Motivation in the workplace. Mapping the Research.

Xanthakis George^{#1}, Stogiannidou Marianthi^{#2}

#1 Aegean University, 0044(0)7514233832, xanthakisg@ba.aegean.gr

#2 Aegean University, Chios, Greece, smar@aegean.gr

ABSTRACT

Motivation is one of the easiest concepts to understand but at the same time one of the most difficult to implement. Employees have different particular traits, habits, needs that make them unique. Motivation begins with the way to influence works behavior.

The history and development of term motivation is interesting in its own right and needs no more justification than this. The purpose of this paper is to make a short presentation of the history of the term motivation, to define motivation, describe its process and highlight the importance/need of motivation within the organisation. At the second part of this paper is presented/mapped the existing research in motivation. The paper comes to an end, considering the dynamic and multiple character of motivation and proposed a framework for future research. Attention in this paper is paid to character of motivation and the need of its dynamic approach.

Keywords: Motivation, dynamic approach, workplace, HR management

Corresponding Author: Xanthakis G.

INTRODUCTION

Once, employees were considered just another input into the production of goods and services. What changed this way of thinking about employees was the research that conducted by Elton Mayo (Dickson, 1973), from 1924 to 1932, known as the Hawthorne Study. Understanding what motivated employees and how they were motivated was the focus of many researchers following the publication of the above Study.

The main question is: why do we need motivated employees? The answer is survival (Smith, 1994). Motivated employees are precious in our rapidly changing workplaces because they are more productive and help organizations survive. Managers need to understand what motivates them within the context of the roles they perform. Motivating employees is arguably too complex and changes constantly (Bowen, 1991). The research suggests that as employees' income increases, money becomes less of a motivator (Kovach, 1987) and at the same as employees get older, interesting work becomes more of a motivator.

MOTIVATION HISTORY- GENERAL

A first attempt to understand human motivation dates back to the time of Greek philosophers and focuses on hedonism as a basic driving force in human behavior. According to the above philosophical tense, individuals focus their efforts on pleasure and pain avoidance. This consideration (Steers, 2004) was developed later in the works of many philosophers, such as Locke, Bentham, Mill, and Helvetius, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the issue of motivation moved from the field of philosophy to the newly emerging science of psychology. Hedonism (Vroom, 1964) had no clear definition of what events were considered to be pleasant or painful for a particular individual. As a result of this (Latham, 2006), Behavioral Scientists began to look for more empirical models of explanation of motivation. Among these first models were instinct theories, such as those proposed by James, Freud, and McDougall. Instead of

considering behavior to be logical, these particular theorists argued that much of the behavior results from the instinct that's described by McDougall (1908) as "a hereditary or inherent psychological disposition that leads the individual to perceive, or to pay attention to objects of a certain class, in order to experience a certain emotional excitement, thus acting in a certain way." James (Steers, 2004) described a number of instincts, including curiosity, sociability, fear, jealousy and sympathy.

MOTIVATION HISTORY- WORKPLACE

In the 1920s, however, the large number of limitations of the above theory led to its replacement by models based on drive or reinforcement. Well known psychologists such as Thorndike, Woodworth and Hull introduced the concept of learning into theories of motivation. Allport (1954) refers to this characterized it as the hedonism of the past. Previous actions of the person who have led to positive results tend to be repeated, while those that led to leading to negative results are avoided.

One of the first studies on motivation in the workplace is the work of Frederick Taylor (1911) and his collaborators that resulted in the development of the Scientific Management theory. Coming from the industry, Taylor and his associates focused on the deficiencies of the production process in factories, at a time of growing industrial growth. Taylor and his colleagues considered and proposed scientific management as a work system with financial benefit for both employees and employers. They suggested the use of improved production techniques for increased productivity. However, the use of an increasingly sophisticated workforce, combined with the company's efforts to maximize productivity and profit without correspondingly increasing employee wages, eventually led to the defamation of the above vision, and the development of trade unionism to protect of workers' rights in the 1930s.

Meanwhile, in the 1930s, social scientists began to examine the role of social influences on individual behavior (Steers, 2004). The role of the team dynamics and the influence of the influences they received were recognized as powerful factors in determining the performance of the employees.

Notable were the research efforts of Elton Mayo (1933). Mayo believed that workers are not only interested in money but could also be motivated by the satisfaction of their social needs in the performance of their work (a factor ignored by Taylor). Mayo introduced and presented the Human Relation School of Thought, focusing not only on the simple worker but on the work of executives, proposing that workers be treated as people who have valuable views and interact with each other.

In the 1950s, many new models of motivation of workers emerged, which were called Context Theories, since their main objective was to identify the factors that are related to motivation. That category includes Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1954), which assumes that as individuals improve, they work to satisfy some of their hierarchical needs. A second need theory of the same time period was originally developed by Murray (1938), and completed by McClelland (1961, 1971).

In the mid-1960s, a new approach to studying work motivation emerged, which focused on outlining the processes that explain job motivation. Process Theories are in sharp contrast to previous Theories of Content. The background of these theories is a series of cognitive theories of motivation that try to understand the human way of thinking about determining behavior in the workplace.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM MOTIVATION

The starting point of any research in the field of motivation is to define the term. The term "motivation" derives from the Latin word "moveo" meaning "move". Motivation is a basic psychological process that has the effect of influencing human behavior.

Atkinson (1964) defines motivation as “the control or direct influence on the direction, the courage and the persistence of an act”. Other researchers define it as the internal power that guides human behavior (Erven & Milligan, 2000) while Kreitner (1995) considers it to be an internal process that gives behavior a purpose. Pinder in his Work Motivation book (as found in Demetriou, 1991) states: “Incitement to work is a set of energetic powers that develop both within and outside the person to produce work-related behavior and determine the formula its behavior, its direction, its intensity and its duration”. The active forces mentioned in the definition include needs, motives, instincts, and external factors without giving a primary role to any of these factors or variables.

Demetriou (1991) defines motivation as the situation that:

- activates
- directs and
- maintains a specific behavior in the work place

According to Bourantas (1992), motivation could be defined as “the internal process of pushing man's behavior toward the goals whose realization has the consequence of satisfying his needs”. People behave in a certain way because they have certain needs that they want to satisfy.

Although many researchers have attempted to come up with a clear definition of motivation, there seems to be no general agreement about how the term should be defined. This is due to the fact that these definitions reflect their own perceptions and experiences in the specific research area.

A detailed definition was presented by Analoui (2000) who illustrated that “*motivation is the internal drive necessary to guide people's actions and behaviors toward achievement of some goals*”. This drive or force comes from the desire to satisfy certain needs and expectations (Mullins, 2005). Similarly, Kast and Rosenzweig (1979) defined motivation as “*what perhaps prompts a person to act in a certain way or at least develop a propensity for specific behaviour*.” Other researchers see motivation as an internal state that encourages people to behave in a certain way in order to accomplish specific desired goals. Moreover, the term is used to express the readiness to increase one's efforts on a specific task in order to get specific incentives (Molander, 1995).

Jones (1955) cited in (Steers, 2004) gave a comprehensive definition of motivation when he defined it as “*how behavior gets started, is energized, is sustained, is directed, is stopped, and what kind of subject reactions are present in the organism while all this is going on*”. Although the previous definitions may seem to vary, the general agreement is that, motivation as a dynamic process that starts with human needs which, in turn, make people act in a certain way to achieve the organizational goals and objectives, and hence satisfy their needs. Moreover, there seems to be a *hidden agreement* between researchers about the main characteristics of the motivation phenomenon, as there are three common denominators which characterize the phenomenon. That is, when researchers discuss motivation, they primarily focus on the following (Steers 2004).

- What energizes human behavior?
- What directs or channels such behavior.
- How this behavior is maintained or sustained within organizations.

Koufidou (2001) defines motivation as “*the emotional state that drives or motivates a person to act in a certain way*”. This emotional state is created by the various stimuli that the person receives from either his inner or external environment. Robbins & Judge (2007) defines motivation as “*the process that explains the intensity, direction and persistence of an individual's effort towards a particular goal*”. The effort intensity (Vocola-Nicolas, 2012)

relates to how hard a person is trying. Of course, this effort should be aligned with the objectives of the business so that it is desirable and maintained as long as it is needed to meet the job objectives.

MOTIVATION PROCESS

Luthans (1992) points out that the key to understanding the process of motivation lies in the meaning of, and relationship between, needs, drives, and incentives. Therefore, motivation according to his point of view is a “*process that starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates behavior or a drive that is aimed at a goal or incentive*”.

As a common factor of a large number of definitions of motivation, we identify the concepts of human behavior, motivation, goals, needs and satisfaction. The formulation of human behavior (and how finally an employee is motivated) is not simple to be explained. However its process (Figure 1) can be imprinted as a chain reaction/process as follows (Paggakis, 1998):

Fig.1:Motivation Process, Source: Paggakis, 1998

Nevertheless, the factors of this equation are very often altered. The problem of human behavior is simplified (Figure 2) assuming the assumption that every human action is the result of the reaction to external stimuli or internal impulses (motives, needs, aspirations).

Fig.2:Motivation Process, Source: Koufiou-Xyrotiri, 2001

The response of man to (external or internal) “stimuli” consists in his “reaction” to what we call behavior. In this sense, the behavior of the individual is always induced and directed towards a goal (Figure 3). However, by talking about specific actions / behaviors of individuals in their workplace, that aim to achieve specific organizational goals, the situation becomes complicated.

Fig.3:Motivation Process in workplace, Source: Mpourantas, 1992

The response of each employee, even to the same stimuli of the environment, varies and depends to a large extent on his experiences, his character, his psychological state, the system

of values and of course his needs. The needs of each employee must be addressed at an individual level, as the psychological stimuli are dissimilar and vary from person to person. The physical desire of individuals to fill a shortage is linked to the concept of need.

Buradas (1992) describes the process of motivation as the set of interrelationships between needs, motives and goals. The reason for the above process is the conscious or subconscious existence of needs. The need generates the motive and the motivation leads to the definition of objectives and actions for their realization. Achieving the goals has the consequence of meeting the needs and reducing or eliminating the incentive. In Figure 3 the above-mentioned process is illustrated schematically.

A key element of motivation is motive and that's the main reason for a person's action. (Kostaridou - Euclidi 1999). That action depends on internal causes (instincts), but also on external stimuli (rewards). Motives can be either conscious or unconscious, so the cause of a particular action is not always obvious. The motives are distinguished by inherent (inherent) or acquired (acquired through socialization), physiological (organism function), biological (survival, reproduction) and psychological (related to personality or social environment).

Lytras (1992) defines the need as a lack or as a normal or psychological imbalance of man. The inconsistency resulting from this relationship leads the individual to actions aimed at meeting the specific needs. Human needs are determined by numerous internal and external factors, evolving and their hierarchical structure varies considerably over time and environment.

IMPORTANCE/NEED TO MOTIVATE IN ORGANIZATIONS

Employee performance can be defined as the achievement of work-related objectives without taking into account the means by which this can be achieved. Employee work performance depends on two factors. The first is the knowledge and the necessary skills to carry out the specific work, while the second factor (perhaps the most important) includes the person's willingness to perform.

According to Buroudas (1992), the necessity of motivating employees to maximize their productivity stems from the fact that in the current cultural and working model the work is heterosexual and the value that created by that, is not harvested in its entirety directly by the worker. In most cases, and especially in the lower ranks of the hierarchy, work is not a direct creative activity for the worker in itself.

The individual itself doesn't harvest the overall effect of it. The remuneration offered does not guarantee that the employee will offer what he can actually offer, but only the minimum acceptable level of performance. Therefore, it's essential that the company develops all these conditions that will encourage the employees to make the greater use of its qualifications.

RESEARCH ON MOTIVATION

The systematic review of existing literature highlights the different approaches to motivation in the workplace. After carefully studying on the research work on motivation and the related theories, we have come to the following categorization in the theoretical approaches:

- Motivation Theories of Content / Motivation theories of Process
- Motivation extrinsic / intrinsic
- Considering the dynamic and multiple character of motivation

CONTENT / PROCESS THEORIES

Several theories have been developed about the motivation of employees, which can be divided into two main categories.

The first one, which were developed in the 1950s, examine the nature of motivation and were called Early or Content theories because their main objective was to identify the factors

involved in motivation. That includes Maslow's hierarchy of theories (1943), Alderfer's ERG theory (1969), McClelland's acquired needs theory (1953), the theory of the two factors of Herzberg (1959). The above-mentioned theories are based on the assumption that all people have a similar set of human needs and behave to meet these needs. These theories can be described as "static theories" because they are only incorporated in a time period and do not have the possibility to change / adapt them in time (Luthans, 1995).

The American psychologist A. Maslow has assumed that individuals (in general) work to meet some of their hierarchical needs, including physical needs, security, protection, social needs of self-esteem and self-realization. He argued that the first three needs represent needs that people need to satisfy in order to develop into a healthy personality, while the latter two represent needs related to individual success and the development of human resources.

Alderfer, later emphasizing in the motivation at workplace, adapted this model to include only three needs: existence, relevance and growth. He accepted the simultaneity of different needs, added the shift to other needs if some of them cannot be satisfied and assumed that the satisfaction of one need does not automatically lead to a reduction in its intensity.

Another need theory of the same period, originally developed by Murray (1938), was completed by McClelland (1953). This theory ignored the concept of hierarchy and focused on the driving force of a series of distinct and clearly identified needs, such as:

- achievement (as the behavior that causes competition for perfection)
- social affiliation
- power (as the need for control in the environment)

While the above-mentioned researchers (Maslow, McClelland, and Alderfer) focused on the existence of needs in the workplace, that create behaviors, Herzberg (1961) tried to understand how activities at workplace and the nature of work itself influenced motivation and worker performance. In motivation/hygiene theory, Herzberg argued that motivation in the workplace is significantly affected by the extent to which a job inherently provides opportunities for recognition and reinforcement. Herzberg saw the environment of a job (which he described as hygienic factor), to be connected over time (a prerequisite) with the satisfaction of future incentives for motivation. Herzberg also introduced the concept of work redesign, and in particular the *Work* enrichment concept as a key factor in motivating workers. Hackman and Oldham (1976) developed the above concept of work design.

Another theory of the same period, slightly different from the previous ones, is McGregor's Theory X and Y (1960), which presented two distinct sides of humans: X (negative) and Y (positive). According to X, the employee has an inherent dislike towards work, avoiding responsibilities and has no ambitions. On the contrary, the employee is looking for work, seeking responsibilities, taking initiatives and being ambitious. According to McGregor, motivation factors for the first type (X) are considered the lower hierarchical needs (normal) while for the (Y) the upper (self-realization).

Summing up, we observe that the majority of theories of this period considered (unchanged) human needs that shaped behaviors in the workplace. Meeting these needs was a motivating factor.

In the mid-1960s, a new approach to the study of work motivation i emerged, that focused on deciphering the processes that explained work motivation and were called Process Theories, or Contemporary Motivation Theories.

The above-mentioned theories face the motivation in the workplace, considering a dynamic perspective and looking for causal relationships over time and events related to human behavior. The background of these theories is a series of cognitive theories of motivation that try to understand the human way of thinking, determining the behavior in the workplace.

Process theories focus on the rational cognitive process and rely on the assumption that while most people may have similar needs, the importance of these needs vary for each person.

This category includes Equity / Justice (Adams, 1965), Expectations (Vroom, 1964), (Skinner 1953), Self-Efficiency (Bandura, 1997), Locke, 1968 self-determination (Deci-Ryan, 1985).

Adams (1963) introduced the theory of equality by considering that individual behavior is determined by comparing his inputs and outcomes from his work with those of his colleagues. In this way he tries to explain how employees respond both cognitively and behaviorally when they perceive injustice in the workplace. The most known of Process Theories is expectations Theory. That theory comes from Lewin's early work (1938) that considered behavior as deliberate, goal-oriented, and based on conscious choice. Vroom (1964) presented the first systematic formulation of the theory of workplace expectancy considering that the intensity of motivation depends on the strength of the individual's expectation for the given result and the attractiveness of it. Porter and Lawler (1968) have improved Vroom's work by including individual differences and clarity of the role by linking the effort to work with professional performance. Porter and Lawler also argued that this relationship between performance and satisfaction is determined by the extent and quality of the rewards that employees receive in return.

In addition to the theory of expectations, a number of other important cognitive theories of motivation at the workplace were developed in the 1960s, each of them having its own perspective.

Goal-setting theory also appeared in the late 1960s as researchers began to discover that when a person is working towards a particular goal, he is motivated effectively. The research has shown (Locke, 1968) that target specialization, goal difficulty and employee commitment to the goal improve the employee's performance. Based on a large number of empirical studies, Locke and Latham (1990) a few years later presented an improved version of target setting theory.

Bandura in 1997 presented the theory of self-efficacy, assuming that self-confidence is at the heart of an individual's motivation when acting. Stajkovic and Luthans (1998, 2003) provided important material to support the role of self-efficacy in determining performance in the workplace, especially in the case of complex work. Luthans (2001), based on the research and material of the latter, suggested extending this concept to the workplace by presenting Positive Organizational Behavior.

Summing up, we observe that both categories of motivation theories (early and modern) recognize that employees have similar needs. Their main different is that the Content theories assume that people behave in a similar way (static view) to satisfy their needs, while Process theories assume that although the needs of individuals are similar, the importance and weight of them are different for the individual (dynamic view), quite subjective and leads to different behaviors.

MOTIVATION EXTRINSIC / INTRINSIC

A large part of the literature on work motivation has been developed around the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. The external motivation concerns the formation and maintenance of a particular behavior, linking it to a specific (and desirable by the employee) benefits (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation, on the other hand, results from the inner, psychological needs of the individual and their satisfaction through work (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The behavior with intrinsic/ internal motivation is observed when there is no apparent reward other than the activity itself (Deci, 1975).

Malone and Leper (1987) described the intrinsic motives as “what people would do without external encouragement.” Examples of intrinsic motives are hunger, sense of duty, altruism, and the desire to be appreciated by the others. Exogenously induced behaviors are those in

which the control mechanism is readily perceived (Deci, 1975). Examples of extrinsic motives are money, rules and laws, and the natural environment.

From the different motivational theories that developed, the distinction of external-internal motivation is more closely related to the Two-Factor Theory presented by Herzberg (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959; Herzberg, 1987). There were two main categories of motivation factors:

(a) hygienic factors or external factors (extrinsic factors) that do not in themselves induce themselves to make an effort, but where their absence gives rise to negative feelings and, consequently, reduced performance; and

b) Motivation factors or intrinsic factors that create an inner desire and mobilize the individual to make an effort and form a particular behavior (while their absence does not create negative emotions).

External incentives include remuneration, additional incentives (linked to performance and productivity), and opportunities for hierarchical development, working and employment relationships, occupational safety and general working conditions. Internal factors, respectively, include the development of knowledge and skills, the creativity of the work, the ability to develop and improve, the ability to take initiatives, the recognition of effort (albeit atypical) and acceptance and appreciation by others.

The work of Lapper, Greene Nisbett (1973) and Deci (1971), explored how extrinsic motivation/motives affect the interior/ intrinsic, and vice versa. In particular, these investigations identified the potential negative effect of external motivation on intrinsic motivation that was known as the crowd-out effect. Schwartz (1982) argued that external motivation act as a limitation to internal, as the effort is only paid to the level associated with motivation and the realization of the expected benefit. Similarly, Amabile (1996) has shown that external motivation is negatively related to internal motivation factors such as the need for creativity and initiative. Continuing on this argument, Kohn (1993) argued that when a behavior is identified with a particular benefit, it is difficult to maintain it when the provision is eliminated. Analyzing data from 128 published papers, Deci, Koestner and Ryan (1999) came to similar conclusions.

On the other hand, a series of research have shown that there is no inconceivable evidence of the negative effects of external motivation on internal motivation (Lepper, Henderlong & Gingras, 1999). Some authors have argued that external motivation, under condition, appears to have a positive effect on internal motive (Eisenberg, Pierce & Cameron 1999, Gagne & Deci 2005). Of course, external and internal motivational factors tend to coexist even in different proportions in most organizational environments (Gerhart, Rynes & Fulmer, 2009; Fang & Gerhart, 2012). This research has shown that a balanced approach between methods and techniques has the best possible incentive effects (Barnes et al., 2011, Cerasoli, Nicklin & Ford 2014, Gerhart & Fang 2015, Zhang et al., 2016).

Nujjio and Meyer (2012) classify in the first category as Intristic the motivation factors that are the product of the work itself and the nature of the profession. In this category, an important role plays the way of organizing work and its own characteristics. The above factors belong to non- Nujjio and Meyer (2012) classify in the first class as Intristic the motivation factors that are the product of the work itself and the nature of the profession. In this category, an important role plays the way of organizing work and its own characteristics. The above factors belong to non-monetary agents at a low cost for the company. These factors include:

- Interesting work - meaningful work
- Satisfaction with work
- Personal responsibility for the outcome of the job
- Work that requires skills and skills

- Work that can be fulfilled from start to finish
- Native features / nature of work
- Autonomy
- Importance of work / impact on society

CONSIDERING THE DYNAMIC AND MULTIPLE CHARACTER OF MOTIVATION

Motivation in workplace is one of the most discussed subjects in organizational studies, and more generally in social sciences. As an object in direct relation to human behavior and internal psychological and cognitive processes, motivation is directly influenced by the specific environment in which each person operates (socio-economic environment-work environment). Despite the many related theories and approaches that have been developed, the many studies that have been conducted, no approach about work motivation has so far been able to offer a satisfactory holistic interpretation of the phenomenon (Latham, 2011), in order to develop a unified theory (ground theory).

As Denhardt, Denhardt, and Aristigueta (2015) pointed out, neither motivation as part of human behavior, nor the internal mechanisms that cause it can be recorded and studied. Only the readjustments of behavior to different external - observable factors (e.g. material and immaterial rewards can be recorded).

Hitka and Balazova (2015) point out in their research that motivation factors vary according to:

- human needs
- social conditions and lifestyle and
- the internal and external environment of the company (Mikro-Makro environment)

D. Elizur (1994), as cited in Pânișoara (2012), conducted an intercultural research in a large number of countries, trying to prioritize motivation factors in the workplace. The results highlight the wide variation depending on the country of the survey.

In the same context, Kovach's long-standing studies and research (1995) on finding the ten most prominent drivers in the workplace are underway. His research on motivation factors lasted more than 20 years and conducted in 25 organizations with participating workers and supervisors concluded that the motivation factors change as a function of:

- economic situation
- living standards
- gender of workers
- position in business and income
- age

Kovach, comparing the above results, with survey findings from 1946 and 1980, concluded that: In the middle of the century for workers, the most important factor of motivation was the full appreciation by the company of the work provided by the worker. Interesting work was placed in sixth place, while help / understanding by management on personal problems was in third place - much higher than in later studies. These differences could be justified as a result of both economic growth and changes in living standards.

The Houston (2000) survey conducted in the US using a sample of 100 public sector employees and 1,356 private sector workers showed differences in motivation factors in these two areas.

Kinnear and Sutherland (2000) focused on the knowledge workers and the factors that motivate this category (financial reward and recognition), while Hossain and Hossain (2012)

studied the motivation factors with the help of workers of a well-known multinational fast food chain in London, adding new factors such as the positive treatment of mistakes at work. During the period 2010-2015, due to the global economic crisis, studies focus on changes in the motivational factors.

Jelacic conducted a survey in 2011 on motivation for workers in wood processing and furniture manufacturing in Croatia. The survey was conducted during the period of deep crisis in the Croatian industry in 2010. The most important factor of motivation is wage and security at work.

Hitka and Balazova (2015) compared the motivation factors amongst the service workers (Hotels) in two neighboring countries of Central Europe, Slovakia and Austria. Hitka et al. (2015) during their survey tried to highlight the changes in motivation factors amongst the employees within particular firm between 2011 and 2013. The survey was conducted in a Slovak wood processing and furniture manufacturing company.

During the period 2012-2015 in the world literature, are found a number of studies about the motivation factors conducted on Asian and African developing countries (Nujjio and Meyer, 2012- Muslim, Dean, Cohen, 2015).

From the above researches, the capacity of the motivation factors, depending on the human needs and in particular:

- of the company's internal and external environment (*Hitka and Balazova (2015)*)
- the country of the survey (*D. Elizur - 1994 - Nujjio and Meyer, 2012 - Muslim, Dean, Cohen, 2015*)
- the economic situation and social status of workers
- living standards
- of employee's sex
- position in business and income
- of age (*Kovach, 1995*)
- of the characteristics of the population social conditions and lifestyle
- to be studied (*Kinnear and Sutherland - 2000, Hossain and Hossain - 2012 - Hitka and Balazova, 2015*)
- of the Economic Environment / Economic Crisis (*Jelacic 2011, Hitka et al 2015*)

CONCLUSION

The above-mentioned brief reference to the existing research framework, using as a guide the three identified research approaches, outlines the existing research on motivation and at the same time propose a framework for future research. Attention in this paper is paid to dynamic character of motivation.

The study of existing theories of motivation (content and process) lead to the conclusion that both categories of motivation theories (early and modern) recognize that employees have similar needs. The difference between them is that content theories assume that individuals behave in a similar way (static view) to satisfy them, while procedural theories assume that although the needs of individuals are similar, the importance and placement of these are different for (dynamic view) and quite subjective and leads to different behaviors.

Current work proposes the dynamic approach where the importance and the weight of needs are different for each person and quite subjective. To highlight and input into the study the factor diversity of the needs, of each employee we introduce as independent variables the factors mentioned in the third study approach (study of motivation factors in a dynamic environment) as described above:

- company's internal and external environment
- country of the survey

- living standards
- employee's sex and age
- employee's position in business and income
- special characteristics of the population
- social conditions and lifestyle
- economic environment

The distinction into extrinsic and intrinsic factors (second study approach) introduces the nature of the profession as well as the management of the company as a motivating factor and leads to the answer to the second research question.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, S. J., Towards an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67: 422–436, 1963.
2. Alderfer, C. P., An empirical test of a new theory of human needs, *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 4(2), pp. 142-175, 1969.
3. Alderfer, C. P., *Existence, relatedness, and growth*. New York: Free Press, 1972.
4. Allport G.W, *The nature of prejudice*. Reading: Massachusetts. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.
5. Amabile, T. M., *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity*. West view press, 1996.
6. Analoui F., What motivate senior managers? The case of Romania. *Journal of Managerial psychology*. Vol.15 No4, pp 324-340, 2000.
7. Atkinson J. W, *An introduction to Motivation*. Princeton N J Van Nostrand, 1964.
8. Bandura A., Self Efficacy. Towards a unifying theory of behavior change *Psychological Review* 84, pages 191-215, 1997.
9. Bandura, A., *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman, 1997.
10. Barnes, C. M., Hollenbeck, J. R., Jundt, D. K., DeRue, D. S. and Harmon, S. J., Mixing individual incentives and group incentives: Best of both worlds or social dilemma?', *Journal of Management*, 37(6), pp. 1611-1635, 2011
11. Bourantas D., *Management*. Athens Publication Mpenou, 2015.
12. Bowen, B. E., Radhakrishna, R.B., Job satisfaction of agricultural education faculty: A constant phenomena. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 32 (2), pp.16- 22, 1991.
13. Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M. and Ford, M. T., Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), pp. 980, 2014.
14. Deci, E. L., Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 18(1), pp. 105, 1971.
15. Deci E. L., *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum, 1975.
16. Deci E. L. and Ryan R. M., *Intrinsic motivation*. Wiley Online Library, 1975.
17. Deci E. L. and Ryan R. M., The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality, *Journal of research in personality*, 19(2), pp. 109-134, 1985.
18. Deci, E. L., Koestner, R. and Ryan, R. M., A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation., *Psychological bulletin*, 125(6), pp. 627, 1999.
19. Demetriou K., *Methods and techniques for motivating workers in practice*. Athens, Gallaios Publications, 1991.
20. Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V. and Aristigueta, M. P., *Managing human behavior in public and nonprofit organizations*. Sage Publications, 2015.

21. Dickson, W. J. Hawthorne experiments. In C. Heyel (ed.), *The encyclopedia of management*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 2nd ed. (pp. 298-302), 1973.
22. Erven, B. and Milligan, R., *Making Employee Motivation a Partnership*. Employee Management for Production Agriculture, 2000.
23. Fang, M. and Gerhart, B., Does pay for performance diminish intrinsic interest. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(6), pp. 1176-1196, 2012.
24. Gerhart, B., Rynes, S. L. and Fulmer, I. S., 6 pay and performance: individuals, groups, and executives. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), pp. 251-315, 2009.
25. Herzberg, F., *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966.
26. Herzberg, F., One more time: how do you motivate employees, *Harvard business review*, 65(5), 1987.
27. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. S. and Snyderman, B., *The motivation to work* New York, 1959.
28. Hitka M. Balazova Z., The Impact of age, education and seniority of motivation employees. *VERSIAS/praktika: Business: Theory and practice* 2015, 16(1) pp. 113-120, 2015.
29. Hossain K.M., Hossain A., Factors affecting employee's motivation in fast food industry: The case of KFC.LTD. *Research journal of economics, business and ICT* Volume 5, 2012.
30. Houston, D. J., Public-service motivation: A multivariate test. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 10(4), pp. 713-728, 2000.
31. Jelasic D., Motivating of Wood company processing and furniture manufacturing companies employees in time of economic crisis. *Human Resources management and Economics and ICT* Volume 1, 2011.
32. Kinnear, L. & Sutherland, M., Determinants of organizational commitment amongst knowledge workers. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 31:106–112, 2000.
33. Koufidou- Xyrotiri S., *Human Resources management: The Challenge of 21st century in work environment*. Thessaloniki. Anikulapublications, 2001.
34. Kovach, K., Why motivational theories don't work. *Advanced Management Journal*, Spring 80, Vol. 45 Issue 2, 54-60, 1980.
35. Kovach, K. A. What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. *Business Horizons*, 30, pp. 58-65, 1987.
36. Kovach, K., Employee motivation: Addressing a crucial factor in your Organization's performance. *Employment Relations Today*, Summer 1995, Vol. 22 Issue 2, 93-107, 1995.
37. Latham G, P., Locke A., New directions to Goal settings Theory. *Association for Psychological Science*. Volume 15- Number 5, 1960.
38. Latham G.P, Ernst C.T., Keys to motivating tomorrow's workforce. *Human Resource Management Review* 16, 181–198, 2006.
39. Latham, G. P. *Work motivation: History, theory, research, and practice*. Sage publication, 2012.
40. Lathans F., *Organisational Behavior. An evidence based Approach*. Twelve edition. McGraw-Hill, 1995.
41. Lepper, M. R., Henderlong, J. and Gingras, I., Understanding the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic Motivation—uses and abuses of meta-analysis: Comment on. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), pp. 669-676, 1999.

42. Luthans F. 1992, Organizational behaviour, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Management in Public Service: Paradoxes, Processes and Problems, Sage Publications.
43. Luthans F., Luthans K., Hodget R., Luthans B., 2001. Positive approach to leadership (PAL). Implication for Today's Organizations. The journal of Leadership Studies Vol, 8 No2.
44. Maehr, M.L. and Braskamp, L.A., The Motivation Factor: A theory of personal investment, Lexington, 1986.
45. Maslow, A. H., A theory of human motivation. Psychological review, 50(4), pp. 370, 1943.
46. Maslow, A. H., Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
47. Mayo, E., The human problems of an industrial civilization. New York: Macmillan, 1933.
48. McClelland, D. C., The achieving society. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1961.
49. McClelland, D. C., Assessing human motivation. New York: General Learning Press, 1971.
50. McDougall W., An Introduction to Social Psychology. Methuen and Co., pages 355. London 1908.
51. McGregor, D., The human side of enterprise, New York, 21, 166, 1960.
52. Mullins L., Management and Organizational Behaviour, Harlow, 7th ed., 2005.
53. Muslim N., Dean D., Cohen D., Employee job research satisfaction factors. Evidence from Electricity provider Company in Malaysia. Procedia Economics and Finance 35, 2016 pp. 532-540, 2015.
54. Nujjoo A., Meyer I., The relative importance of different types of rewards for employee motivation and commitment in South Africa. SA Journal of Human Resource Management 10(2), 2012.
55. Oldham, G. R. and Hackman, J. R., Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. Journal of organizational behavior, 31(2-3), pp. 463-479, 2010.
56. Oldham, G. R. and Hackman, J. R., How job characteristics theory happened, in Smith, K.G. & Hitt, M.A. (eds.) The Oxford handbook of management theory: The process of theory development. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 151-170, 2005.
57. Paggakis G., Human Resources management. Athens. Sakkoulas Publication, 1998.
58. Pânisora G., Pânisora I.O., Motivation in a crisis society. Romanian perspective. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 33, 20 – 24 pp. 177-194, 2012.
59. Ramlall, S., A Review of Employee Motivation Theories and their Implications for Employee Retention within Organizations. Journal of American Academy of Business. Cambridge; 5(1), 52, 2004.
60. Robbins, S. Judge. TA, Organizational Behavior. Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 2007.
61. Schwartz, H. S. 1982. Job involvement as obsession-compulsion. Academy of Management Review, 7(3), pp. 429-432.
62. Skinner, B. F., Beyond Freedom and Dignity, A.A. Knopf, Inc., N.Y., 1971.
63. Skinner, B. F., About Behaviourism, J. Cape, N.Y., 1974.
64. Skinner, B. F., Science and Human Behaviour, Macmillan, London, 1953.
65. Smith, G. P. Motivation. In W. Tracey (ed.), Human resources management and development handbook (2nd ed.), 1994.
66. Stajkovic A.D & Luthans F., Self Efficacy and work related performance. A Metaanalysis. Psychological Bulletin, 124. Pp 240-261, 1998.
67. Stajkovic A.D & Luthans F., Behavioral Management and Task performance in operations. Conceptual background. A Meta analysis and test of alternative models. Personnel Psychology, 55. Pages 155-194, 2003.

-
68. Steers R.M., Mowday R.T., Shapiho D.L., The future of work motivation Theory. Academy of Management Review, Vol.29, No.3, 379-387,2004.
  69. Taylor, F.,Scientific management. New York: Harper, 1911.
  70. Taylor, J.,Public service motivation, relational job design, and job satisfaction in local government. Public Administration,92(4), pp. 902-918, 2014.
  71. Vroom, V.,Motivation and work. New York: Wiley, 1964.
  - 72.** Zhang, J., Zhang, Y., Song, Y. and Gong, Z., The different relations of extrinsic, introjected, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation on employees' performance:Empirical studies following self-determination theory,Management Decision,54(10),pp. 2393-2412, 2016.