

## **A Study of the Maslow's Needs Priority among the Iranian Auditors**

**Mahdi Salehi<sup>1\*</sup>, Mahmoud Mousavi Shiri<sup>2</sup>**

Received: 2011/10/4

Accepted: 2012/4/14

### **Abstract**

Auditors play a critical role in any company. The managers of such departments should manage subordinates so well in order to obtain good results. For this condition to happen, at first the managers' motivations should be recognized and be satisfied, otherwise neither managers, nor subordinates practice auditing in perfect condition. The results of this study show some high rating areas of internal audit department managers' motivation that have a strong effect on the clients. Furthermore, the results of this study reveal some motivational weakness in internal audit departments in Iran. The authors believe that from any aspect, internal audit departments should satisfy different motivation.

**Keywords: Internal Auditors, Motivation, Iran.**

---

1 . Assistant Professor of Accounting, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. mahdi\_salehi54@yahoo.com  
2 . Department of Management, Economics and Accounting, Payame Noor University, I.R. of Iran  
mousavi1973@yahoo.com

## **Introduction**

Traditionally, internal audit function has been designed to help ensure reliable accounting information and to safeguard company assets. Internal auditing is considered a stressful occupation, because heavy workloads, many deadlines and time pressures often characterize the job. The internal auditors are often under pressure to produce quality work and yet may be under serious budget constraints to accomplish the work in less time (Brown and Mendenhall, 1995). The work may also involve extensive business travel and frequently changing work locations, which can further increase the job stress levels of internal auditors (Sears, 1992). In such conditions, managers can play very vital role to reduce some of workplace stress as well as increasing motivation.

A manager, who creates trust and confidence in the minds of his subordinates, motivates his or her employees to be more trust-worthy, diligent, accountable and responsible. He wins their hearts and minds. This is what is required of motivation today. Development of trust and confidence building cannot be achieved within a short period. It is a constant and continuous

process of creating a climate of trust and confidence among the subordinates. A manager needs to possess qualities like accountability, trustworthiness, consistency, constructive behavior, genuine motive, ideal foresight, flexibility, evenhandedness, competence, communication skill, appreciating mindset and commitment; in order to win over his subordinates. Monappa and Saiyadain (2003) state that the term, 'manager' is a wide one. Most people are managers in a general sense. Anyone trying to achieve a goal through the efforts of others is a manager. A manager is defined as one holding a managerial position in the organization. A manager is the principal factor in determining the productivity of the workforce. The viability of business organizations and consequently the economic well being of a nation depends largely on the efforts of the managerial class. The effective manager is one who is properly developed in terms of basic intellectual abilities and the predispositions necessary for carrying out the task smoothly. Further, Hoven (1982) observes that people's needs, values and expectations change with the conditions around them. What will remain crucial at all times is that

managing will always be a human activity and thus ultimately influenced by the interplay of human forces. Changing the work-related needs, motives, aspirations, beliefs and values of managerial group in an organization is a daunting challenge. Managers at different levels work for a wide variety of various reasons. Even managers within the same culture or organization have a wide array of needs, motives and aspirations. Some managers want money, some want challenge and some want power. What each unique manager in an organization wants from work plays an instrumental role in determining his or her motivation to work. Motivation is vital to all types of organization. Often, the difference between highly effective organizations and less effective ones lies in the motivation of their managers.

#### **Auditing: A Historical Perspective**

The demand for auditing is sourced in the need to have some means of independent verification to reduce record-keeping errors, asset misappropriation, and fraud within business and non-business organizations. Accounting historian Brown (1905) intuitively describes the roots of auditing in

general, as the origin of auditing goes back to times scarcely less remote than that of accounting. Whenever the advance of civilization brought about the necessity of one man being intrusted to some extent with the property of another, the advisability of some kind of check upon the fidelity of the former would become apparent. As far back as 4000 B.C., historians believed organized businesses and governments in the Near East to allay their concerns about correctly accounting for receipts and disbursements and collecting taxes first instituted formal record-keeping systems. Similar developments occurred with respect to the Zhao dynasty in China (1122-256 B.C.). The need for and indications of audits can be traced back to public finance systems in Babylonia, Greece, the Roman Empire, the City States of Italy, etc., all of which developed a detailed system of checks and counterchecks (Salehi, 2008). Specifically, these governments were worried about incompetent officials prone to making bookkeeping errors and inaccuracies as well as corrupt officials who were motivated to perpetrate fraud whenever the opportunity arose. Even the Bible explains the basic rationale for instituting controls rather

straightforwardly: "...if employees have an opportunity to steal they may take advantage of it." The Bible also contains examples of internal controls such as the dangers of dual custody of assets, the need for competent and honest employees, restricted access, and segregation of duties (O'Reilly et al., 1998). Historically then, the emergence of double entry bookkeeping in circa 1494 A.D. can be directly traced to the critical need for exercising stewardship and control. Throughout European history, for instance, fraud cases - such as the South Sea bubble of the 18th century, and the tulip scandal provided the justification for exercising more control over managers.

Within a span of a couple of centuries, the European systems of bookkeeping and auditing introduced into the United States. As business, activities grew in size, scope, and complexity, a critical need for a separate internal assurance function that would verify the information used for decision-making by management emerged. Management needed some means of evaluating not only the efficiency of work performed for the business but also the honesty of its employees. Around the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the establishment of a formal internal audit function to which

these responsibilities could be delegated was seen as the logical answer. In due course, the internal audit function became responsible for "careful collection and interpretive reporting of selected business facts" to enable management to keep track of significant business developments, activities, and results from diverse and voluminous transactions (Mautz, 1964). Companies in the railroad, defense, and retail industries had long recognized the value of internal audit services, going far beyond financial statement auditing and devoted to furnishing reliable operating reports containing nonfinancial data such as "quantities of parts in short supply, adherence to schedules, and quality of the product" (Whittington and Pany, 1998). Similarly, the U.S. General Accounting Office and numerous State Auditors' Offices, for instance, the State of Ohio Auditors' Office, have traditionally employed large numbers of internal auditors.

In sum, the collective effect of growing transaction complexity and volume, the owner/ manager's "principals" remoteness from the source of transactions and potential bias of reporting parties "agents", technical (accounting) expertise required to

review and summarize business activities in a meaningful way, need for organizational status to ensure independence and objectivity, as well as the procedural discipline necessary for being the “eyes and ears” of management all contributed to the creation of an internal audit department within business organizations. Starting as an internal business function primarily focused on protection against payroll fraud, loss of cash, and other assets, internal audit’s scope was quickly extended to the verification of almost all financial transactions, and still later, gradually moved from an “audit for management” emphasis to an “audit of management” approach (Reeve, 1986).

Brink and Cashin (1958) state that internal auditing thus emerges as a special segment of the broad field of accounting, utilizing the basic techniques and methods of auditing. The fact that the public accountant and the internal auditor use many of the same techniques often leads to a mistaken assumption that there is little difference in the work or in ultimate objectives.

The internal auditor, like any auditor, is concerned with the investigation of the validity of representations, but in his case,

the representations with which he is concerned cover a much wider range and have to do with many matters, where the relationship to the accounts is often somewhat remote. In addition, the internal auditor, being a company man, has a more vital interest in all types of company operations and is quite naturally more deeply interested in helping to make those operations as profitable as possible. Thus, largely, management services comes to influence his thinking and general approach.

Walsh (1963) believes that the widening gap between management and action has made it necessary to develop a series of controls by means of which the business may be administered efficiently.

Ratliff and Reding (2002, p. 6) capture the expanded responsibilities and skill-set of the 21<sup>st</sup> century auditor as follows:

“Auditors of the 21<sup>st</sup> century must be prepared to ‘audit’ virtually everything operations (including control systems), performance, information and information systems, legal compliance, financial statements, fraud, environmental reporting and performance, and quality. Auditors must master: Analytical and critical thinking skills; an efficient method to gain

an adequate understanding of any auditee individual, organization, or system; new concepts, principles, and techniques of internal control; an awareness and understanding of risk and opportunity related to both the auditee and the auditors; development of general and specific audit objectives for any audit project; selection, collection (using a broad array of audit procedures), evaluation, and documentation of audit evidence, including the use of statistical and non-statistical induction; reporting audit results in a list the following necessary personal attributes to be a successful internal auditor (in addition to technical and professional qualifications, this is a formidable list): (1) basic fairness and integrity; (2) dedication to the organization's interests; (3) reasonable humility; (4) professional poise; (5) empathy; (6) role consistency; (7) curiosity; (8) critical attitude; (9) alertness; (10) persistence; (11) energy; (12) self-confidence; (13) courage; and (14) ability to make sound judgments and (15) have high motivation for work. In this study the authors only emphasis to several

dimensions of motivation as follows:

### **Nature and Concept of Motivation**

Unfortunately, motivation is not a simple concept. It involves a complex combination of individual needs, drives, tensions, discomforts and expectations. The motivation of any organism, even the simplest one, is at present only partly understood. Hence, motivation deals with complex human behavior in order to determine the factor that prompts an individual to do his best. It is wrong to say that motivation is merely a relationship between the effort and reward in case of all employees in all circumstances. Many people motivated by the desire of self-realization, unique achievement and the like.

At present, motivation is the foundation through which all economic activities are carried out. The word, 'motivation' comes from 'motive', which in turn is derived from the Latin word 'movere', which means 'to move'. The terms relating to motivation are given in the Table 1. They provide a useful guide to the terms, which managers use today.

**Table1.** Synonyms of Motivation

| Associated Terms                     | Associated Qualities |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Approach to work                     | Energy               |
| Orientation to work                  | Drive                |
| Application                          | Tenacity             |
| Willingness                          | Determination        |
| Dedication                           | Strength of purpose  |
| Alignment of person and organization | Purposeful           |
| Commitment                           |                      |
| Work appetite                        |                      |

Source: Institute of Manpower Studies (1988)

It is also important to note that the meaning of motivation is properly understood from the viewpoint of different perspectives. Hence, the worth-mentioning and most relevant ones are given below.

According to Berelson and Steiner (1964), motivation refers to all those inner striving conditions, which described as wishes, desires, drives, etc. It is an inner state, which activates or moves. In the words of Hodge and Johnson (1970), state that motivation in organizational settings refers to the willingness of an individual to react to organizational requirements in the short run. The dynamic forces, which actuate the individual, may also be explained as motivation. It is the drive to reduce tension caused by an unsatisfied

need (Klatt, 1978). Putti (1981) observed that motivation means different things to different individuals. For some, it may be an incentive and for others a psychological backing or setting a good example and it is the act of inducing an individual or oneself to follow a desired course of action.

Many contemporary authors have also defined the concept of motivation. Kreitner (1995) defines the term, motivation as the psychological process that gives behavior purpose and direction. Buford et al., (1995) define motivation, as a predisposition to behave in a purposive manner to achieve specific, unmet needs. Higgins (1994) defines it as an internal drives to satisfy an unsatisfied need. Bedeian (1993) defines it as the will to achieve. Motivation is the result of the interaction between the individual and the situation. Certainly, individuals differ in motivational drive but overall motivation varies from situation to situation. The levels of motivation vary both between and within individuals at different times. Weaver (1988) defines it as the willingness to exert high levels of effort to reach organizational goals, conditioned by the effort's ability to satisfy some individual need.

Goleman (1998) observes that motivation is a passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status and means a propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence. The hallmarks of these definitions are strong drive to achieve optimism even in the face of failure and organizational commitment. According to Cummings and Elsalmi (1968), motivation has been defined in terms of 'need satisfaction', that is, the needs that employees seek to satisfy on their jobs, the manner in which they perceive their work environment as satisfying or dissatisfying. Miller et al., (1996) observe motivation is an internal process through which human wants, needs and desires are satisfied. Each person is unique and possesses different attitudes, experiences and opinion. Jones (1955) states that motivation is concerned with how behavior gets started, is energized, is sustained, is directed, is stopped, and what kind of subjective reaction is present in the organism while all this is going on. According to Gray and Starke (1988), motivation is the result of processes, internal or external to the individual that arouse enthusiasm and persistence to pursue a certain course of action. Luthans (1989) describes motivation as a process that starts

with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates behavior or a drive that aimed at a goal or incentive. Steers and Porter (1991) define the term as the set of forces that causes people to engage in behavior rather than some alternative behaviour. Chandan (1997) observes people differ by nature, not only in their ability to perform a specific task but also in their will to do so. This "will" to do is known as motivation. The force of motivation is a dynamic force, setting a person into motion or action.


According to Viteles (1953), motivation represents an unsatisfied need, which creates a state of tension or disequilibrium, causing the individual to move in a goal directed pattern towards restoring a state of equilibrium by satisfying the need. Hodgetts (1977) refers to motivation as the process of creating organizational conditions, which will impel employees to strive to attain company goals. Lillis (1958) defines it as the stimulation of any emotion or desire operating upon one has will and prompting or driving it to action. Stanley (1959) defines it as any emotion or desire, which so conditions one's will that the individual is properly led into action. Allan (2001) states to motivate means to



encourage, influence, inspire and stimulate people, providing them with a reason for working well and to make people feel that they want to work, making them feels good about the work that they are doing. In simple terms, motivation is the force that drives people to do things. Motivation in an organization is the willingness of an employee to respond to organizational requirements. The more positive the individual's motivation towards the organization, the more effective is his performance. His motivation largely is determined by his perception. Motivation refers to the propensity towards a particular

behavior pattern to satisfy a need or deficiency.

Motivation in employees operates in a basic framework, which is visualized by experts in the field in different ways. However, the framework provided by Moorhead and Griffin (1999) is analyzed in Table 2. The basic motivational framework shown below provides a useful way to see how motivational processes occur. When people experience a need or deficiency, they seek ways to satisfy it, which results in a choice of goal-directed behavior. After performing the behavior, the individual experiences rewards or punishments that affect the original need deficiency.



### Importance of Motivation

Interest on motivation in work organizations has escalated dramatically in recent years. Steers and Porter (1975)

observe that several factors appear to account for the prominence of this topic as a focal point of interest. The increased

attention towards motivation is justified by several reasons. In this regard, Gray and Starke (1988) state motivated employees are always looking for better ways to do a job. A motivated employee is generally more quality oriented. Highly motivated workers are more productive than apathetic workers. The high productivity of Japanese workers is attributable to many reasons, but motivation is the main factor. Motivation is considered as one of the most important aspects of actuating, because it is motivation that energizes the behavior of people while behavior activates action and action leads to actuation. Michael (2001) observes motivation is a set of processes concerned with the force that energizes behavior and directs it toward attaining some goal. The need leads to motives resulting in motivation. The terms like wants, needs, desires, wishes, aims, goals, drives and motives related to motivation. The relationship between needs drives and goals can make an integral part of motivation. Motivation implies a goal toward which the movement occurs; it means that motivation causes action. Needs are synonymous with wants, motives or impulses which result in action, while a drive is a force that affects a situation by

pushing on a specific direction. Goals, on the other hand, are ultimate objectives for the achievement of which behavior and action are directed. Motivation may include any inner condition of the person that initiates or directs his behavior towards a particular goal. The motivation can be defined as the inner drive of a person, which energizes his action for the achievement of certain goals for the satisfaction of the given wants or needs. Motivation can have one or more motives backed by needs and wants with an internal drive to act. It is related to behavior on one hand and action on the other and is a moving or guiding force.

The importance of motivation of managerial group cannot be over-emphasized. The success of an organization depends considerably upon the level of motivation of its managers. A highly motivated managerial group can help the organization sustain, even in the worst type of environmental conditions. On the other hand, the success of an organization's business strategy might be jeopardized if the managers of the organization are not motivated individuals. Each person is different. Each situation is disparate. Each solution must be carefully crafted. Any problem, which stems from lack of commitment, enthusiasm and concern, can only successfully be addressed by

providing motivation. Ghosh and Ghorpade (1997) state motivation is the ultimate test of effectiveness of industrial and business organizations, because it directly relates to the results achieved. Looking at it from a broader perspective, work motivation of employees in the organization ultimately determines the state of the national economy, as it is an aggregate of unit organizational performance, which determines the national economy. Work effective managers are concerned about motivation, because the work motives of employees affect their productivity and quality of their work (Chandan, 1997). Through the mid-1970s the term motivation was mentioned 611 times compared with 860 times for leadership in twenty-eight management textbooks (Aronoff, 1975).

### **The Problem of the Study**

Motivational dynamics is the key catalyst for economic success of a nation. Motivation is indeed the life force, the muscle and drive of any business organization. Further, the social economic scenario is changing fast with macro economic reforms sweeping across the countries. There is an imminent pressure for success mainly through the philosophy of working harder. The main trends of downsizing and mergers demand new

approaches, work norms and different mindsets in employees. As a result, the role of managers has significantly increased in managing the people to meet the organizational goals. Quite often, the management concentrates on quality control, research and development, marketing strategies, technical knowledge, expertise, organizational structures, operational systems and tools, motivation of its employees and virtually ignores the motivation of managers at different levels, either deliberately or through a lack of complete awareness. Further, it is not only important that the workers are to be motivated, but also there is a need for motivating the managers, who play a pivotal role in any organization. In this regard, Pestonjee and Basu (1972) observe the problem of executive motivation assumes significance because management mainly deals with men and modern business consists of about 85 percent men, 10 percent material and 5 percent money. Leaving apart the problem of motivating the managers themselves, they also have one of the hardest jobs dealing with people. Although working with people can be enjoyable, it does have its drawbacks. Knowing how to motivate employees is a fundamental asset for managers to possess.

Because each individual is different, discovering the right motivation tactic becomes a tough task to undertake. In other words, the challenge lies in motivating the d, Cofer and Appley (1964) state that the changing environmental conditions make the motivational issues and problems even more complex and pragmatic. No matter where we begin the study of psychological processes or phenomena, we must eventually deal with the problem of motivation. At present, the motivational dynamics has drifted from job security of 1940s and 1950s to the interesting and challenging job in recent year on one hand and from emphasis given to already satisfied needs to the unsatisfied needs on the other. The problem at present in motivational dynamics revolves around the leverage effect of interesting and challenging job and meeting the dissatisfied needs.

### **Research Methodology**

The present study is essentially based on sample survey of selected Iranian Certified Public Accountant members. According to the above literature and the objective of this study, the needed data are collected. So far, finding motivation dimensions, the authors

managers, who in turn have to motivate the managed. These managers have to work in this twin role under fast changing environmental surroundings. In this regard designed and developed a questionnaire based on the methods used in previous researchers. The questionnaire contains two parts namely (A) bio-data and (B) this section includes some questions regarding two factors affecting auditor's managers motivation. The data was collated and interpreted using SPSS software. The study was carried out by adopting relevant statistical techniques, which consisted of mean value, standard deviation, and frequency analysis. Totally, 180 respondents completed the research questionnaires. According to Table 3, out of 180 participants 66 were male (30.60 percent) and 125 were female (69.40 percent). Further, 135 participants were younger than 40 (75.00 percent) and 45 participants were older than 40 (25 percent). Among these, 52.50 percent had less than ten years experience, 36 percent had between 10 to 20 years experience and 21.50 percent had more than 20 years experience.

As Table 1 reveals the majority of participants had sufficient academic degrees. Out of 180 participants 113 participants, had a bachelor degree in accounting or related subjects (62.50 per cent) and 67 had M.A or PhD degrees (47.50 percent).

**Table 3.** Frequency Table of Participant

| Variables  | Items           | Frequency | Percent |
|------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| Gender     | Male            | 55        | 30.60   |
|            | Female          | 125       | 69.40   |
| Age        | Less than 30    | 28        | 35.60   |
|            | 30 to 45        | 98        | 54.60   |
|            | More than 45    | 18        | 9.80    |
| Experience | Less than 10    | 75        | 42.50   |
|            | 10 to 20        | 64        | 36.00   |
|            | More than 20    | 38        | 21.50   |
| Education  | Bachelor degree | 113       | 62.80   |
|            | Master          | 58        | 32.20   |
|            | PhD             | 3         | 1.70    |

## Analysis and Results

The empirical study begins with a comprehensive analysis, which includes the perception of 180 respondents on the level of motivation prevalent and the expected level of motivation covering the ten variables used in the study, Namely, benefits, payment, reward, friendly co-workers, friendly management and supervision, good working environment, interesting and challenging job, job security, opportunity for power and promotion. The comprehensive analyses are presented under (i) Actual Level of Motivation; (ii) Expected Level of Motivation; (iii) Motivational Gap; and (iv) Comparison with Maslow's Needs Priority.

**Table 4.** Actual Level of Motivation

| (A) Actual Level                           | Frequency Distribution |            |             |              | Statistical Values |      | Rank |
|--|------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|------|------|
|  | Disagree               | Neutral    | Agree       | Total        | Mean               | SD   |      |
| <b>Friendly co-workers</b>                 | 4<br>(2)               | 12<br>(5)  | 200<br>(93) | 216<br>(100) | 2.91               | 0.35 | 1    |
| <b>Opportunity for power</b>               | 4<br>(2)               | 19<br>(9)  | 193<br>(89) | 216<br>(100) | 2.88               | 0.38 | 2    |
| <b>Interesting and challenging job</b>     | 9<br>(4)               | 19<br>(9)  | 188<br>(87) | 216<br>(100) | 2.83               | 0.48 | 3    |
| <b>Working environment</b>                 | 14<br>(6)              | 23<br>(11) | 179<br>(83) | 216<br>(100) | 2.76               | 0.56 | 4    |
| <b>Friendly management and Supervision</b> | 19<br>(9)              | 54<br>(25) | 143<br>(66) | 216<br>(100) | 2.57               | 0.65 | 5    |
| <b>Job security</b>                        | 35<br>(16)             | 47<br>(22) | 134<br>(62) | 216<br>(100) | 2.46               | 0.76 | 6    |
| <b>Reward</b>                              | 73<br>(34)             | 55<br>(25) | 88<br>(41)  | 216<br>(100) | 2.07               | 0.86 | 7    |
| <b>Promotion</b>                           | 67<br>(31)             | 69<br>(32) | 80<br>(37)  | 216<br>(100) | 2.06               | 0.82 | 8    |
| <b>Payment</b>                             | 69<br>(32)             | 67<br>(31) | 80<br>(37)  | 216<br>(100) | 2.05               | 0.83 | 9    |
| <b>Benefits</b>                            | 71<br>(33)             | 66<br>(30) | 79<br>(37)  | 216<br>(100) | 2.04               | 0.83 | 10   |
| <b>Average</b>                             |                        |            |             |              | 2.46               | 0.65 |      |

**(i) Actual Level of Motivation:**

Table 4 presents an overview of the actual level of motivation of 180 respondents. The overall mean value of motivation stood at 2.46, which indicated substantially higher

levels of motivation with the standard deviation of 0.65.

In other words, the motivational level achieved was 82.00 percent.

**Table 4.** Actual Level of Motivation

| (A) Actual Level                    | Frequency Distribution |            |             |              | Statistical Values |      | Rank |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|------|------|
|                                     | Disagree               | Neutral    | Agree       | Total        | Mean               | SD   |      |
| Friendly co-workers                 | 4<br>(2)               | 12<br>(5)  | 200<br>(93) | 216<br>(100) | 2.91               | 0.35 | 1    |
| Opportunity for power               | 4<br>(2)               | 19<br>(9)  | 193<br>(89) | 216<br>(100) | 2.88               | 0.38 | 2    |
| Interesting and challenging job     | 9<br>(4)               | 19<br>(9)  | 188<br>(87) | 216<br>(100) | 2.83               | 0.48 | 3    |
| Working environment                 | 14<br>(6)              | 23<br>(11) | 179<br>(83) | 216<br>(100) | 2.76               | 0.56 | 4    |
| Friendly management and Supervision | 19<br>(9)              | 54<br>(25) | 143<br>(66) | 216<br>(100) | 2.57               | 0.65 | 5    |
| Job security                        | 35<br>(16)             | 47<br>(22) | 134<br>(62) | 216<br>(100) | 2.46               | 0.76 | 6    |
| Reward                              | 73<br>(34)             | 55<br>(25) | 88<br>(41)  | 216<br>(100) | 2.07               | 0.86 | 7    |
| Promotion                           | 67<br>(31)             | 69<br>(32) | 80<br>(37)  | 216<br>(100) | 2.06               | 0.82 | 8    |
| Payment                             | 69<br>(32)             | 67<br>(31) | 80<br>(37)  | 216<br>(100) | 2.05               | 0.83 | 9    |
| Benefits                            | 71<br>(33)             | 66<br>(30) | 79<br>(37)  | 216<br>(100) | 2.04               | 0.83 | 10   |
| <b>Average</b>                      |                        |            |             |              | 2.46               | 0.65 |      |

Note: Figures in brackets indicate percentages

This motivational level found to be very much influenced by friendly co-workers; opportunity for power; interesting and challenging job; working environment; and friendly management and supervision and the respective mean values were found to be 2.91, 2.88, 2.83, 2.76 and 2.57. However, the

influence of job security, reward, promotion, payment and benefits on motivational level achieved in the selected units found to be low at 2.46, 2.07, 2.06, 2.05 and 2.04, respectively. The most significant factor influencing the motivational level found to be friendly co-workers having the mean value of 2.91 with standard deviation of 0.35 as against benefits

variable acting as a motivational factor having the mean value of 2.04 with the standard deviation of 0.83. It was also interesting to note that the non-monetary variables influenced more significantly than the

monetary variables and the respective overall mean value of these two groups of variables stood at 2.79 and 2.46, respectively, as revealed in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Overall Mean Value Difference Analysis: Actual Level

| <b>Actual Level</b>                          | <b>Mean</b> |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Above Average:</b>                        |             |
| 1 <b>Friendly co-workers</b>                 | 2.91        |
| 2 <b>Opportunity for power</b>               | 2.88        |
| 3 <b>Interesting and challenging job</b>     | 2.83        |
| 4 <b>Working environment</b>                 | 2.76        |
| 5 <b>Friendly management and supervision</b> | 2.57        |
| <b>Group Mean Value</b>                      | 2.79        |
| <b>Below Average:</b>                        |             |
| 6 <b>Job security</b>                        | 2.46        |
| 7 <b>Reward</b>                              | 2.07        |
| 8 <b>Promotion</b>                           | 2.06        |
| 9 <b>Payment</b>                             | 2.05        |
| 10 <b>Benefits</b>                           | 2.04        |
| <b>Group Mean Value</b>                      | 2.14        |
| <b>Overall Mean Value</b>                    | 2.46        |

**(ii) Expected Level of Motivation:**

Table 6 highlights the extent to which these ten variables should be reoriented to achieve the desired motivational level. The overall expected level was found to be 2.83

with the standard deviation of 0.45, both revealing a highly focused perception by the respondents. The expectation level found to be the highest regarding working environment, which had a mean value of 2.95 with the standard deviation of 0.29.



**Table 6.** Expected Level of Motivation

| (B) Expected Level                  | Frequency Distribution |            |             |              | Statistical Values |             | Rank |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|------|
|                                     | Disagree               | Neutral    | Agree       | Total        | Mean               | SD          |      |
| Working environment                 | 4<br>(2)               | 2<br>(1)   | 210<br>(97) | 216<br>(100) | 2.95               | 0.29        | 1    |
| Friendly co-workers                 | 2<br>(1)               | 10<br>(5)  | 204<br>(94) | 216<br>(100) | 2.94               | 0.28        | 2    |
| Opportunity for power               | 3<br>(1)               | 15<br>(7)  | 198<br>(92) | 216<br>(100) | 2.90               | 0.34        | 3    |
| Interesting and challenging job     | 5<br>(2)               | 14<br>(7)  | 197<br>(91) | 216<br>(100) | 2.89               | 0.38        | 4    |
| Reward                              | 8<br>(4)               | 14<br>(6)  | 194<br>(90) | 216<br>(100) | 2.86               | 0.44        | 5    |
| Promotion                           | 9<br>(4)               | 22<br>(10) | 185<br>(86) | 216<br>(100) | 2.81               | 0.49        | 6    |
| Benefits                            | 10<br>(5)              | 26<br>(12) | 180<br>(83) | 216<br>(100) | 2.79               | 0.51        | 7    |
| Friendly management and supervision | 11<br>(5)              | 26<br>(12) | 179<br>(83) | 216<br>(100) | 2.78               | 0.53        | 8    |
| Payment                             | 16<br>(7)              | 24<br>(11) | 176<br>(82) | 216<br>(100) | 2.74               | 0.58        | 9    |
| Joy Security                        | 24<br>(11)             | 30<br>(14) | 162<br>(75) | 216<br>(100) | 2.64               | 0.67        | 10   |
| Average                             |                        |            |             |              | <b>2.83</b>        | <b>0.45</b> |      |

Note: Figures in brackets indicate percentages

The lowest expectation found is job security, which had a mean value of 2.64 and the standard deviation of 0.67. The higher expectations found to be in working environment, which were followed by friendly co-workers, opportunity for power, interesting and challenging job and reward with the mean values of 2.94, 2.90, 2.89 and 2.86, respectively. It was also observed that the above variables had higher level of concentrated opinion as observed from

standard deviations. Further, Table 7 expected level of motivation from the viewpoint of average mean value with higher averages and lower averages. It was evident that the expectation from non-monetary variables and monetary variables stood at 2.91 and 2.75, respectively in comparison with the overall mean value of 2.83. In other words, more weight is given to non-monetary variables in leveraging the motivational level when compared to monetary variables.

**Table 7.** Overall Mean Value Difference Analysis: Expected Level

| Expected Level     |                                     | Mean        |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Above Average:     |                                     |             |
| 1                  | Working environment                 | 2.95        |
| 2                  | Friendly co-workers                 | 2.94        |
| 3                  | Opportunity for power               | 2.90        |
| 4                  | Interesting and challenging job     | 2.89        |
| 5                  | Reward                              | 2.86        |
| Group Mean Value   |                                     | <b>2.91</b> |
| Below Average:     |                                     |             |
| 6                  | Promotion                           | 2.81        |
| 7                  | Benefits                            | 2.79        |
| 8                  | Friendly management and Supervision | 2.78        |
| 9                  | Payment                             | 2.74        |
| 10                 | Job security                        | 2.64        |
| Group Mean Value   |                                     | <b>2.75</b> |
| Overall Mean Value |                                     | <b>2.83</b> |

**(iii) Motivational Gap:**

An extension of analysis of actual and expected motivational level has been the analysis of the gap between the above two. Table 8 presents the motivational gap between the actual and the expected levels. The overall gap between the actual and the expected levels stood at 0.37 from the viewpoint of mean value. In other words, the gap in motivational level stood at 15.04 percent from the actual level. From the viewpoint of gap in different variables, it is observed that the highest gap found to be in the reward with the value of 0.79, which was followed by the gaps of 0.75, 0.75 and

0.69, in cases of promotion, benefits and payment, respectively. Smaller gaps were found in cases of friendly management and supervision, working environment, job security, interesting and challenging job, friendly co-workers and opportunity for power with the respective gaps standing at 0.21, 0.19, 0.18, 0.06, 0.03 and 0.02. To conclude, the respondents expected more from the monetary factors. The expectation gaps from non-monetary factors were found to be low and it seemed that they were not very much fulfilled already to a substantial level or the respondents were not concerned very much.

**Table 8.** Motivational Gap

| Motivational Factors                | Mean Values   |                 | Gap<br>(A - B) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
|                                     | Actual<br>(A) | Expected<br>(B) |                |
| Friendly co-workers                 | 2.91          | 2.94            | -0.03          |
| Opportunity for power               | 2.88          | 2.90            | -0.02          |
| Interesting and challenging job     | 2.83          | 2.89            | -0.06          |
| Working environment                 | 2.76          | 2.95            | -0.19          |
| Friendly management and supervision | 2.57          | 2.78            | -0.21          |
| Job security                        | 2.46          | 2.64            | -0.18          |
| Reward                              | 2.07          | 2.86            | -0.79          |
| Promotion                           | 2.06          | 2.81            | -0.75          |
| Payment                             | 2.05          | 2.74            | -0.69          |
| Benefits                            | 2.04          | 2.79            | -0.75          |
| Average                             | <b>2.46</b>   | <b>2.83</b>     | <b>-0.37</b>   |

**(iv) Comparison With Maslow's Needs Priority**

Another dimension of the study is a comparison of needs priority developed by Maslow with the empirical results of the present study. Table 9 presents the comparative analysis of actual level and expected level of motivation in the background of Maslow's needs priority.

The motivational level found to be highly influenced by social needs having the mean value of 2.74 and the standard deviation of 0.50. This is followed by esteem needs, self-actualization needs, physiological needs and security needs. In other words, the security needs, physiological needs and self-actualization needs were found to be highly dissatisfied and they acted as

deterrent to motivation level. According to Maslow, the lower level needs comprising of physiological needs and security needs should be fulfilled first to achieve a higher level of motivation, but the empirical evidences suggested that these needs were not met adequately. Hence, the respondents were found to be dissatisfied.

Another component of comparison with Maslow's needs priority has been the

expected level of motivation variables. It is interesting to note that the higher level needs comprising of self-actualization needs and esteem needs continued to be prioritized by the respondents and the expected levels were found to be 2.94, 2.88 and 2.88 in terms of mean values and the inference is that the management should further improve on these higher needs to strengthen the motivation.

**Table 9.** Comparison With Maslow's Needs Priority

| <b>(A) Actual Level</b>             | <b>Mean</b> | <b>SD</b>   | <b>Rank</b> | <b>Maslow's Rating</b> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Social Needs                        |             |             |             |                        |
| Friendly management and supervision | 2.57        | 0.65        |             |                        |
| Friendly co-workers                 | 2.91        | 0.35        |             |                        |
| Overall                             | <b>2.74</b> | <b>0.50</b> | 1           | 3                      |
| Esteem Needs                        |             |             |             |                        |
| Reward                              | 2.07        | 0.86        |             |                        |
| Opportunity for power               | 2.88        | 0.38        |             |                        |
| Overall                             | <b>2.48</b> | <b>0.62</b> | 2           | 4                      |
| Self-Actualization Needs            |             |             |             |                        |
| Interesting and challenging job     | 2.83        | 0.48        |             |                        |
| Promotion                           | 2.06        | 0.82        |             |                        |
| Overall                             | <b>2.45</b> | <b>0.65</b> | 3           | 5                      |
| Physiological Needs                 |             |             |             |                        |
| Payment                             | 2.05        | 0.83        |             |                        |
| <b>(A) Actual Level</b>             | <b>Mean</b> | <b>SD</b>   | <b>Rank</b> | <b>Maslow's Rating</b> |
| Working environment                 | 2.76        | 0.56        |             |                        |
| Overall                             | <b>2.41</b> | <b>0.70</b> | 4           | 1                      |
| Security Needs                      |             |             |             |                        |
| Job Security                        | 2.46        | 0.76        |             |                        |
| Benefits                            | 2.04        | 0.83        |             |                        |
| Overall                             | <b>2.25</b> | <b>0.80</b> | 5           | 2                      |

| (B) Expected Level                  |             |             |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---|---|
| Self-Actualization Needs            |             |             |   |   |
| Interesting and challenging job     | 2.94        | 0.26        |   |   |
| Promotion                           | 2.93        | 0.26        |   |   |
| Overall                             | <b>2.94</b> | <b>0.26</b> | 1 | 5 |
| Social Needs                        |             |             |   |   |
| Friendly management and supervision | 2.75        | 0.59        |   |   |
| Friendly co-workers                 | 3.00        | 0.00        |   |   |
| Overall                             | <b>2.88</b> | <b>0.30</b> | 2 | 3 |
| Esteem Needs                        |             |             |   |   |
| Reward                              | 2.86        | 0.45        |   |   |
| Opportunity for power               | 2.90        | 0.31        |   |   |
| Overall                             | <b>2.88</b> | <b>0.38</b> | 3 | 4 |
| Physiological Needs                 |             |             |   |   |
| Payment                             | 2.79        | 0.57        |   |   |
| Working environment                 | 2.95        | 0.38        |   |   |
| Overall                             | <b>2.87</b> | <b>0.48</b> | 4 | 1 |
| Security Needs                      |             |             |   |   |
| Job Security                        | 2.89        | 0.31        |   |   |
| Benefits                            | 2.68        | 0.61        |   |   |
| Overall                             | <b>2.79</b> | <b>0.46</b> | 5 | 2 |

The expectation on social needs ranked third and the mean value stood at 2.88. It was also observed that the physiological needs and security needs were ranked fourth and fifth as against Maslow's hierarchical presentation of these, two lower needs in terms of first and second. From the viewpoint of individual variables, the charts clearly indicated that most of the Maslow's lower level needs turned out to be higher level needs for the respondents and the higher level needs of Maslow's were recognized as lower level needs. This reversal of the Maslow's needs hierarchy was also found in case of expectation level

for each variable. Continuing the above interpretation with reference to group needs, it was further evidenced that the lower level needs and higher level needs of Maslow's needs hierarchy, the higher level needs group became the lower level needs group and vice versa. The reason for this reversal of the prioritization may be found in geographical reasons based on interviews with the respondents and experts in the field.

### Conclusion

The results of this study showed that the overall mean value of motivation stood at 2.46, which indicates the higher level of motivation achieved.

The highest level of expectation was from working environment and the mean value stood at 2.95 against the lowest expectation from job security, having the mean value of 2.64. The expectation levels found to be low in case of payment, friendly management and supervision, benefits and promotion and their respective mean values stood at 2.64, 2.74, 2.78 and 2.79. The higher expectations found in non-monetary needs than in monetary needs with the exception of friendly management and supervision and the respective group mean values stood at 2.91 and 2.75. In other words, the respondents did not expect much from most of the monetary needs, even though they were dissatisfied with these monetary needs.

The overall gap between expected and actual levels of motivation stood at 0.37. The highest gap was found in case of reward with the gap of 0.79, which was followed by benefits, promotion and payment with the respective mean value gaps standing at 0.75, 0.75 and 0.69. The higher gaps were found more in case of monetary factors with 0.75 than in case of non-monetary factors with 0.12. When rating was applied in the context of Maslow's needs priority, the highest level of motivation was found to be in social needs with the mean value of 2.74 and the self-actualization needs found to have the highest expectation having the mean value

of 2.94. In summary, the results of this study showed some motivational weakness in internal audit departments in Iran. The authors believe that from any aspects, internal audit departments should satisfy different motivation of managers. Furthermore, chief executive managers should seriously follow the motivation of this department.

### References

- [1] Allan, John (2001). *How to be Better at Motivating People*, New Delhi: Kogan Page India Private Limited, P.15.
- [2] Aronoff, C., (1975). *The Rise of the Behavioral Perspective in Selected General Management Textbooks: An Empirical Investigation through Content Analysis*, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 4, PP. 657-693.
- [3] Bedeian, A.G. (1993). *Management*, Third Edition, New York: Dryden Press.
- [4] Berelson, B., Steiner, G.A (1964). *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings*, New York: Harcourt Brace and World, P. 240.
- [5] Brink, V.Z., Cashin J.A. (1958), *Internal Auditing* (New York: Ronald Press).
- [6] Brown, D. and Mendenhall, S. (1995), *Stress and Components of the Internal Auditor's job*, *Internal Auditing*, Vol. 10, Winter, PP. 31-39.

- [7] Brown, Richard A., (1905). History of Accounting and Accountant (Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, 1905).
- [8] Buford, J.A., Jr., Bedeian A.G., Lindner J.R. (1995). Management in Extension, Third Edition, Ohio: Ohio State University Extension.
- [9] Carey, J.L., (1969). The Rise of the Accounting Profession: From Technician to Professional (New York: American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.
- [10] Chandan, J.S., (1997). Management: Concepts and Strategies, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.,P.326.
- [11] Cofer, C.N., Appley M.H. (1964). Motivation Theory and Practice, New York: John Wiley,P.1.
- [12] Cummings, L.L., Elsalmi A.M. (1968). Empirical Research on the Bosses and Correlates of Managerial Motivation: A Review of Literature, Psychological Bulletin, Vol.70, No.2,PP.127-144.
- [13] Ghosh, P.K., Ghorpade M.B. (1997). Industrial Psychology, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House,P.279.
- [14] Goleman, Daniel., (1998). What Makes a Leader?, Harvard Business Review, Nov. – Dec.,PP. 92-102.
- [15] Gray, J.L., Starke F.A. (1988). Organizational Behavior: Concepts and Applications, Columbus: Merrill Publishing Co.,P.104.
- [16] Higgins, J.M., (1994). The Management Challenge, Second Edition, New York: Macmillan.
- [17] Hodge, B.J., Johnson, H.J. (1970). Management and Organizational Behavior, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,P.195.
- [18] Hodgetts, R.M., (1977). Introduction to Business, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company,P.168.
- [19] Institute of Manpower Studies (1988). What Makes a Manager?, New York: Institute of Manpower Studies, Quoted in Adair, John., (1996). Effective Motivation: How to Get Extraordinary Results from Everyone, New Delhi: Rupa and Co.,PP. 9-11.
- [20] Jones, M.R., (1955). Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- [21] Klatt, Lawrence A., (1978). Human Resources Management: A Behavioral Systems Approach, Illinois: Richard D Irwin, P. 30.
- [22] Kreitner, R., (1995). Management, Sixth Edition, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- [23] Lillis, J.C., (1958). Motivation: What Makes Sammy Run?, Advanced Management Journal,PP.5-8.
- [24] Luthans, Fred., (1989). Organizational Behavior, Second Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill,P.231.

- [25] Mautz, R.K., (1964). *Fundamentals of Auditing*, 2nd Ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.).
- [26] Michael, V.P., (2001). *Human Resources Management and Human Relations*, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House, pp. 17-21.
- [27] Miller, Donald S., Stephen E.C., Carlson, J.B (1996). *Fundamentals of Management*, Cincinnati: South Western Publishing Company.
- [28] Moorhead and Griffin (1999). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organization*, Fifth Edition, Delhi: AITBS Publishers and Distributors, P. 119.
- [29] Moorhead, Gregory., Griffin, R.W (1999). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*, Fifth Edition, Delhi: AITBS Publishers and Distributors,P.119.
- [30] O'Reilly, V.M., McDonnell P., Winograd B.N., Gerson J.S., Jaenicke H.R. (1998). *Montgomery's Auditing*, 12th Ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons).
- [31] Pestonjee, D.M., Basu, G (1972). *A Study of Job Motivation of Indian Executives*, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 8, No. 1,PP. 3-16.
- [32] Putti, Joseph M., (1981). *The Essence of Management*, New Delhi: National Publishers,P. 186.
- [33] Ratliff, R.L., Reding K.F. (20012). *Introduction to Auditing: Logic, Principles, and Techniques* (Altamonte Springs, FL: The Institute of Internal Auditors).
- [34] Reeve, John T., (1986). *Internal Auditing*, PP. 8-1 to 8-39. In Cashin, J.A., Neuwirth, P.D., and Levy, J.F. (eds.), *Cashin's Handbook for Auditors*, 2nd Ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall).
- [35] Salehi, Mahdi (2008). *Evolution of Accounting and Auditors in Iran*, Journal of Audit Practice, Vol. 5, No. 4,PP. 57-74.
- [36] Sears, B.P. (1992). *Travel Trauma*, Internal Auditor, Vol. 49, June, PP. 53-8.
- [37] Stanley, Vance., (1959). *Industrial Administration*, P.159.
- [38] Steers, R.M., Porter L.W. (1991). *Motivation and Work Behavior*, Fifth Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, pp.5-6.
- [39] Viteles, M.S., (1953). *Motivation and Morale in Industry*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, p.73.
- [40] Walsh, Jr., F.J., (1963). *Internal Auditing: Business Policy Study No. 111* (New York: National Industrial Conference Board).
- [41] Weaver, T., (1988). *Motivating with Money: Cornell Hotel & Restaurant, Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 29,PP. 40-45.
- [42] Whittington, O.R., Pany, K. (1998). *Principles of Auditing*, 12th Ed. (Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw Hill).



## بررسی سلسله نیازهای مازلو در بین حسابرسان ایرانی

مهدی صالحی<sup>۱</sup>، محمود موسوی شیری<sup>۲</sup>

تاریخ پذیرش: ۹۱/۱/۲۶

تاریخ دریافت: ۹۰/۷/۱۲

حسابرسان نقش مهمی در هر شرکت ایفا می کنند. مدیران این بخش ها برای به دست آوردن نتایج بهتر باید زیرمجموعه ها را به خوبی مدیریت کنند. برای تحقق چنین شرایطی ابتدا بایستی انگیزه های مدیران در نظر گرفته شده تا نه تنها آنها را راضی کند بلکه عملکرد زیر مجموعه های آنان را نیز در شرایط کاملی قرار دهد. نتایج این تحقیق نشانگر آنست که هر گاه انگیزه مدیران این بخش ها بالا بوده تاثیر بسزایی بر عملکرد بخش داشته است. علاوه بر این، نتایج حاصل از این مطالعه حاکی از وجود ضعف های انگیزشی در بخش های حسابرسی داخلی در ایران است. نویسندگان معتقدند که انگیزه های گوناگون بخش های حسابرسی داخلی باید از هر جهت ارضا شود.

واژگان کلیدی: حسابرسان داخلی، انگیزش، ایران.

---

۱. استادیار، حسابداری دانشگاه فردوسی مشهد.

۲. استادیار، حسابداری دانشگاه پیام نور.