies, disability accommodations, etc. Safety and Security needs include: Personal security, financial security, Health and well-being, Safety net against accidents/illness and their adverse impacts.

c) Social belonging needs: affection, belongingness, acceptance and friendship. After physiological and safety needs are fulfilled, the third level of human needs is interpersonal and involves feelings of belongingness. Deficiencies within this level of Maslow's hierarchy can adversely affect the individual's ability to form and maintain emotionally significant relationships in general, such as: friendships, intimacy, and family. According to Maslow (1943) humans need to feel a sense of belonging and acceptance among their social groups, not considering the size of the groups. For instance, some large social groups may include clubs, co-workers, religious groups, professional organizations, sports teams, and gangs. (Maslow, 1943).

d) Esteem needs: internal factors such as self-respect, autonomy, achievement and external factors such as status, recognition and attention. All humans have a need to feel respected; this includes the need to have self-esteem and self-respect. Esteem need presents the typical human desire to be
accepted and valued by others. People often engage in a profession or hobby to gain recognition. These activities give the person a sense of contribution or value. Low self-esteem may result from imbalances during this level in the hierarchy. People with low self-esteem often need revere from others; they may feel the need to search for recognition or glory. Most people have a need for stable self-respect and self-esteem. Maslow noted two versions of esteem needs: a "lower" version and a "higher" version. The "lower" version of esteem is the need for respect from others. This may include a need for status, recognition, eminence, prestige, and attention. The "higher" version manifests itself as the need for self-respect. This "higher" version takes preference over the "lower" version since it relies on an inner capability established through knowledge. Deprivation of these needs may lead to an inferiority complex, weakness, and helplessness (Maslow, 1954). This means that esteem and the subsequent levels are not strictly separated; instead, the levels are closely related.

e) Self-actualization: drive to become what one is capable of becoming. It includes growth, achieving ones potential and self-fulfillment. "What a man can be, he must be." (Maslow, 1954). This quotation forms the basis of the perceived need for self-actualization. This level of need refers to what a person's full potential is and the realization of that potential. Maslow describes this level as the desire to accomplish everything that one can, to become the most that one can be (Maslow, 1954). Individuals may perceive or focus on this need very specifically. As previously mentioned, Maslow believed that to understand this level of need, the person must not only achieve the previous needs, but master them (Maslow, 1954).

f) Self-transcendence: In his later years, Maslow explored a further dimension of needs, while criticizing his own vision on self-actualization (Maslow, 1954). The self only finds its actualization in giving itself to some higher goal outside oneself, in altruism and spirituality (Garcia-Romeu, 2010). "Transcendence refers to the very highest and most inclusive or holistic levels of human consciousness, behaving and relating, as ends rather than means, to oneself, to significant others, to human beings in general, to other species, to nature, and to the Cosmos" It is pertinent to state that as each of the needs becomes considerably fulfilled, the next stage becomes dominant (Robbins, 2009). However, a need must not be completely satisfied before the next level becomes compelling. A study by Jaja (2003) posits that more realistic description of the hierarchy would be in terms of decreasing proportion of satisfaction as potency increases.

**Criticisms of Maslow's Theory**

Despite the popularity of Maslow's Hierarchy, there is not much recent data to support it. Flower (2014) posits that contemporary science specifically Dr. Edward Deci, hundreds of Self-Determination Theory researchers, and thousands of studies — instead points to three universal psychological needs. These researchers suggest that the focus should be on: autonomy, relatedness, and competence rather than focusing on a pyramid of needs (Flower, 2014).

Autonomy is people's need to perceive that they have choices, that what they are doing is of their own volition, and that they are the source of their own actions. The way leaders frame information and situations either promotes the likelihood that a person will perceive autonomy or undermines it. To promote autonomy:

a) Frame goals and timelines as essential information to assure a person's success, rather than as dictates or ways to hold people accountable.

b) Refrain from incentivizing people through competitions and games.

c) Don't apply pressure to perform. Sustained peak performance is a result of people acting because they choose to not because they feel they have to.

Relatedness is people's need to care about and be cared about by others, to feel connected to others without concerns about ulterior motives, and to feel that they are contributing to something greater than themselves. Leaders have a great opportunity to help people derive meaning from their work. To deepen relatedness:

a) Validate the exploration of feelings in the workplace.

b) Take time to facilitate the development of people's values at work and help them align those values with their goals.

c) Connect people's work to a noble purpose.

Competence is people's need to feel effective at meeting every-day challenges and opportunities,
demonstrating skill over time, and feeling a sense of growth and flourishing. Leaders can rekindle people’s desire to grow and learn. To develop people’s competence:

i. Make resources available for learning. What message does it send about values for learning and developing competence when training budgets are the first casualty of economic cutbacks?

ii. Set learning goals not just the traditional results-oriented and outcome goals.

iii. At the end of each day, instead of asking, “What did you achieve today?” ask “What did you learn today?”

Unlike Maslow’s needs, these three basic needs are not hierarchical or sequential. They are foundational to all human beings and our ability to flourish. The exciting significance to leaders is that when the three basic psychological needs are satisfied in the workplace, people experience the day-to-day high-quality motivation that fuels employee work passion and all the inherent benefits that come from actively engaged individuals at work.

Lawyer and Suttle (1972) in their study of managers in two companies found little support that a hierarchy of needs existed. Also, the assumption that only one level of need is operational at any point in time is challenged. Maslow viewed human needs as being static whereas in reality these needs are dynamic. Finally, the theory indicates that a satisfied need is not a motivator. But it is true that individual needs are never fully or permanently satisfied (Baridam, 2002).

Globally ranking in their extensive review of research based on Maslow’s theory, Wahba and Bridwell (1976) found little evidence for the ranking of needs that Maslow described or for the existence of a definite hierarchy at all. The order in which the hierarchy is arranged has been criticized as being ethnocentric by Hofstede (1984). Maslow’s hierarchy of needs fails to illustrate and expand upon the difference between the social and intellectual needs of those raised in individualistic societies and those raised in collectivist societies. The needs and drives of those in individualistic societies tend to be more self-centered than those in collectivist societies, focusing on improvement of the self, with self-actualization being the apex of self-improvement. In collectivist societies, the needs of acceptance and community will outweigh the needs for freedom and individuality (Cianci & Gambrel, 2003).

**Ranking of sex:**

The position and value of sex on the pyramid has also been a source of criticism regarding Maslow’s hierarchy. Maslow’s hierarchy places sex in the physiological needs category along with food and breathing; it lists sex solely from an individualistic perspective. For example, sex is placed with other physiological needs which must be satisfied before a person considers “higher” levels of motivation. Some critics feel this placement of sex ignores the emotional, familial, and evolutionary implications of sex within the community, although others point out that this is true of all of the basic needs (Kenirick, 2010). There are also people who do not want sex, such as some asexual (Bogaert, 2006).

**Changes to the hierarchy by circumstance**

The higher-order (self-esteem and self-actualization) and lower-order (physiological, safety, and love) needs classification of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is not universal and may vary across cultures due to individual differences and availability of resources in the region or geopolitical entity/country.

In the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of a thirteen item, the statistical scale showed that there were two predominantly essential levels of needs in the United States during the peacetime between 1993 and 1994. These are: survival (physiological and safety) and psychological (love, self-esteem, and self-actualization). In 1991, a retrospective peacetime measure was established and collected during the Persian Gulf War and United States citizens were asked to recall the importance of needs from the previous year. Once again, only two levels of needs were identified; therefore, people have the ability and competence to recall and estimate the importance of needs (Tang, & West, 1997).

Goebel and Brown (1981) looked at how Maslow’s hierarchy might vary across age groups. The survey asked participants of varying ages to rate a set number of statements from most important to least important. The researchers found that children had higher physical need scores than the other...
groups, the love need emerged from childhood to young adulthood, the esteem need was highest among the adolescent group, young adults had the highest self-actualization level, and old age had the highest level of security, it was needed across all levels comparably. The authors argued that this suggested Maslow's hierarchy may be limited as a theory for developmental sequence since the sequence of the love need and the self-esteem need should be reversed according to age.

Criticism of definition of terms - Self-actualization: The term "self-actualization" may not universally convey Maslow's observations; this motivation refers to focusing on becoming the best person that one can possibly strive for in the service of both the self and others (Maslow, 1954). Maslow's term of self-actualization might not properly portray the full extent of this level; quite often, when a person is at the level of self-actualization, much of what they accomplish in general may benefit others, or "the greater good".

Fredrick Herzberg Two Factor Theory
Herzberg discussed two sets of factors in deciding employees working attitudes and level of performance, named Motivators & Hygiene Factors (Robbins, 2009). Motivators are intrinsic factors that will increase employees' job satisfaction; while Hygiene Factors are Extrinsic Factors to prevent any employee dissatisfaction. Herzberg posits that full supplies of Hygiene Factors will not necessary result in employees' job satisfaction. In order to increase employees' performance or productivity, Motivators must be addressed.

This theory further proposed that the intrinsic and extrinsic factors are independent towards each other. Presence of extrinsic factors will only eliminate employees' work dissatisfaction; however, it will not provide job satisfaction. On the other hand, sufficient supply in intrinsic factor will cultivate employees' inner growth and development that will lead to a higher productivity and performance; however, absent of this factor will only neutralize their feeling neither satisfy nor dissatisfy on their jobs. Extrinsic factors only permit employees willingness to work while intrinsic factors will decide their quality of work. These two groups of extrinsic and intrinsic factors are not necessary opposite with each other, as opposite of satisfaction are not dissatisfaction, but rather no satisfaction. Similarly, opposite of dissatisfaction are not satisfaction, but no dissatisfaction (Robbins, 2009).

Herzberg's theory distinct intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors according to the effect of Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1959, 1987; Robbins, 2009). Among sixteen factors proposed, those which will lead to employees Job Satisfactions are categories into Motivator, while the rest of the factors that will make employees dissatisfy with their job are categories into Hygiene Factors.

Herzberg's Two-factor theory, also called motivation-hygiene theory believes that an individual's relation to work is basic and that one's attitude towards work can very well determine success or failure. The research was undertaken by Herzberg in the 1950s where he interviewed 203 engineers, accountants and managers at Pittsburgh, United States of America because of their growing importance in the business world. The research broadened the understanding of motivating factors and job satisfaction in the workplace. It has always been important to lead employees to do what employers or customers want and to give satisfaction to employees in the workplace for improved productivity.

Herzberg (1968) suggested in a Two-factor Theory of Motivation that there were two factors driving employee satisfaction in the workplace: motivation factors and hygiene factors. Hygiene factors, if lacking in a vocational environment, can lead to workers' job dissatisfaction. The role of hygiene factors is simply to prevent workers' discontent. In other words, these factors do not lead to higher levels of motivation but, without them, there is dissatisfaction. Unlike hygiene factors, motivation factors can truly encourage employees to work hard and enjoy their jobs. These factors involve what people actually do on the job and should be engineered into the jobs employees do in order to develop intrinsic motivation within the workforce (Herzberg, 1968). Specific examples of hygiene factors are organizational policy, interpersonal relations, job conditions, traffic during the commute, career stability, supervision, and guaranteed retirement fund. Motivators are
personal growth, passion for the job, social responsibility, opportunity for advancement, respect, praise, recognition, and the feeling of achievement (Daft, 2003). An interesting point is that salary can be a hygiene factor or a motivator according to the meaning of itself. If salary does not have any meaning other than 'buying power', it should be just considered a hygiene factor. On the contrary, salary could be a motivator if it represents a symbol of achievement at work (Daft, 2003).

There have been a number of empirical studies on Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation and job satisfaction in various organizations. Herzberg (1968) insisted that if hygiene factors are present, job satisfaction will follow, but it will not encourage employees to increase productivity. However, unlike Herzberg's assertion, Simons and Enz (1995) pointed out that hygiene factors, such as good wages and job security, are more important than motivators, such as interesting work and full appreciation of work done by the employees. In addition, according to Chitiris (1988), when an organization did not allow employees an opportunity to satisfy most of their needs, hygiene factors became more powerful sources of motivation than motivators, and they led to improved performance and productivity.

Chitiris (1988) concludes that employees have two set of needs in the work place. He described them as Hygiene factors and Motivator factors. Hygiene factors (satisfiers) include salary, working condition, fringe benefits interpersonal relations, organizational policy and administration, supervision, and job security. He also stated that these factors on their own do not lead to job satisfaction but their absence can create dissatisfaction.

Motivator factors: are factors such as recognition, responsibility, achievement, and opportunity for progression, recognition, advancement, and responsibility, increases job satisfaction. Herzberg found that a combination of these factors increased motivation and improved individual performance.

Criticism of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation

The theory basically explains job satisfaction and not motivation. Even job satisfaction is not measured on an overall basis. It is not unlikely that a person may dislike part of his/her job, still thinks the job acceptable. This theory neglects situational variable to motivate an individual, and because of its ubiquitous nature, salary commonly shows up a motivator as well as hygiene (Chand, 1998).

Herzberg's research methodology is being questioned by scholars. The critical incident technique he used by asking people to look at themselves retrospectively does not substantially provide a vehicle for expression of other factors to be mentioned. This methodology may cause people to recall only the most recent experiences. Also, methodological inconsistencies and the fact that different researchers have used different motivation variables have affected the contraposition about Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (Chitiris, 1988). Therefore, we cannot conclude that Herzberg's proposal regarding motivation is readily applicable to all kinds of organizations. In other words, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory needs to be reexamined to understand which motivation factors are more significant in different organizations.

Herzberg's theory was conducted on knowledge workers (managers, accountants and engineers) thus scholars criticize its ability to be generalized. Herzberg's theory focused too much attention on "satisfaction"-"dissatisfaction" rather than individual performance. Satisfaction may not be directly related to job performance. Herzberg's theory fails to account for differences in individuals. While some are motivated by job context variables, others find favor in job content factors depending on his particular circumstance (Baridam, 2002)

According to Sungmin (2009) among several theories regarding motivation factors leading to job satisfaction, most researchers consider Herzberg's Two-Factor model theory as the best method in predicting job satisfaction. However, different research results were found regarding Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation predicting job satisfaction. Some researchers insisted motivators were more significant in increasing job satisfaction for employees as Herzberg pointed out. Other researchers argued hygiene factors were more important predictors of job satisfaction. Therefore, this paper cannot conclude Herzberg's proposal regarding motivation as applicable to all kinds of organizations.
Comparative Analysis between Maslow's Theory and Herzberg's Theory.

Gaurav Akrani (2011) enumerated several distinctions between Maslow and Herzberg's theories as follows:

1. In Terms of Meaning: Maslow's theory is based on the concept of human needs and their satisfaction while Herzberg's theory is based on the use of motivators which includes achievement, recognition and opportunity for growth.

2. Basis of Theory: Maslow's theory is based on the hierarchy of human needs. He identified five sets of human needs (on priority basis) and their satisfaction in motivating employees while Herzberg refers to hygiene factors and motivating factors in his theory. Hygiene factors are dissatisfiers while motivating factors motivate subordinate. Hierarchical arrangement of need is not given.

3. Nature of Theory: Maslow's theory is rather simple and descriptive; the theory is based on long experience about human needs. While Herzberg's theory is more prescriptive. It suggests the motivating factors which can be used effectively. The theory is based on actual information collected by Herzberg after interviewing 203 engineers and accountants.

4. Applicability of Theory: Maslow's theory is the most popular and widely cited theory of motivation and has wide applicability. It is mostly applicable to poor and developing countries where money is still a big motivating factor. While Herzberg's theory is an extension of Maslow's theory of motivation. It is on the other hand applicable to rich and developed countries where money is less important motivating factor.

5. Descriptive or Prescriptive: Maslow's theory is descriptive in nature while Herzberg's theory is prescriptive in nature.

6. Motivators: According to Maslow's model, any need can act as a motivator provided it is not satisfied while Herzberg in his dual factor model, hygiene factors (lower levels) do not act as motivators, only higher order needs (achievement, recognition, challenging work) act as motivators.

McClelland's Needs Theory of Motivation

Another well-known need-based theory of motivation, as opposed to hierarchy of needs or satisfaction-dissatisfaction, is the theory developed by David C. McClelland and his associates. A Psychologist, David McClelland describes three central motivational paradigms: achievement, affiliation and power. This Need Theory is a motivational model that attempts to explain how the needs for achievement, power (authority), and affiliation affect people's actions in a management context. McClelland developed his theory based on Henry Murray's (1938) developed long list of motives and manifest needs used in his early studies of personality.

Sinha (2015) posit that McClelland's need theory is closely associated with learning theory, because he believed that needs are learned or acquired by the kinds of events people experience in their environment and culture. He found that people who acquire a particular need behave differently from those who do not have. (Sinha, 2015)

McClelland's theory of needs is based on three types of needs namely:

1) Need for power: the need to make others behave in a way that they would not have behaved. People who are strongly power-motivated are driven by the desire to influence, teach, or encourage others. They enjoy work and place a high value on discipline. However, they may take a zero-sum approach to group work—for one person to win, or succeed; another must lose, or fail. If channeled appropriately, though, this can positively support group goals and help others in the group feel competent about their work. According to Sinha (2015) the need for power is concerned with making an impact on others, the desire to influence others, the urge to change people, and the desire to make a difference in life. People with a high need for power are people who like to be in control of people and events. These result in ultimate satisfaction to man.

The literature revealed that people who have a high need for power are characterized by:

i) a desire to influence and direct somebody else
ii) a desire to exercise control over others
iii) a concern for maintaining leaders-follower relations

2) Need for Achievement is the drive to excel, to achieve in relation to a set of standards, to strive to succeed. Achievement is the act of performing, obtaining, or accomplishing.
People who are strongly achievement-motivated are driven by the desire for mastery. They prefer working on tasks of moderate difficulty in which outcomes are the result of their effort rather than of luck. They value receiving on their work. Need for achievement is a behavior directed towards competition with a standard of excellence. McClelland found that people with a high need for achievement perform better than those with a moderate or low need for achievement, and noted regional, national differences in achievement motivation. He identified six characteristics of high need achievers to:

i. have a strong desire to assume personal responsibilities for performing a task of finding a solution to a problem.
ii. set moderate difficult goals and take calculated risks
iii. have a strong desire for performance feedback
iv. have need for achievement for attaining personal accomplishment
v. look for challenging tasks
vi. individuals who are not buck-passers.

Need for Affiliation is the desire for friendly and interpersonal relationship. Jaja (2003) posits that affiliation is the relationship that results from combining one thing with another. People who are strongly affiliation-motivated are driven by the desire to create and maintain social relationships. They enjoy belonging to a group and want to feel loved and accepted. They may not make effective managers because they may worry too much about how others will feel about them. Similarly, Sinha (2015) defines the need for affiliation as a desire to establish and maintain friendly and warm relations with other people. He posits that the people with high need for affiliation have the following characteristics:

i. they have a strong desire for acceptance and approval from others.
ii. they tend to conform to the wishes of those people whose friendship and companionship they value
iii. they value the feeling of others.

The need for affiliation in many ways is similar to Maslow's social needs. (Sinha, 2015) McClelland stated that all employees have these three types of motivation regardless of age, sex, race or culture. The type of motivation that each individual is driven by is changed by life experiences and the opinion of their culture. He also opined that those in top level management positions should have a high need for power and a low need for affiliation. People with a high need for achievement will succeed best when given projects with attainable goals and although individuals with a need for achievement can make good managers, they are not suited to being in top management positions.

He also believes that people with high need for affiliation may not be good top managers but will be team players and are best suited for cooperative work environment. McClelland went further to expand characteristics of those with need for power as; those with strong power needs (most successful) and those with lower power needs. He also identified two types of managers; those who seek institutional power and those seek personal power. However, he also stated that those who seek for institutional power are more successful as they can create favorable condition at work. McClelland believes human needs differed with the passage of time.

Application of Need Theory

According to Brandon (2015) Need Theory does not claim that people can be categorized into one of three types. Rather, it asserts that all people are motivated by all of these needs in varying degrees and proportions. An individual's balance of these needs forms a kind of profile that can be useful in determining a motivational paradigm for them. It is important to note that needs do not necessarily correlate with competencies; it is possible for an employee to be strongly affiliation-motivated, but to still be successful in a situation in which his affiliation needs are not met (Brandon, 2015).

McClelland proposes that those in top management positions should have a high need for power and a low need for affiliation. He also believes that although individuals with a need for achievement can make good managers, they are not generally suited to being in top management positions.

Criticisms of McClelland's Theory

Robbins et al (2009) has criticized McClelland's theory stating that it has less practical effect than other theories, because McClelland argued that the
three needs are subconscious, meaning that we may be high on these needs without knowing. Measuring them is not very easy. This theory as well as the other two theories does not care about gender, age, culture, religious or other factor differences; Similarities between Maslow, Herzberg and McClelland’s Theory

i. They are all motivational theories that confer a specific set of needs which must be met in order to propitiate behavior and maintain it. In Maslow’s theory, it is through a Hierarchy of Needs. In Herzberg’s theory it is through 2 ways paradigm in which two specific needs must be met and they are hygiene (basic physical and psychological needs) and motivation.

ii. They all believe that workers have needs and when these needs are not met, they cause demotivation.

iii. They suggest specific things that management can do to help their employees become self-actualized.

iv. They believe that there is a reason for human specific behavior.

v. They also suggest differences in humans in terms of need. Different things motivate different people.

Conclusion and Recommendations

With the knowledge we have gained from the various perspectives of these authors, one can unequivocally say that they have contributed immensely to knowledge in the area of motivation. This literature review showed that there is a clear relationship between Maslow’s Hierarchy of needs Theory, Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory of motivation and McClelland’s need for achievement theory. This relationship shows the overlap of higher level needs and motivators and the corresponding overlap of hygiene and lower order needs. The lower needs must be met before higher order needs can have any motivational force and Herzberg’s parallel hygiene factors must be met to prevent job dissatisfaction. Maslow’s higher order needs serve to motivate people and are of an intrinsic nature which corresponds to Herzberg’s motivational factors that are also intrinsic in nature. However, having criticized and compared each of them to the other, we must say that the theory of David McClelland looks so real that it perfectly fits into real life situation. The fact that he believes human needs changes by life experiences and the opinion of their culture makes it more natural than the others. Maslow only believed in his hierarchy of needs, Hezberg only believed in Hygiene factors and motivational factors yet they never considered variables such as cultural factors that are outside the organization which also account for individual behavior. Therefore, McClelland’s theory is a very suitable motivational tool for today’s world in the sense that it fits into any organization and it also considers the situational factors that Maslow and Herzberg never mentioned, hence the this study recommends that organizations should endeavor to adopt McClelland’s theory in motivating its workforce.

References


