



IECO

INSTITUTE FOR ETHICS
IN COMMUNICATION
AND ORGANIZATIONS

WORKING PAPER 12-02

Rev.: September 01, 2012

**TOWARDS A WIDER CONCEPTION OF
HUMAN MOTIVATIONS**

MANUEL GUILLÉN
IGNACIO FERRERO
W. MICHAEL HOFFMAN

TOWARDS A WIDER CONCEPTION OF HUMAN MOTIVATIONS

IECO Working Paper 12-02

A first draft of this paper was presented at the EBEN Annual Conference held at IESE in Barcelona, Spain, 2012, September 20-22. A highly modified version of this first draft has been published in:

GUILLÉN, M.; FERRERO, I. & HOFFMAN, W.M. (2014). "The Neglected Ethical and Spiritual Motivations in the Workplace". *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. Feb. doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1985-7.

MANUEL GUILLÉN PARRA

University of Valencia. Associate Professor. Management Department.
Avda. Naranjos, s/n. 46022 Valencia. Spain.

Manuel.Guillen@uv.es

Director of the Institute for Ethics in Communication and Organizations.

IGNACIO FERRERO

University of Navarra. Professor. Business Ethics.
Campus Universitario. 31009 Pamplona. Spain.

jiferrero@unav.es

W. MICHAEL HOFFMAN

Bentley University. Executive Director. Center for Business Ethics.
175 Forest St. , Waltham, MA 02452. USA.

mhoffman@bentley.edu

TOWARDS A WIDER CONCEPTION OF HUMAN MOTIVATIONS

IECO Working Paper 12-02

Abstract

Managing other people's work is filled with challenges, and among them, understanding what motivates people is essential. In order to develop skills and virtues that lead to flourishing in the workplace, human motivation has to be properly understood. This paper defends that content theories on human motivation have either neglected or minimized the importance of the ethical and spiritual dimensions of motivation, resulting in a model of a person as self-interested, amoral and non-spiritual. In this article, authors attempt to overcome this idea through an integration of the areas of psychology, ethics and theology, offering an expanded taxonomy of human motivation that explicitly includes morality and spirituality. This effort is but a step toward articulating a more complete and accurate description of motivation that brings out the full dimensions of being human.

Keywords: human motivations; taxonomy of human motivations; moral motivations; spiritual motivations; religious motivations; spirituality in the work place

TOWARDS A WIDER CONCEPTION OF HUMAN MOTIVATIONS

IECO Working Paper 12-02

Content

1. Introduction	5
2. Early Theories of Motivation	5
3. Openness to morality and giving	8
4. Including morality and giving as human motivations.....	9
5. Spiritual motivations.....	14
6. Openness to spirituality and transcendence.....	15
7. Conclusion	18
8. References	19

TOWARDS A WIDER CONCEPTION OF HUMAN MOTIVATIONS

IECO Working Paper 12-02

1. Introduction

The study of human motivation is a subset of the field of psychology. Thousands of scholars have attempted to understand the reasons and mechanisms of motivation. However, this enormous amount of influential literature has either minimized or neglected the importance of the ethical and spiritual dimensions of motivation. Such an omission seems odd, since moral and spiritual principles that guide human lives have long been recognized (Rubenstein 1987, Smith 2000). In this article, we intend to overcome this omission by offering a more complete taxonomy of human motivations that explicitly includes morality and spirituality.

2. Early Theories of Motivation

Despite the enormous effort that has been devoted to the study of motivation, there is no single theory of motivation that is universally accepted. Nevertheless, it is generally recognized that there are two major theoretical streams of research in motivation: the content and the process theories. Content motivation theories center their attention on ‘what’ motivates people in acting, on those factors, needs or goals within the individual that lead to motivation. On the other hand, process theories focus on how the motivation mechanism takes place and its dynamics. They attempt to capture the dynamic of making choices with respect to desired goals (those goals previously described by content theories). In an effort to lay a foundation for the inclusion of ethical and spiritual motivations, we will first briefly describe some of the most widely accepted early content theories of motivation in modern psychology.

Among them, the hierarchical description of human needs proposed by Abraham Maslow in 1943 is paradigmatic. Maslow describes motivations from basic or lower-order needs-- physiological and safety-- ascending to higher-order needs-- those associated with social activities, esteem-building, and self-actualization or constant self-improvement. This hierarchy of human motivations is a continuum of needs that must be met, with each level invoking its own kind of motives (O'Connor & Yballe, 2007). Notice that human needs are seen here as few, finite, classifiable and constant through all human cultures and across historical time periods, whilst what changes over time and between cultures is the way these needs are satisfied (Max-Neef, 1987).

After Maslow's description, different researchers proposed similar classifications with higher empirical support. In the early 60s, David McClelland identified three types of needs (achievement, power, and affiliation) which cause three different kinds of associated motivations. According to his theory, most people possess and portray a mixture of these needs. Those with a high need for achievement have an attraction to situations offering personal accountability. Individuals with a dominating need for authority and power have a desire to influence and to increase personal status and prestige. Finally, those with a great need for affiliation value building strong relationships and belonging to groups or organizations (McClelland, 1962). Therefore, these three motivations don't necessarily follow a sequential process, as Maslow advocated.

In 1969 Clayton P. Alderfer, published his Three Needs Theory-- existence, relatedness and growth (ERG). He argued that all of them can be pursued simultaneously. Alderfer's ERG and McLellan's theories improve upon Maslow's theory by allowing more flexibility of movement between needs.

Another important representative of the theories of content, Frederick Herzberg (1968), distinguished between extrinsic and intrinsic factors. The former refers to doing something because it leads to a distinct outcome, something external you expect to receive; and the latter refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable, an internal reward. The intrinsic and extrinsic types of motivation have been widely studied, and the distinction has shed important light on both developmental and educational practices. A more recent example of this is the description of motivations by Edward Ryan and Richard Deci (2000), which revisited the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to better understand its development. They identified the existence of three basic innate psychological needs-- competence (feeling self-efficacious, having the relevant skills to succeed); autonomy (an internal perceived locus of causality, a self-determined behavior); and relatedness (a sense of belongingness and connectedness). The first two motives are intrinsic and the third is extrinsic (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

In order to clarify and unify these early classical theories of motivation, we integrate all of them into a single table or grid (Table 1). The columns of this grid include extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, according to the Herzberg

distinction, and the rows present higher and lower order of needs, according to Maslow. Extrinsic motivation refers to an external benefit, utility or advantage. We call these motivations reward, denoting the lower order goals, such as subsistence, safety, power, etc.; and relatedness, designating the higher order goals, such as esteem, affiliation, etc.

On the other hand, intrinsic motivations refer to something received internally, while the agent is acting or doing something, which causes them pleasure or satisfaction. We call these motivations learning, when the agent improves his or her skills, thereby acquiring competence; and satisfaction, when the success or achievement causes the agent to be fulfilled.

	Extrinsic motivation	Intrinsic motivation
Higher-order needs	<p>RELATEDNESS</p> <p>Receive good from outside</p> <p><i>Esteem and social needs (Maslow)</i> <i>Affiliation (McClelland)</i> <i>Recognition and Relatedness (Alderfer)</i> <i>Relatedness (Ryan and Deci)</i></p>	<p>SATISFACTION</p> <p>Acquire good from inside oneself</p> <p><i>Self-actualization (Maslow)</i> <i>Growth (Alderfer)</i> <i>Autonomy (Ryan and Deci)</i></p>
Lower-order needs	<p>REWARD</p> <p>Receive good from outside</p> <p><i>Safety and physiological needs (Maslow)</i> <i>Power (McClelland)</i> <i>Existence (Alderfer)</i></p>	<p>LEARNING</p> <p>Acquire good from inside oneself</p> <p><i>Achievement (McClelland)</i> <i>Competence (Ryan and Deci)</i></p>

As the synthesis in Table 1 shows, there is a strong consistency in classical approaches of motivation. On the other hand, this synthesis also illustrates that little interest was paid in the early approaches to understanding the “moral content” of motivation. Maslow, Alderfer, and Herzberg all focus on needs or deficiencies (content or need-based theories), but they do not seem to pay much attention to ethics as a dimension of human needs. We find it sadly shocking that the most influential content theories of motivation contain a limited implicit ethical assumption – namely, that human nature is essentially amoral.

In addition to this quite amoral postulate, these early theories contain a mostly self-centered view of human nature. As shown in Table 1, the considered motivations refer to the need to receive reward or relatedness, or acquire learning or satisfaction, but ignore the desire to give as a plausible motivation.

These theories seem to conclude that human behavior is basically based on motivations regarding one's own interest and not with other types of interest. If this is so, how can we explain behaviors that focus on helping and serving others? Are these behaviors always self-interested? Do people always seek exclusively their own satisfaction? Behaviors such as cooperation, help, or service to others are explained, in this perspective, only as a desire of satisfying a personal self-interest, for self-satisfaction or self-development, and not as a benevolent action toward others. It is not surprising, therefore, that most early theories of motivation present a second limited implicit ethical assumption – namely, that human nature is exclusively self-interested.

The legacy of these amoral and primarily self-interested theoretical assumptions can be found in the majority of organizational behavior and business administration text books still today. As Sumantra Ghoshal states, “if both common sense and empirical evidence suggest the contrary, why does the pessimistic model of people as purely self-interested beings still so dominate management-related theories?” (2005: 83). Human behavior cannot be reduced to an exclusive search for self-interest, as if this motivation was more elementary than other values. This kind of assumption should not be permitted to pass unexamined. Moral and social concerns can be just as basic or elementary (Sen, 1998).

The purpose of the next part of this work is to make a step forward in overcoming these limitations. Aiming to achieve a richer understanding of motivations beyond the aforementioned content theories, it is essential to explicitly include the ethical and giving dimensions of human nature.

3. Openness to morality and giving

Human beings act because they have reasons, motives or goals. Many times they seek justice, integrity, benevolence or goodness. Therefore, moral goals or motives (Rosati, 2008), as well as motives of giving, should be part of the content of motivation. And, while these motives were absent in the majority of early content theories (see Table 1), moral judgments and social interests are present in most modern process theories.

Today, the motivation phenomenon is analyzed more as a dynamic whole, beyond descriptions of the reasons for acting. Process (or cognitive) theories basic goal is to understand the mechanism of human motivation and what procedures it follows. These theories focus on conscious human decision-

making processes as an explanation of motivation, and are concerned with determining how individual behavior is encouraged, directed, and maintained. Among the best well-known motivation process theories are the Reinforcement Theory (Skinner, 1953); the Theory of Equity (Adams, 1963); the Expectations Theory (Vroom, 1964); and the Goals Theory (Latham & Locke, 1979).

During last few decades, different comprehensive approaches about human motivation process have been developed in order to provide integrated motivation models, and most of them include justice and social behavior as explicit components of the mechanism of motivation. In 2005, in the first Annual Review of Psychology chapter since 1977, devoted exclusively to work motivation, the conclusion was that the three most important approaches to work motivation to appear in the last 30 years are goal-setting, social cognitive and organizational justice theories (Latham and Pinder, 2005). It is clear that justice, as a moral aspect of motivation, is considered as a reason of human conduct. Other motivational theories (e.g., self-efficacy, moral disengagement) have been applied directly to an understanding of why individuals engage in unethical behavior or fail to engage in ethical behavior (Bandura et al., 1996; Mitchell & Palmer, 2010).

Moreover, important research documents the role of social factors in motivating behavior. Kropotkin (1972) notes that humans like most other animal species live in societies, which could not develop and cannot persist without cooperation. Adam Grant (2008) in some of his studies shows the importance of employees knowing about the beneficiaries of their work, and more recently, different organizational citizenship behaviors have received a great deal of research attention, including research investigating what motivates individuals to engage in these behaviors (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). De Waal (2008) reviews in a Chapter of the Annual Review of Psychology the accumulated research on altruistic motivation, showing also the uselessness of understanding motivation in exclusively self-interested terms.

To sum up, after an early limited understanding of human motivation, the accumulation of more recent empirical evidence shows us that the (content) theories had deficient explanatory power because they stopped short of including particular ethical and pro-social considerations. The purpose of the next part is to revisit the early description of human motivation content (see Table 1) in order to explicitly include ‘moral’ and ‘giving’ motivations as components of a more accurate taxonomy of human needs.

4. Including morality and giving as human motivations

Aristotle’s distinction of human goods described twenty-five centuries ago may help us to rethink the classification of motives of human actions. He explained the different kinds of human friendship distinguishing three kinds of

goods as the goals or ends pursued in human relationships. “The kinds of friendship may perhaps be cleared up if we first come to know the object of love. For not everything seems to be loved but only the lovable, and this is good, pleasant, or useful” (Aristotle, 1934: 1155b). Therefore, following the Aristotelian tradition, there are three kinds of lovable things or human goods: one kind is intended for the sake of something else –the useful good; and the other two are aimed for their own sake. Among these latter goods are the pleasant good and the moral good.

If we look at the lower level of the grid in Table 1, the needs described by Maslow, including safety and physiological basic needs, as well as the need of existence by Alderfer; power and achievement by McClelland, and competence by Ryan and Deci, perfectly fit Aristotle’s concept of useful good. These are goods that human beings need in order to attain other goods, for the sake of some other goods, and not for their own sake -- e.g. air, food, drink, warmth, shelter, sleep, and also money, working conditions, security, protection or law. Therefore, we advocate using the Aristotelian term ‘useful good’ instead of Maslow’s lower order needs.

The second type of good, the pleasant good, attracts us because it satisfies us without the mediation of any other good, causing a sense of enjoyment. These goods are related to the upper order needs: esteem and social interpersonal relationships (Maslow); recognition and relatedness (Alderfer); affiliation (McClelland); relatedness (Ryan and Deci); as well as to those needs directly related to satisfaction, like self-actualization (Maslow); growth (Alderfer); and autonomy (Ryan and Deci). The pleasant goods are sought for their own sake because they are nice, enjoyable, fun or pleasant.

Like the pleasant, the moral good is chosen for its own sake. The moral good consists of everything that is right and worthy of cultivation (McCullough & Snyder, 2001), contributing to the flourishing of the human being and his moral character (Doherty, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 1998), such as the human virtues of justice, sincerity, truthfulness, honesty, and peace. Peter Kreeft summarized this Aristotelian classification, saying that “there are only three reasons why anyone should ever do anything: because it is morally virtuous, practically necessary, or fun” (1990).

We argue that if a motivation theory intends to be authentically human, it must include the consideration of the moral motives in its taxonomy, as modern theories of process and empirical evidence shows. For this reason we suggest, as a practical way to avoid an amoral misconception of human behavior, that there be an expansion of the categorization of motivation to include the ethical.

Then, using Aristotle as our guide, we introduce two new subcategories of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations referring to the moral good. The extrinsic moral motivation can be described as the desire to receive moral good from the outside. Here, we do not denote an external psychological reward or affection,

but the reception of an external moral good, such as justice, truth, or goodness - - e.g. the willingness to be treated morally well, respected as human beings, to receive appropriate recognition, moral reputation or approval or legitimacy from others, when we fulfill our moral duties, norms or obligations.

On the other hand, the intrinsic moral motivation may be described as the desire to acquire moral good while acting, a good inside the agent. It is an internal moral ability or acquired disposition that results from the realization of such action, or what Aristotle would call a moral virtue. This is the trait of character that enables a person to achieve human flourishing, a form of self-actualization or well-being, which goes beyond Maslow's early narrower conception of self-fulfillment (Melé, 2003).

To complete the explicit consideration of moral motivation, and to overcome the assumption of an exclusive self-interested view of motivation, we expand the taxonomy of motivation to include the motivation of giving. This will allow us to transcend the individual domain and to consider the impact that our actions have on others. This kind of motivation was already identified by other thinkers in previous early decades. For example, Lersch (1938) described self-transcending drives as one of the groups of motives that characterize human development from infancy to adulthood, striving for cooperative, creative or loving behaviors.

Frankl (1966) argued some years later that there are two specifically human phenomena by which human existence is characterized: the capacity of self-detachment and of self-transcendence. Allport (1961) held a similar position seeing human beings as proactive and purposeful, whose personality is less a finished product than a transitive process. In addition to these proposals, we should also mention that, in 1971, in a less well-known late work, Maslow (1971) introduced an "8th" need for self-transcendence, in addition to his own expanded hierarchy (1970) in which he added aesthetic and cognitive needs.

More recently, Pérez-López (1993) claimed that human beings have both kinds of motivations: self-interest (extrinsic and intrinsic motives) and others-interest (transcendent motives). This motivation has been labeled as transitive motivation (Melé, 2003), a terminology we will use here.

We suggest, therefore, a more complete and accurate description of human goals, purposes or needs, adding the transitive motivation to the intrinsic and extrinsic ones, as well as including the ethical dimension of human nature. We offer Table 2 as a graphic illustration of these additions to the description of human motivation.

	Extrinsic motives	Intrinsic motives	Transitive motives
Moral good	<p>RESPECT Receive moral good from outside</p> <p><i>Legitimacy and justice</i></p>	<p>FLOURISHING Acquire moral good from inside</p> <p><i>Virtuousness and excellence</i></p>	<p>LOVE Give moral good to others</p> <p><i>Friendship and beneficence</i></p>
Pleasant good	<p>RELATEDNESS Receive pleasant good from outside</p> <p><i>Affection and participation</i></p>	<p>SATISFACTION Acquire pleasant good from inside</p> <p><i>Auto-realization and autonomy</i></p>	<p>CARE Give pleasant good to others</p> <p><i>Kindness and amiability</i></p>
Useful good	<p>REWARD Receive useful good from outside</p> <p><i>Subsistence and protection</i></p>	<p>LEARNING Acquire useful good from inside</p> <p><i>Competence and understanding</i></p>	<p>SERVICE Give useful good to others</p> <p><i>Help and collaboration</i></p>

Table 2. The expanded grid of human motivations, including moral and transitive needs

This expanded taxonomy of motivations now includes a new third column for the transitive motives, which points outside the agent. Adding this new column, three new categories of motivation for giving come to light, reflecting the three kinds of human good (useful, pleasant and moral).

Starting from the bottom of the grid, the first new category is the transitive useful motivation, understood as the desire to give useful good to others. This eagerness to help others, to be useful to others, may be labeled as service: assistance, support, aid, solidarity, cooperation or collaboration. Who could deny these are the motives of many people in many circumstances (i.e. parents, teachers, doctors, nurses, public service agents and other professionals)?

Insofar as this collaboration, service, or help can be provided with affection or kindness, the good at stake can be pleasant as well as useful. Therefore, we can also describe the transitive pleasant motivation as the desire to give pleasant good to others. It is the eagerness to help others to satisfy their needs for affection, for care. These are internal and subjective needs, related to

but different from the practical and objective needs satisfied through the act of helping.

Finally, when the moral good is considered, we arrive at a higher level of motivation: the transitive moral motivation. It may be described as the rational desire to give moral good to others. In the Aristotelian tradition this kind of motivation is called love, understood as the desire to do or give that which is good to another. When a mother or a father wakes up in the middle of the night to care for a child, most probably, the reason or motive of this action is neither reward, relatedness or self-respect (extrinsic motives), nor learning, satisfaction or personal flourishing (intrinsic motives), but it is related to service, care and love (transitive motives). When parents correct their children, they do so most frequently out of love.

We want to highlight that the verbs in Table 2 are: “to receive” when describing extrinsic motives; “to acquire” when describing intrinsic motives; and “to give” when describing transitive motives. In this way, we try to make clear that extrinsic motives refer to something from outside (received), intrinsic motives refer to something from inside (acquired) and transitive motives refer to the act of giving to another person (given). Transitive motives have a “purpose” that transcends the individual person.

Although all these human motivations can be described in a hierarchical order, they are complementary and can be achieved simultaneously, not sequentially (MacIntyre, 1985, 35). In fact, all of them can be present in the same person, at the same time, and presumably in the same action, although probably in different proportions.

Consider, for example, a manager implementing a new safety program for his workers in a factory. The motives of his action can be related to extrinsic motives, such as favorable monetary compensation (extrinsic useful motivation); achieving social prestige (extrinsic pleasant motivation); and attaining moral reputation of being a good person (extrinsic moral motivation). In addition, there may also be intrinsic motives such as learning a new technique (intrinsic useful motivation); having a personal satisfaction for the success of this implementation (intrinsic pleasant motivation); and striving to be a good person who fulfills his duties with integrity: trying to be honest, industrious, and generous in his job (intrinsic moral motivation).

If we also consider transitive motives, we may see that this manager may have other motives such as providing workers a safer workplace without a direct link to increased productivity (transitive useful motivation); giving his workers care and affection (transitive pleasant motivation); and also trying to improve their welfare for the sake of themselves, as a kind of human love (transitive moral motivation). Different motives may vary in presence and intensity

precisely because human beings are free to decide the reasons for their choices. This same example can be applied to any human activity.

This new proposed grid allows a deeper reflection on the relationships between psychology and moral motivations. There is growing evidence that moral virtues and some habits are quite relevant for business performance (Melé, 2003). Recent research suggests that many employees define themselves as giving and caring individuals who hold pro-social identities (Aquino & Reed, 2002). In fact, a lot of research effort has been done in evolutionary biology, psychology, sociology, political science, and experimental economics suggesting that people behave far less selfishly than most assume (Benkler, 2011). Studies of individuals helping others suggest that the act of giving to a recipient can increase the giver's commitment to that recipient (Aronson, 1999; Flynn & Brockner, 2003). Moreover, a recent study proposes that "the act of giving to support programs strengthens employees' affective commitment to their organization by enabling them to see themselves and the organization in more pro-social, caring terms" (Grant et al., 2008).

After widening the narrow assumptions of the early most popular motivation content theories, one dimension of human motivation is still absent from this taxonomy (see table 2). Where are the drives related to spirituality? Is it not true that millions of human beings through history have been driven by spiritual motives in their conduct?

5. Spiritual motivations

A growing literature suggests that there is a spiritual reality to peoples' lives, and that this reality affects individuals in a variety of ways (King, 2006). Therefore, shouldn't these spiritual motivations be part of a complete and more accurate description of a comprehensive grid of human motives? It is undeniable that the role of spirituality in the workplace has widely gained the interest of scholars and practitioners over the last few decades (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008), but it is still missing in motivation theories. Consequently, we need to consider explicitly the role of spiritual motivation. No doubt such motives of conduct belong to the area of beliefs, and may be present in some individuals and not in others. However it does not mean that such motives are not real. Therefore, this is an area of human behavior that demands dialogue and mutual understanding between psychology and theology.

Depending on the tradition considered, spirituality may be understood as something exclusively internal, or as open to nature and the cosmos, and also as a dimension open to a divine realm. In the first case, spirituality helps to find a path toward a higher state of awareness, wisdom or perfection of one's own being, developing an individual's inner life. This spirituality is centered on the individual, focused on oneself and on the search for an inner path enabling a

person to discover the essence of his/her being. Transcendental meditation is a clear example of this kind of spirituality. In the second case, the basic path to access spiritual reality would be the experience of human relatedness and the aesthetic contemplation of nature and the cosmos. A number of pantheistic approaches to spirituality would be included in this group. Finally, a third way to understand spirituality is as a belief in the transcendent quality of a Higher Being, such as God (Pargament & Mahoney, 2002). Most religions are among this third kind of spirituality. In fact, notice that the word religion (from the Latin term: *religare*), means precisely a kind of spiritual relation or linkage with an Otherness, with God. In this perspective, the way to get access to a spiritual reality is through prayer or personal dialogue with God. Some polytheist and every monotheist religion would be included in this conception of spirituality.

As the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognized in its article 18: “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance”. Religion is a phenomenon essentially and exclusively human. It is present in every single civilization and in the majority of societies. Because of this it is worthy of universal recognition and protection.

This third meaning of spirituality, religion, has to do, therefore, with the search for meaning and values that include some experience of transcendence (Bruce, 1999). It is often experienced as a source of inspiration or orientation in life, reflecting “the extent to which an individual is motivated to find sacred meaning and purpose to his or her existence” (Tepper, 2003). In this sense, spiritual motivation, in its three conceptions, can be understood as a kind of human need or a good at the highest level, given that it includes the “deepest values and meanings by which people live” (Sheldrake, 2007: 1-2).

6. Openness to spirituality and transcendence

Recognizing spirituality as a legitimate category of human needs and desires, we include it in Table 2 to create a still wider taxonomy of human motivations (see Table 3). To explicitly consider spiritual motivations, we suggest the addition of the category of ‘spiritual good’, in the top row of the motivational grid, in addition to those categories of ‘useful’, ‘pleasant’ and ‘moral’ goods. Moreover, a new fourth column should be added, in order to consider those conceptions of spirituality that are open to a divine realm, to a Higher Being, or to God. These are ‘transcendental’ motivations, open to the reality of an Otherness. They could be also described as ‘religious’ motivations, given that they refer to a relationship with God, with whom the human being can have a personal relationship. This is understood in many monotheist

religions, and more specifically, in the Judeo-Christian tradition described in the Bible.

The extrinsic spiritual motivation can be described as the desire to receive spiritual good from the outside. Contemplation, understood as the openness to receive spiritual good, is a concept that does not require the acceptance of a divinity but refers to the openness to an external spiritual good or grace, a spiritual gift or support, such as wisdom, joy or peace of spirit. In the Christian tradition, every gift received from God would be included here as a spiritual or supernatural motive of human conduct (Isaiah 11:2-3), such as the fruits of charity (Gal 5:22-23), the theological virtues, or the eternal contemplation of God in heaven (the highest supernatural grace or reward).

The intrinsic spiritual motivation may be described as the desire to acquire spiritual good while doing human actions. It is an internal spiritual improvement that results from the realization of such action, or what may be described as spiritual flourishing, the increase of the spirituality or blessedness of the person. Once again, strictly speaking, this motivation does not demand the recognition of the existence of a divinity, but, is open to such a presence. For a Christian believer, such a human motivation would be godliness, holiness, or sanctity understood as becoming saint as God is saint (Rom 8:28-30). It could also mean being spiritually good or perfect: "be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Mt 5:48).

The transitive spiritual motivation may be described as the desire to give spiritual good to others. This motivation includes all the reasons that make a person act to provide spiritual good to other people. Somehow this is the noblest meaning of love, to share the spiritual good with others. In the Christian tradition, this kind of motivation has to do with one of the meanings of charity, or agape, which upholds and purifies human love, and "which is ultimately unselfish not because it focuses on the good of the recipient, but because it comes from God through the giver and is directed toward all: giver, receiver..." (Clough, 2006: 25).

Table 3 adds a new fourth column to the grid of motivations in order to consider the notion of spirituality open to a divine realm. This column refers to the human relation with a Transcendent Being, which we have labeled as transcendental motivation. Starting from the bottom of this new column of the grid, the first new category is the transcendental useful motivation, or the desire to give useful good to the Other. This eagerness to be useful to God or to divinity, to cooperate with Him, may be labeled also as service to God, submission or obedience to His will. This is an attitude proper of the creature before God's power or authority. Moreover, we can also describe a transcendental pleasant motivation as the desire to give pleasant good to the Other. It is the inclination to be affectionate with Him, with the One who, is not only our creator, the almighty God, but also the One who (in the Christian tradition) wants to be called Father. The movement of the human heart before

God as Father is one of piety, of appreciation, of reparation, of gratitude and thanksgiving. In addition, it is also possible to talk about a transcendental moral motivation, a desire to give the appropriate moral good to God, to give Him what He deserves in justice, which in fact is reverence, veneration, adoration or worship, as the highest good and source of every good.

Finally, transcendental spiritual motivation may be considered as the highest human motivation, the one consisting of a desire to give the spiritual good back to the One who is Himself the Spirit and Life (John 6: 63). Human creatures are unique in that only they can give glory voluntarily to the One who is the Glory itself, the One who deserves praise, tribute, and honor. To do everything for the glory of God, to glorify him, is described then as the noblest human motivation, giving back spiritual love to the same Love.

Going back to the previous example of the manager implementing a new safety program for his workers in a factory, the motives of his action can be related to natural motives (see Table 2) , but also to spiritual motivations. He may do his job thinking about a spiritual reward because of his good conduct as peace or joy (extrinsic spiritual motivation); looking for sanctity while doing appropriately the work (intrinsic spiritual motivation); helping to sanctify others through his example in the workplace (transitive spiritual motivation); trying to do the will of God throughout his professional vocation (transcendent useful motivation); giving thanks to God for and through his job (transcendent pleasant motivation); seeing the job as an opportunity to offer something good to God (transcendent moral motivation); and fulfilling the glory of God as the highest intention of his daily tasks (transcendent spiritual motivation).

We are not saying here that these spiritual motivations are necessarily present in every human being. However, for those who have faith in the existence of God, these motivations are plausible, and if the purpose is to understand human motivations, then they should be recognized as reasonable motives of human conduct. This is the reason to include them in this grid.

Notice that the expanded multidimensional grid of motivations proposed here (Table 3) includes basic dimensions of human life: physiological, social-psychological, moral and spiritual. This multidimensional proposal recognizes previous theoretical approaches and recent empirical findings in behavioral ethics and positive organizational psychology. Moreover, it permits the distinction of the different areas of knowledge affecting human motivation (ethics, sociology, psychology and theology, among others) and contributes to the dialogue and integration among them.

	Extrinsic Motives	Intrinsic motives	Transitive motives	Transcendental motives
Spiritual good	<p>GIFTS Receive spiritual good from outside</p> <p><i>Assistance and grace</i></p>	<p>SANCTITY Acquire spiritual good from inside</p> <p><i>Holiness and godlikeness</i></p>	<p>CHARITY Give spiritual good to others</p> <p><i>Contribution and self-giving</i></p>	<p>GLORIFY Give spiritual good to the Other (God)</p> <p><i>Praise and tribute</i></p>
Moral good	<p>RESPECT Receive moral good from outside</p> <p><i>Legitimacy and justice</i></p>	<p>FLOURISHING Acquire moral good from inside</p> <p><i>Virtuousness and excellence</i></p>	<p>LOVE Give moral good to others</p> <p><i>Friendship and beneficence</i></p>	<p>WORSHIP Give moral good to the Other (God)</p> <p><i>Reverence and adoration</i></p>
Pleasant good	<p>RELATEDNESS Receive pleasant good from outside</p> <p><i>Affection and participation</i></p>	<p>SATISFACTION Acquire pleasant good from inside</p> <p><i>Auto-realization and autonomy</i></p>	<p>CARE Give pleasant good to others</p> <p><i>Kindness and amiability</i></p>	<p>GRATITUDE Give pleasant good to the Other (God)</p> <p><i>Thanksgiving and reparation</i></p>
Useful good	<p>REWARD Receive useful good from outside</p> <p><i>Subsistence and protection</i></p>	<p>LEARNING Acquire useful good from inside</p> <p><i>Competence and understanding</i></p>	<p>SERVICE Give useful good to others</p> <p><i>Help and collaboration</i></p>	<p>SUBMISSION Give useful good to the Other (God)</p> <p><i>Service and compliance</i></p>

Table 3. The expanded grid of human motivations, including moral and spiritual dimensions

7. Conclusion

We have presented a synthesis of the most respected content theories of motivation (Table 1) underlining their limited implicit amoral and self-interested assumptions. Then, based on the Aristotelian distinction of human goods, and a review of the literature, a taxonomy of motivation is expanded by

explicitly introducing ethical or moral motives in human actions, as well as transitive motives, or motives “of giving” (Table 2). Finally, we expand the taxonomy of motivation even further to a wider classification open to spirituality and transcendence (Table 3).

In this way, our proposal overcomes the narrow assumptions of early content theories of motivation which implicitly considered human motives as self-interested, amoral and non-spiritual. So, here we suggest a rational integration of psychological, ethical and theological findings. This is an integration that respects the different epistemological nature of the three areas (their different objects of knowledge) and also their different methodological approaches. The assumption here is that their objects of study, while remaining distinct, all belong to the sphere of human motivations. So they should be distinguished but not separated.

Much empirical work remains to be done in order to better understand the complex phenomena of human motivation. This effort is but a step toward articulating a more complete and accurate description of motivation that brings out the full dimensions of being human.

8. References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, pp. 422–436.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, pp. 142–175.
- Allport, G.W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Aquino, K. & Reed, A. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83: 1423–1440.
- Aristotle. (1934a). *Nicomachean ethics*. H. Rackham (Trad.). Vol.19. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Aristotle. (1934b). *Metaphysics*. H. Tredennick (Trad.). Vols.17-18. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Aronson, E. (1999). The power of self-persuasion. *American Psychologist*, 54, pp. 875–884.

- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(2), 364-374.
- Bateman T. S. and Organ, D. W. (1983). Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship between Affect and Employee "Citizenship". *The Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), pp. 587-595
- Benkler, Y. (2011). The unselfish gene. *Harvard Business Review*, (July/August), 89(7-8), pp. 67-75.
- Bruce, W. (1999). Spirituality in public service: A dialogue. *Public Administration Review* 59(2), pp. 163-169.
- Clough, W.R. (2006). To be loved and to love. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 34(1), pp. 23-31.
- De Waal, F.B. (2008) Putting the Altruism Back into Altruism: The Evolution of Empathy. Vol. 59: 279-300.
- Doherty, W. J. (1995). Soul searching: Why psychotherapy must promote moral responsibility. New York: Basic Books.
- Flynn, F. J., & Brockner, J. (2003). It's different to give than to receive: Predictors of givers' and receivers' reactions to favor exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, pp. 1034-1045.
- Frankl, V.E. (1966). Self-Transcendence as a human phenomenon. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 6, pp. 97-106.
- Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(1), pp. 75-91.
- Gotsis, G. & Kortezi, Z. (2008). Philosophical foundations of workplace spirituality: A critical approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78, pp. 575-600.
- Grant, A. M. 2008. The significance of task significance: Job performance effects, relational mechanisms, and boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 108-124.
- Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E., & Rosso, B. (2008). Giving commitment: Employee support programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, pp. 898-918.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more Time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46 (January/February), pp. 53-62.

- King, S. (2006). The moral manager. *Public Integrity*, 8(2), pp. 113-133.
- Kreeft, P. (1990). *A Summa of the Summa*. San Francisco, CA.: Ignatius Press.
- Kropotkin, P. (1972). *Mutual aid: A factor of evolution*. Boston: Extending Horizons.
- Latham, G. P. & Locke, E. A. (1979). Goal setting-A motivational technique that works. *Organizational Dynamics*, 8, pp. 68–80.
- Latham, G. P. & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work Motivation Theory and Research at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, pp. 485-516.
- Lersch, Ph. (1938). *Aufbau der person*. München, Barth. (in German)
- McCullough, M.E. & Snyder, C.R. (2001). Classical sources of human strength: Revisiting an old home and building a new one. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19, pp. 1–10.
- Maslow, A. (1943). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. 1971. *The Further Reaches of Human Nature*. New York: Viking Press.
- Max-Neef, M. (1991). *Human scale development*. New York: Apex Press.
- McClelland, D. C. (1962). Business, drive and national achievement. *Harvard Business Review*, 40, pp. 99–112.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Melé, D. (2003). The challenge of the humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(1), pp. 77–88.
- Mitchell, M. S., & Palmer, N. F. (2010). The managerial relevance of ethical efficacy. In M. Schminke (Ed.), *Managerial ethics: Managing the psychology of morality* (pp. 89-108). New York: Routledge.
- O'Connor, D., & Yballe, L. (2007). Maslow revisited: Construction a road map of human nature. *Journal of Management Education*, 31(6), pp. 738-756.
- Pargament, K. L., & Mahoney, A. (2002). Spirituality: Discovering and conserving the sacred. In *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.). Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe. pp. 646–659.

- Pérez-López, J. A. (1993). *Fundamentos de la dirección de empresas*. Madrid: Rialp.
- Rubenstein, R. L. (1987). *Spirit matters: The worldwide impact of religion on contemporary politics*. New York: Paragon House.
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, pp. 54–67.
- Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, pp. 1-28.
- Sen, A. K. (1998). Foreword. In Ben-Ner, A. & Putterman, L. (eds.), *Economics, values and organization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheldrake, P. (2007). *A brief history of spirituality*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smith, H. (2000). *Why religion matters: The fate of the human spirit in an age of disbelief*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Smith, C. A.; Organ, D. W. and Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), pp. 653-663.
- Tepper, B. J. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior and the spiritual employee. In *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.). Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 181–190.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.