#432

Faculty Working Papers

MOTIVATION-NEED THEORIES AND CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

W. Fred van Raaij and Kassaye Wandwossen

#432

College of Commerce and Business Administration
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

FACULTY WORKING PAPERS

College of Commerce and Business Administration

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

September 5, 1977

MOTIVATION-NEED THEORIES AND CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

W. Fred van Raaij and Kassaye Wandwossen

#432

MOTIVATION-NEED THEORIES AND CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

W. Fred van Raaij *
Kassaye Wandwossen
University of Illinois
146 Commerce West
Urbana, IL 61801
(217) 333-4573

May, 1977

ABSTRACT

This paper is an effort to integrate the relevant findings in other disciplines (organizational behavior, especially) with the knowledge in consumer behavior and to suggest a working framework for future research. First, we review and evaluate the theoretical framework and empirical findings of the various need-motivation theories. Then, the applicability of such theories to consummer behavior is assessed, thereby suggesting a different way of looking at motivation, and where possible, presenting models that will lend themselves to practical applications.

In our opinion, motivational models are highly relevant for the generic choice process, while multi-attribute attitude models are relevant for the specific choice process. A motivational model for the generic choice is proposed, with the notion that consumer behavior in its various ramifications (i.e., from the consumer, economist, social marketer, etc., perspectives) can be better understood from the analysis of generic choices.

MOTIVATION-NEED THEORIES AND CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

Introduction

Motivation-need theories have been instrumental in the development of comprehensive models of consumer behavior, especially the models of Engel, Kollat and Blackwell (1968), and Howard and Sheth (1969). Recently, applications of motivation theories in consumer research are proposed by Burnkrant (1976) and Fennel (1975). Further, Rosenberg's (1956) attitude model employs the concept of "perceived instrumentality," the instrumentality of the attitude object in attaining a desired goal. Attitudes, in this sense, motivate behavior, elicit arousal, and give direction to behavior, and thus are part of motivation theory. In general, however, motivation theory and its recent developments have not found much application in consumer research, while consumer needs, desires, and wants are the core in the marketing concept. Surprisingly, Maslow's need hierarchy model has gained some popularity, despite the overwhelming evidence refuting the existence of such hierarchies (Atkinson, 1964; Wahba and Bridwell, 1976).

This paper is an effort to integrate the relevant findings in other disciplines (organizational behavior, especially) with the knowledge in consumer behavior and to suggest a working framework for future research. First, we review and evaluate the theoretical framework and empirical findings of the various need-motivation theories (e.g., Maslow, 1943, 1965, 1970; Blau, 1964; Clark, 1960; Hall and Nougaim, 1968; Alderfer, 1969, 1972; Berkowitz, 1969; Herzberg, 1966; Korman, 1974; Lawler, 1971). Second, we assess the applicability of such theories to consumer behavior, thereby suggesting a different way of looking at motivation, and where possible, presenting models that will lend themselves to practical applications.

Instincts and Needs

In the mainstream of Darwinian evolutionary theory, certain behavioral

tendencies are innately built into organisms for survival of the indivdual and thus the species. William James (1890) and William McDougall (1923) made lists of instincts that were seen as mainsprings of all kinds of behaviors, simple and complex. Later, Murry (1937) made another classification of human needs. Murray, however, distinguished a directional aspect and an arousal component that actually kicks the behavior off and that can be motivated in a number of ways. Needs, in Murray's concepts, are hypothetical constructs directing behavior toward certain goals, or end states. Classifications of needs, as provided by McDougall or Murray look similar to classifications of elements in chemistry, but lack their strictly defined structure and usefulness. A structural principle is needed to explain the dynamic interactions of needs and their fulfillments.

Maslow's Need Hierarchy

Abraham Maslow (1965) postulates that needs are hierarchically structured and that needs low in the hierarchy must be fulfilled before need higher in the hierarchy become salient. Interrelationships between needs are specified, which are missing in McDougall's and Murray's systems. According to Maslow, the physiological needs (e.g., hunger, thirst) come first, followed by security needs, social needs (affiliation), self-esteem needs (recognition), and finally self-actualization needs. Recently, the need to know and to understand, and aesthetic needs are added to the list (Maslow, 1970). The need to know and to understand is comparable to Berlyne's (1963) epistemic behavior.

Maslow's basic needs (Maslow, 1943, 1965, 1970) are thought to be structured in such a way that the satisfaction or gratification of the lower-order needs leads to the activation of the next higher-order need in the hierarchy. This is the gratification/activation principle. The other principle is the deprivation/domination principle, which states that the most deficient need is the most important need. A distinction is sometimes made

between deficiency and growth needs. Needs for belongingness, love, and self-actualization are referred to as growth needs; the others are deficiency needs. To achieve growth needs, deficiency needs must first be satisfied. This may be compared with Herzberg's(1966) hygienic and motivating factors in his job satisfaction theory. A deficiency in the hygienic factors creates dissatisfaction, while fulfillment of these factors does not create satisfaction. The motivating factors, when fulfilled, give rise to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction, and probably also consumer satisfaction, is not measureable on a simple bipolar scale but consists of two more or less independent (sets of) factors. In consumer research, we may distinguish between necessary product attributes (hygienic factors) and motivating product attributes. Absence of necessary attributes gives rise to dissatisfaction, while the presence of motivating attributes leads to satisfaction.

Evaluation of Maslow's Need Hierarchy

Despite its vagueness and lack of adequate empirical support (Wahba and Bridwell, 1976), Maslow's need hierarchy has influenced the work of numerous psychologists (Argyris, 1964; Clark, 1960; Dichter, 1964; Leavitt, 1964; McGregor, 1960; Schein, 1965). Nonetheless, the findings remain largely controversial; and an evaluation of inter-disciplinary approaches is rare (Jacoby, 1976). A number of factors seem to have favored the appeal of Maslow's need hierarchy, while the lack of foresight among researchers and the absence of standardized measurement techniques seem to have forestalled the comprehensive evaluation of the interdisciplinary approaches.

1. Maslow's approach is a theory of motivation, in that it links basic needs/motives to general behavior (Wahba and Bridwell, 1976). In other words, the basic needs/motives are linked to behavior through a theory of motivation which asserts that (i) deprivation is followed by gratification;

(ii) less potent needs emerge upon the gratification of the more preponderant ones (Maslow, 1970); (iii) and it is a dynamic process where deprivation is hypothesized to lead to domination, which leads to gratification that culminates in the activation of the next higher order need in the echelon.

2. At times, the findings have been used to support two apparently contradictory hypotheses. For instance, Maslow (1965) postulated that (i) gratification of the self-actualization need results in an increase of its importance rather that a decrease, and also that (ii) a long-time deprivation of a need may create a fixation for that need. Maslow noted the exception to his model; that, it is possible for higher-order needs to emerge not after gratification of the next-lower need, but after long-time deprivation (Maslow, 1970). The state of affairs remains that Maslow's need hierarchy, and his propositions regarding gratification and activation, especially in the self-actualization stage, remain controversial. His need hierarchy is by no means definitive, and is rather out of focus in comparison with the role of learning, perception, values, and expectations in human behavior (Atkinson, 1964).

Alderfer (1972) points out that satisfaction with regard to some environmental and job characteristics are studied rather than satisfaction with the postulated needs. Maslow initially postulated that high satisfaction or dissatisfaction is given high ranked importance (Maslow, 1965). Contrary to what is postulated by Maslow, high job satisfaction rather than deprivation is correlated with importance (Dachler and Hulin, 1969). In another study, again, contrary to what Maslow hypothesized, Mobley and Locke (1970) concluded that extreme satisfaction and dissatisfaction depend on the importance attached to them, and not importance determining satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Some support has been found for Maslow's (1965) deficiency and growth needs in studies that compared executives and workers in an organization. In these studies higher-order (growth, actualizing) needs are judged to be more important for top executives than for underprivileged workers (Davis, 1946; Pellegrin and Coates, 1957). In a deprived environment lower-order (existence, hygienic) needs seem to be more important than higher-order needs (Cofer and Appley, 1964; Porter, 1961, 1962; Porter and Mitchell, 1967). By implication, the rating of importance of job satisfaction seems to be positively related to the level of the job one holds (Porter, 1961; Porter and Mitchell, 1967) or "that the deprivation domination principle may only be operative in the case of the deprivation of the lower-order needs, especially physiological needs" (Wahba and Bridwell, 1976, p. 231).

Notwithstanding the above conclusions, the concept of deprivation/domination seems to have little or no effect on the behavior of consumers in relatively affluent societies for a number of reasons. (1) The daily purchases are mostly over and above what is (basically) needed. (2) Until the time that the law of diminishing returns sets in or depleting raw material resources make "abundant" consumption difficult, there is a "need" to buy and possess more. Instead, consumption is influenced by relative deprivation compared with "relevant other consumers". This relative deprivation may trigger the dominance of the desire "to keep up" with the reference group.

Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

Consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction studies will benefit from the two-factor need theories (Maslow, 1965; Alderfer, 1969; Herzberg, 1966). Brands possess tow types of attributes. The first type of attributes (inhibitors) give rise to dissatisfaction, if their level is below a certain threshold. A

car that is insufficiently safe causes dissatisfaction, while no satisfaction is derived from a car that is sufficiently safe. The second type of attributes (facilitators) give rise to satisfaction, if their level is above a certain threshold. Similar to the deprivation/domination principle, the presence of inhibitors causes dissatisfaction and (extending the above principle) this dissatisfaction cannot be cempensated by facilitators. If no inhibiotors are present, a "zero point" has been reached. Consumer satisfaction can only be obtained through the absence of ihibitors and the presence of facilitators.

The distinction between ihibitors and facilitators has its analogy in consumer decision making. In terms of decision rules, the first type of attributes (inhibitors) elicit the conjunctive decision rule to eliminate brands with inhibiting (below threshold) values on certain attributes. The second type of attributes (facilitators) elicit the disjunctive decision rule to select brands with facilitating (above threshold) values on other attributes. The conjunctive rules must occur before the disjunctive rule.

Jacoby(1976) emphasizes the applicability of Herzberg's (1966) two-factor model for the study of consumer satisfaction, which may be compared to a simple choice heuristic: the sequence of conjunctive and disjunctive information processing (van Raaij, 1977, p. 23-26). Some problems exist, however, in applying Herzberg's (1966) two-factor model in consumer satisfaction research:

1. In the decision process the consumer will avoid brands that give rise to dissatisfaction through the application of the conjunctive decision rule. Dissatisfaction may only occur after an incorrect application of the conjunctive rule, or after using incomplete or deceptive information.

2. As Jacoby (1976) points out, Herzberg's propositions as well as the findings cited before are involved with the determinants of satisfaction/dissatis-

faction and not with performance. Therefore, they cannot be directly extended to a purchase situation that involves a combiantion of dichotomies involving purchase behavior-satisfaction and purchase behavior-dissatisfaction. As a solution, he proposes another behavior-satisfaction dimension orthogonal to the facilitator-inhibitor dimension (Jacoby, 1971).

Motivation Models

Cognitive motivation models fall into three broad categories: equity, need achievement and expectancy-value models (see Table 1). The communality of the models is that the units of framework we present are of cognitive, subjective nature, and that they include hypothetical constructs as perceived equity, need achievement, expectation, and values. A similar, but shorter, review of the three catgories is given in van Raaij (1976).

Equity

The concept of equity may be explicitly stated as the even exchange of values such that what is received is presumed to be equal to what is given (Adams, 1965). Equity operates within a range, with a lower and upper limit. Inputs ("what is given") are difined as "what a person perceives as his contributions to the exhange for which he expects a just return" (Walster and Walster, 1975). Apparently, equity theory may be applied to social relations such as management-worker and seller-buyer. Further, the concept of power seems to be related to perceived and subjective equity.

It is our hypothesis that the ranges of equity (upper and lower limits) may well be measured by the expectancy-value type of model (Table 1) for two reasons: (1) The expectancy component of the model is general, comprehensive and brand specific. (2) The expectancy component handles expectations about equity as compared with "relevant others." We return later to the discussion of how consumer behavior is motivated by perceived inequity or a disparity between the desired and actual state. The application of the equity

---

Table 1 about here

---

concept of consumer behavior may be restricted to some aspects of consumption. Such equity-based motivational forces include sensitivity of consumers toward primarily price, time and effort expended (e.g., Gabor and Granger, 1966). However, it has to be pointed out that (1) it is not a priori known how equity is created and what its upper and lower limits are; (2) promotional activities make the equity relation relative and situation-affected, depending on whether the purchase has been prompted by a deal or not, for instance; (3) consumers tend to "satisfice" (March and Simon, 1958), and do not necessarily maximize as implied in the equity concept (e.g., Pritchard, 1969).

To summarize, equity is useful in two ways for consumer research. First, the inequity of the seller-buyer relation may give rise to consumer dissatisfaction and the motivation to restore equity. Armstrong (1976) provides some examples of the restoration of equity between consumers and marketers. As with Herzberg's (1966) two-factor model, an equitable relation as perceived by the consumer prevents the elicitation of dissatisfaction. On the other hand, and equitable relation is a necessary but not a sufficient prerequisite for consumer satisfaction. Second, the equity relations holds for the consumer with regard to "relevant others" (reference groups). Here, an inequitable relation motivates the consumer to restore equity, that means he is motivated to bring his consumption level and pattern into agreement with that of his reference group. Generally, this results in an increase in consumption expenditures, as aspirations and expectations become higher (e.g., Duessenberry's (1949) "relative income hypothesis" and Katona, Strumpel and Zahn's (1971) "rising aspirations and affluence").

Need Achievement

The concept of need achievement (McClelland, 1961) is basically another variation of the expectancy-value approach. Need achievement resembles Maslow's (1970) self-actualization motive in a number of ways. The main

Table 1. Motivation Models.

Type	Formulae	Explanation
1. Equity-expectancy		
a. job performance: (Vroom, 1964)	$MF = E \times V$	MF = Motivational force E = Expectancy force of achieving desired outcome V = Value of desired outcome
b. attitude:	$A_o = PI \times VI$	A_o = Attitude PI = Perceived instrumentality VI = Value importance
2. Need-achievement:	$T_s = M_s \times P_s \times I_s$ $T_f = M_f \times P_f \times I_f$ $I_f + P_s = 0$ and $P_s + P_f = 1$ and $P_s + I_s = 1$ $T_a = T_s - T_f$ $T_a = (M_s - M_f)[P_s - P_s^2]$	T_s = Strength of motivation to achieve success T_f = Strength of motivation to avoid failure M_s = Motive or need to achieve success M_f = Motive or need to avoid failure I_s = Incentive value of success I_f = Incentive value of failure P_s = Probability P_f = Probability

difference, however, is that it includes the probability of attaining a goal and a probability of failure. The need achievement model (Table 1) attributes the strength of motivation to the cognitive expectation that the action will result in the consequence. Stated somewhat differently, the tendency to engage in an activity is determined by the desired goal of the action. Therefore, the outcome or consequence has attraction or value to the individual. Assuming that $I_f = -P_s = 1$ (a particular outcome is either a success or a failure). As indicated in Table 1, the summation of T_s and T_f provides the tendency or motive to achieve (T_a), which may be derived from the given algebraic relationship: $T_a = (M_s - M_f)\ (P_s - P_s^2)$.

The need achievement concept is only applicable in cases where the consumer perceives some risk of failure. Two ways exist to increase the tendency to achieve (T_a): (1) Increase the "approach" tendency (T_s) by making the product more attractive, and (2) decrease the "avoidance" tendency (T_f) by reducing perceived risk (see Roselius, 1971 for possible risk relievers). Again, a congruence with Herzberg's two-factor model can be observed. The avodiance tendency (T_f) may be related to some unsatisfactory product attributes (inhibitors) and the approach tendency (T_s) may be related to other, satisfactory product attributes (facilitators). The only difference is that in the approach-avodiance paradigm unsatisfactory attributes can be compensated by satisfactory attributes. As Schewe (1973) points out, "The greatest problem appears to be determining a valid and reliable measure of the need achievement construct" (Schewe, 1973, p. 33). In addition, achievement needs are not operating in all purchase situations. P_s and I_s may have low levels and, hence, result in low levels of the strength of the motive to achieve success (T_s). He concludes that further research is necessary to find its true potential as a determinant of consumer behavior (Schewe, 1973).

Finally, contrary to the postulate of need achievement, motives are not

stable behavioral dispositions, though they may well be partly learned. Also, it must be emphasized that it is not necessary for motives in general to operate after they are aroused by the presence of the incentives or situational cues that have been associated with the incentive (see Campbell and Pritchard, 1976, pp. 112-14).

Expectancy-Value Models

The basis for expectancy models has been made by Tolman (1932) and Lewin (1938). It seems to be influenced more by Lewin's field theory in that it involves the perceptual analysis of (1) alternatives with their (2) desireabilities and (3) expectancies, and their (4) outcomes in the immediate psychological field.

Many psychological theories come under the label of expectancy-value models: subjective expected utility theory (Edwards, 1954), social learning theory (Rotter, 1954), motivation theory (Atkinson, 1964), and attitude theories (e.g., Rosenberg, 1956; Fishbein, 1967). An overview of these theories can be found in van Raaij (1977).

Expectancy theory states that the desire or motive to engage in a certain behavior is a composite of the expected outcome of that behavior and the value or evaluation of that behavior. As can be seen from Table 1 the motivational force to engage in a particular behavior, as applied in organizational psychology, is a function of the four factors stated above (Vroom, 1964; Graen, 1969; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick, 1970). However, it needs to be pointed out that the expectancy concept is not without questions. We will try to find answers to these questions before we apply this concept to consumer motivation.

First, the extension of the concept of "evoked set" (Howard and Sheth, 1969) seems to provide an answer to the question of how many alternatives, as well as type of alternatives are considered by the individual. Second,

the desireability or attractiveness of the alternatives is a function of the probability that the alternative possesses a certain attribute times the evaluation of that attribute on a bipolar favorable-unfavorable scale. Third, Jacoby (1976) emphasizes not to overlook that the desired outcomes of a behavior are influenced by "motivational inputs." A distinction is made between input and output. "Outputs or outcomes refer to the primary functional aspects of the alternatives in the product set; they are the basic purpose for buying and using the product. Inputs, on the other hand, are those motivational forces other than perceived functional consequences which influence the selection of one specific behavioral alternative over the other available alternatives" (Jacoby, 1976, p. 1049).

If the functional goal of the purchase of a car is its service and economy, say, as opposed to status or a combination of all these, then these consequences constitute the desired outcomes. The inputs such as advertising, availablility of deals, past satisfaction with the product, referred to as "antecedents" (Jacoby, 1976), may induce the consideration of one brand over another. Jacoby suggests the partitioning of the evaluation component into input (or antecedent) and output (or consequent) "values." Unfortunately, this is only at the brand level, and even at that level, it fails to resolve a number of questions raised earlier. Although Jacoby's revision make the traditional models more comprehensive and richer in their construct composition, some drawbacks have to be mentioned: (1) It fails to answer how and why an individual becomes motivated to consider certain outcomes or consequences. (2) It ignores the interdependency between product and brand, that is, the desire to consider a product class and then to engage in brand(s) selection. (3) It fails to note that some repetitive buying behavior is influenced by simple S-R relationships, or may even be stochastic, making motivational

models too elaborate or irrelevant for this kind of buying behavior.

Our interest in motivational models of consumer behavior is mainly at the product class level (generic choice) but has also implications for the brand level (specific choice).

Motivational Model for Product Choice

We think that motivational models are especially useful for the generic choice (among product classes) and less useful for the specific choice (within product classes). For the latter case, multi-attribute attitude and preference models may hold better predictions for brand choice within the product class. In most cases, the generic choice is more important and critical for the consumer; however, this seems to be a neglected area of research in marketing. We think that the generic choice, whether to buy a car or to go on a vacation, for example, has more relevance for general economic policy, consumer education, and also for marketing mix decisions. Between the generic and specific choice, a "modal choice" or method choice can be distinguished in many cases (see, for instance, Sheth (1975) for travel mode selection).

Figure 1 gives the sequence of the three choice levels as they occur in consumer decision making regarding travel. The product choice is the first

Figure 1. Sequence of Choices in Consumer Decision Making

A. generic choice (travel vs. other product classes)
↓
B. modal choice (airline vs. train)
↓
C. specific choice (American vs. United)

to be made. Subsequently, a selection of a modal or method within the product class is made. Then, within the modal, the consumer selects a specific brand.

Sheth (1975) distinguishes five utility needs. These utility needs can be seen as the basic needs that products satisfy. In the generic choice process, consumers compare the product classes on their ability to satisfy the basic needs. We may also conceive these utility needs as the basic dimensions

of motivation. In all cases, consumers want to reach certain goal states and the products are instrumental in reaching the goals.

The five motivational dimensions are (Sheth, 1975): (1) Functional motives, (2) aesthetic-emotional motives, (3) social motives, (4) situational motives, and (5) curiosity motives.

1. Functional motives are related to the technical functions the product performs. The combination of product attributes forms the total functional utility of a product.

2. Aesthetic-emotional motives are the style, design, luxury, and comfort of a product (class). These motives are not only important for the specific (brand) choice but also for the generic (product) choice. The product class is evaluated in terms of the fundamental values of the consumer in the emotive areas of fear, social concern, respect for quality of life, appreciation of fine arts, religion, and other emotional feelings. Thus, it may be contended that individuals tend to select those product classes that match with their life styles and enable them to express their fundamental values.

3. Social motives are related to the impact that consumption makes on relevant others. Status, prestige, and esteem may be derived from the possession and usage of products and their conspicuous features. Some products are selected for their conspicuousness only ("conversation pieces"), sometimes in combination with aesthetic motives.

4. Situational motives are not motives in the sense of long-term desires to reach a certain goal. The selection of a product may be triggered by situational determinants such as availability, price discount, and/or accessability. These situational factors apply usually for a specific brand or type. The brand choice is usually made in these cases without a careful evaluation of the product class(es).

5. Curiosity motives are motives that are supposed to prompt trials of new and/or innovative products. The consumer may try a new product; however, his repeat-purchase may be independent of such trials.

Choice Modal Prediction

It has to be emphasized that the motivational model suggested here is mainly applicable to consumers' product choices, involving large financial outlays or high perceived social and/or physical risk. Repetitive brand or product choice triggered by depletion of stock is not relevantly described and predicted by our motivational model. Further, note that within each of the five motivational dimensions subclasses exist for different product classes. For example, the generic choice between a refrigerator and a TV set involves different functional utilities -cooling food versus entertainment/information, respectively. In the generic choice process, the consumer essentially compares products on a different set of dimensions for each product, while in the specific choice process the same set of dimensions apply for all brands within the product class. The consumer necessarily, unlike in the specific choice situation, has to "compute" an overall utility for each product class to see whether it satisfies a number of motives, and then compare these overall utilities to make a final choice. To depict these relationships, we suggest a straightforward multi-attribute model. In this model (eq. 1), overall preference or total utility a product class satisfies and the evaluation of these motives may be written as,

$$U_j = \sum_{i=1}^{m} M_{ij} \times V_i \quad \ldots\ldots \qquad (1).$$

U_j is the utility of product class j that satisfies m motives (M_{ij}), and V_i is the evaluation of the m motives on a favorable-unfavorable scale. M_{ij} can be thought of as a vector of probabilities that the product class j satisfies a specific motive i. These probabilities are strictly zero or above zero, and therefore, only positive. This composite measure, U_j, is expected to cover the five dimensions outlined above. Thus the behavior or behavioral intention (BI) of the consumer equals the maximum of U_j (j=1, ..,

m) if m product classes are considered.

$$B = BI = \max U_j \ (j=1, \ldots, m) \ldots \qquad (2).$$

Usually, the number of product classes is smaller than the number of brands in the specific choice situation.

Individual consumers differ not only in their evaluation of motivational dimensions (V_i), but also in the saliency of these dimensions over time. Recent gratification of a motivational dimension may lead to a decrease in the evaluation of that motivational dimension. This is especially true for the functional, social, and curiosity motives. Lack of gratification of a motivational dimension increases the evaluation of that motive (the deprivation/domination principle).

Basically, motives are "means-end beliefs" (Tolman, 1932). That is, there is cognitive association between a specific product class or the buying of a certain product from a set of product classes, and the expectation that the product contributes to the attainment of a goal or the satisfaction of a motivational dimension. This expectation is thought to be a subjective probability. Parenthetically, the strength of motives or motivational dimensions is largely determined by cultural and life history factors. Further, motives become salient if a disparity exists between a desired goal state and the actual state on a motvational dimension. A desired state is triggered in the comparison of one's own position and the position of "relevant others" on the various functional as well as non-functional utility dimension(s). Equity theory (Adams, 1965) predicts that differences in the input/output ratio bring about a change in the desired goal state. Need-achievement theory (McClelland, 1961) attributes the strength of motivation to the cognitive expectation that the action will result in the consequence. The origin of motivation is external in equity theory (reference groups) and internal in need-achievement theory. We assume that an intermediate dispar-

ity between desired and actual state of the individual has the strongest effect on motivation. For a small disparity an assimilation effect is thought to occur; the disparity is rationalized away. For a large disparity, a contrast effect is more likely; the disparity is too great to be bridged by the acquisition of a product. The desired goal state is perceived as unattainable in this case. This curvilinear relationship between motive strength and disparity may be effectively compared with Berlyne's (1963) exploratory behavior theory and the level of arousal potential.

Operationalization

The elicitation of the motivational dimensions can be done in two subsequent pilot surveys constituting depth interviews and other non-attributive methods. In the depth interview method no particular forms and orders of motives should be established; instead, motives should be elicited with the help of probing questions, incomplete sentences and the Kelly grid method. Such elicited motives constitute a listing of the relevant needs or motives applicable to a specific situation. In non-attributive method the researcher has to start with a listing of these possible motives and request the consumer to indicate the ones he considers salient.

Summary

Motivation-need theories are reviewed, their implications to consumer behavior investigated, and the various findings and concepts integrated in formulating a model of choice prediction.

In our opinion, motivational models are highly relevant for the generic choice process, while multi-attribute attitude models are relevant for the specific choice process. A motivational model for the generic choice is proposed, with the notion that consumer behavior in its various ramifications (i.e., from the consumer, economist, social marketer, etc., perspectives) can be better understood from the analysis of generic choices.

Note:

*W. Fred van Raaij is a Visiting Assistant Professor of Business Administration at the University of Illinois (1976-77), and Assistant Professor of Economic Psychology at Tilburg University, The Netherlands (1977-78).

Kassaye Wandwossen is a doctoral student at the University of Illinois and expects to obtain his Ph.D. in 1978.

References

Adams, J. S., "Inequity in Social Exchange." In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 2, New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Alderfer, C. P., "An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4a (May 1969), 142-75.

Alderfer, C. P., Existence, Relatedness and Growth, New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Argyris, C., Integrating the Individual and the Organization, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Armstrong, J. S., "Role Conflict in Marketing or the Ox and the Fox," Oslo: Symposium, "New Directions in Marketing," 1976.

Atkinson, J. W., An Introduction to Motivation, New York: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Berkowitz, L., "Social Motivation." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, Vol. 3, 1969 (second edition).

Berlyne, D. E., "Motivational Problems Raised by Exploratory and Epistemic Behavior." In K. Sigmund (ed.), Psychology: The Study of a Science, New York: McGraw-Hill, Vol. 5, 1963, 284-364.

Blau, P., Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Burnkrant, R. E., "A Motivational Model of Information Processing Intensity," The Journal of Consumer Research: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly, 3, (June 1976), 21-30.

Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E. and Weick, K. E., Managerial Behavior, Performance, and Effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Campbell, J. P. and Pritchard, R. D., "Motivation Theory in Industrial and Organizational Psychology." In M. D. Dunnette (ed.), Handbook of Organizational Psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Clark, J. B., "Motivation in Work Groups: A Tentative View," Human

Organization, 13, (1960-61), 198-208.

Cofer, C. N. and Appley, M. H., Motivation: Theory and Research, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Dachler, H. P. and Hulin, C. L., "A Reconsideration of the Relationship Between Satisfaction and Judged Importance of Environment and Job Characterstics," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4, (August 1969), 252-66.

Davis, W. A., "The Motivation of the Underprivileged Worker." In W. F. Whyte (ed.), Industry and Society, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.

Dichter, E., Handbook of Consumer Motivations: The Psychology of the World of Objects, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Duessenberry, J. S., Income, Saving and the Theory of Consumer Behavior, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Edwards, W., "Probability Preference in Gambling," American Journal of Psychology, 67, (1954), 441-52.

Engel, J. F., Kollat, D. T. and Blackwell, R. D., Consumer Behavior, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973 (second edition).

Fennel, G., "Motivation Research Revisited," Journal of Advertising Research, 15 (June 1975), 23-8.

Fishbein, M. A., "Attitude and the Prediction of Behavior." In M. A. Fishbein (ed.), Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement, New York: Wiley, 1967, 477-92.

Gabor, A. and Granger, C. W. J., "Price as an Indicator of Quality: Report on an Inquiry," Economica, 33(February 1966), 43-70.

Graen, G. B., "Instrumentality Theory of Work Motivation: Some Experimental Results and Suggested Modifications," Journal of Applied Psychology Monographs, 53 (April 1969), part 2.

Hall, D. T. and Nougaim, K. E., "An Examination of Maslow's Need Hierarchy in an Organizational Setting," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3 (February 1968), 12-35.

Herzberg, F., Work and the Nature of Man, Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Company, 1966.

Howard, J. A. and Sheth, J. N., The Theory of Buyer Behavior, New York: Wiley, 1969.

James, W., The Principles of Psychology, New York: Holt, 1890 (2 volumes).

Jacoby, J., "A Multi-indicant Approach for Studying New Product Adopters," Journal of Applied Psychology, 55 (August 1971), 384-8.

Jacoby, J., "Consumer and Industrial Psychology: Prospects for Theory Coroboration and Mutual Contribution." In D. M. Dunnette (ed.), Handbook of Organizational Psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Katona, G. B., Strumpel, B., and Zahn, E., Aspirations and Affluence: Comparative Studies in the United States and Western Europe, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Korman, A. K., The Psychology of Motivation, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Lawler, E. E., Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Leavitt, H. J., Managerial Psychology, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964 (second edition).

Lewin, K., The Conceptual Representation and the Measurement of Psychological Forces, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1938.

March, J. G. and Simon, H., Organizations, New York: Wiley, 1958.

Maslow, A. H., "A Theory of Human Motivation," Psychological Review, 50 (1943), 370-96.

Maslow, A. H., "Higher and Lower Order Needs." In C. L. Stacey and M. F. DeMartino (eds.), Understanding Human Motivation, Cleveland/NewYork: The World Publishing Company, 1965.

Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality, New York: Harper & Row, 1970, (second edition).

McClelland, D. C., The Achieving Society, Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1961.

McDougall, W., Outline of Psychology, Boston: Scribner's, 1923.

McGregor, D., The Human Side of the Enterprise, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Mobley, W. H. and Locke, E. A., "The Relationship of Value Improtance to Satisfaction," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5 (September 1970), 463-83.

Murray, H. A., "Facts Which Support the Concept of Need or Drive," Journal of Psychology, 3 (1937), 27-42.

Pellegrin, R. and Coates, C., "Executive and Supervisors: Contrasting Definitions of a Career Success," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1 (1957), 506-17.

Porter, L. W., "A Study of Perceived Need Satisfactions in Bottom and Middle Management Jobs," Journal of Applied Psychology, 45 (February 1961), 1-10.

Porter, L. W. and Lawler, E. E., Managerial Attitudes and Performance, Homewood, IL: Irwin, 1968.

Porter, L. W. and Mitchell, V. F., "Comparative Study of Need Satisfactions in Military and Business Hierarchies," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51 (April 1967), 139-44.

Pritchard, R. D., "Equity Theory: A Review and Critique," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4 (May 1969), 176-211.

Roselius, T., "Consumer Rankings of Risk Reduction Methods," Journal of Marketing, 35 (January 1971), 56-61.

Rosenberg, M. J., "Cognitive Structure and Attitudinal Affect," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53 (November 1956), 367-72.

Rotter, J. B., Social Learning and Clinical Psychology, Englewood Cliffs,

NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Schein, E. H., Organizational Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Schewe, C. D., "Selected Social Psychological Models for Analyzing Buyers," Journal of Marketing, 37 (July 1973), 31-9.

Sheth, J. N., "A Pschological Model of Travel Mode Selection," Urbana, IL: Bureau of Econmic and Business Research of the University of Illinois, Working Paper #291, November 1975.

Tolman, E. C., Purposive Behavior in Animals and Men, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1932.

Van Raaij, W. F., Consumer Choice Behavior: An Information Processing Approach, Voorschoten: VAM, 1977.

Van Raaij, W. F., "Economic Psychology and Marketing," Oslo: Symposium "New Directions in Marketing," 1976.

Vroom, V. H., Work and Motivation, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Wahba, M. A. and Bridwell, J. G., "Maslow Reconsidered: A review of Research on the Need Hierarchy Theory," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15 (April 1976), 212-40.

Walster, E. and Walster, G. W., "Equity and Social Justice," Journal of Social Issues, 31 (Summer 1975), 21-43.