Motivating the Future Workforce of Philippine Organizations

Jose Gerardo O. Santamaria[*]

University of the Philippines, Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business, Diliman, Quezon City 1101, Philippines

This study tested the principal motivation theories, namely the Self-Determination Theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, by exploring the features of events that Filipino university students considered satisfying. Employing a phenomenological approach (Sheldon, Elliot, Kim, & Kasser, 2001) that captured what was meaningful to the participants, the study asked 186 college students conveniently sampled from two Metro Manila universities to think about an event they considered as satisfying. They were then asked to indicate how they felt certain needs were satisfied during this event. They were also asked the extent to which they felt certain moods during the event. The results revealed that the universal needs proposed by self-determination theory—relatedness, autonomy and competence—as well as the higher-level needs proposed by Maslow—self- esteem and self-actualization—were most salient during the respondents' most satisfying experiences. However, only the need for autonomy had a significant association with and was a significant predictor of both positive and negative affect. These findings have implications for managers who have the capacity to create the kinds of contexts that can motivate individuals, an important factor in work organizations.

1   Introduction

Why do individuals find certain experiences satisfying? Inquiring into why such experiences are pleasurable may provide insights into what might motivate people. Need theories of motivation help explain what drive individuals to action, and they have also been used to describe what human beings need in order to flourish (Sheldon, 2011). On one hand, one of the better known among early theories is Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Maslow proposed that individuals strive to fulfill five basic needs, which he theorized to be arranged in a hierarchy. Lower-level needs have to be substantially satisfied before the individual strives to satisfy another need (Dye, Mills, & Weatherbee, 2005). On the other hand, the self-determination theory proposes that individuals have three innate needs—likened to social nutriments—that are essential for healthy development (Ryan & Deci, 2000). These needs explain why people engage in activities that create, not reduce, deficit (Deci & Moller, 2005). Both these theories propose that these needs are universal to all human beings and that the satisfaction of these needs will lead to well-being, which is generally defined as the experience of positive affect and avoidance of negative affect. Positive well-being has been associated with many positive outcomes that are valuable both for the individual and for an organization (Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Pressman & Cohen, 2005).

This study attempts to provide initial evidence on what might motivate university-age students, who are future employees in organizations, by inquiring into those experiences that they considered as satisfying. Answers to why some experiences are satisfying may help provide insights into the kinds of contexts that motivate individuals. Context affects to what extent needs are satisfied (Latham & Pinder, 2005) and, thus, has strong implication to those who want to motivate others (Yao, Franco, & Hechanova, 2005).

1.1   Self-Determination Theory

The self-determination theory (SDT) is a contemporary motivation theory that proposes that people have innate needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Robbins & Judge, 2011). These psychological needs are posited to be universal. SDT resolved what the Hullian drive theory and Freudian instinct theory were not able to explain, that is, why human beings engage in activities of exploration, play, and manipulation—activities that induce, not reduce, deficit. In fact, the focus of these non-drive activities highlights the inclination of humans to engage in activities that are interesting and enjoyable to them, and this has come to be defined as intrinsic motivation.

[*] Correspondence: Tel: +63 2 928 4571; Fax: +63 2 929 7991. Email: josantamaria@upd.edu.ph

Self-determination theory posits that humans have the desire to effectively engage and deal with their environments. This implies having the ability to engage in and to choose the activity. Ryan and Deci (2000) made a distinction between competence and autonomy. They defined competence as the ability to engage effectively with the environment and this is facilitated by optimal challenges and honest feedback (Ryan & Brown, 2003). Autonomy, on the other hand, concerns the "endorsement of one's behavior and the accompanying sense of volition or willingness" (Deci & Ryan, 2008a, pp. 186-187). Autonomy is facilitated when people are not controlled or compelled to act in a certain way and when they are given choices (Ryan & Brown, 2003). Relatedness refers to the need to feel connected to others, to love and care, to be loved, and to be cared for (Deci & Ryan, 2000). It is facilitated by expressions of acceptance, warmth and caring (Ryan & Brown, 2003). Consistent with the need for belongingness, relatedness is a need for "frequent personal contacts or interactions with other persons and … there is an interpersonal bond marked by stability… and continuation into the foreseeable future" (Baumeister & Leary, 1995, p. 500). Further, this need for belongingness has an evolutionary basis: Our ancestors' ability to be with a group enabled them to survive from predators and more effectively hunt for food (Buss, 1991).

SDT describes an individual's interactions with the environment as dialectic and it likens the three needs discussed above to social nutriments that are essential for the healthy development of all human beings. It describes the universal needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness as being essential for human growth. These needs are distinct from the basic drives identified by Hull, such as sex, hunger, thirst and avoidance of pain. To satisfy intrinsic motivation, one must fulfill the needs for competence and autonomy. To enable the internalization of socially sanctioned requests, these two needs have to be fulfilled in addition to the need for relatedness. However, social contexts may either encourage or thwart healthy development (Ryan & Deci, 2000). For example, environments that are controlling or that pressure individuals to feel, think and behave in certain ways thwart intrinsic motivation.

Self-determination theory has received strong empirical support and has been researched in different cultural settings (Deci & Ryan, 2008b). For instance, Sheldon et al. (2001) conducted a study comparing university students from the US and South Korea—predominantly individualistic and collectivistic oriented, respectively—and found strong support for the universal needs of relatedness, autonomy, and competence.

1.2   Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

The best known among the early motivation theories is Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Robbins & Judge, 2011). Maslow proposed that everyone has a natural inclination to grow and fulfill his or her potentials (Pervin & John, 2001). He acknowledged both deficiency and growth needs and proposed a hierarchical structure (i.e., pyramid) for such needs. He defined the most basic need—at the bottom of the pyramid—as those satisfying physiological needs, such as those for food, water and shelter. Subsequently, there are the needs for safety, belongingness, esteem, and, at the top of the hierarchy, the need for self-actualization. The hierarchical structure of these needs implies that lower-level needs have to be sufficiently satisfied before the next higher need becomes salient for the individual.

First, the most basic needs are physiological in nature: hunger, thirst, shelter, sex and other bodily needs. These needs pertain to what have been referred to earlier as deficit-reducing in that once these are satisfied, the need for these are extinguished (Deci & Moller, 2005). Second, safety needs refer to security and protection from physical and emotional harm. Third, social needs pertain to the desire to be loved and to love and includes the needs for affection, belongingness, acceptance, and friendship. These also pertain to the need to belong to groups. Fourth, self-esteem is the degree to which individuals define themselves positively or negatively (Kirkpatrick & Ellis, 2004). Esteem needs refer to self-respect, autonomy and achievement; it also pertains to the needs for status, recognition and attention from others. Self-esteem has also been likened to a sociometer that gauges one's level of social inclusion (Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995). As a sociometer, it provides a gauge for people to behave in a manner that will ensure their connection with other people. Using the perspective of evolutionary psychology, Kirkpatrick and Ellis (2004) hypothesized that this gauge

solved an adaptive problem as social exclusion from groups posed a significant problem for survival for our ancestors.

Finally, self-actualization refers to the drive to become what one is capable of becoming, including achieving one's full potential. Pervin and John (2001) considered the concept of self-actualization one of Maslow's most important contributions. In studying the lives of remarkable people in history that he considered as being self-actualized, Maslow described them as those who had accepted themselves and others for who they were, were concerned with themselves but also recognized the needs of others, had an unusual sense of humor, were autonomous, and had a sense of detachment from their surroundings and a capacity to transcend a particular culture (Feist & Feist, 2007). Initially, Maslow believed that only a few, special, individuals were capable of ever realizing their best selves and reaching their fullest potentials. These individuals would naturally move to this actualizing phase after they had sufficiently satisfied their lower-level needs (physiological, safety, belongingness and esteem). Later, however, he proposed that everyone had the capacity to reach this point but only a few would be able to do so. The most important impediment to reaching one's full potential was what he termed the "Jonah Complex": The individual becomes overwhelmed by what were previously considered small fears and was now overcome with self-doubt as the person sought to realize his or her full potentials (Goud, 1994).

Maslow's hierarchy of needs share some things in common with SDT. Firstly, its need for belongingness is similar to SDT's need for relatedness. The needs for self-esteem and actualization also overlap with those of autonomy and competence. Secondly, it also posits that social contexts have an important role and can affect an individual's motivation. Maslow believed that the environment can inhibit an individual from fulfilling his or her potentials, and such obstacles needed to be removed. For example, characteristics such as being labeled bad, cruel or destructive, are not innate but are violent reactions against frustration of intrinsic needs. Inner nature, Maslow believed, is good or neutral and it is best to develop it. The environment determines how adequately the self unfolds or becomes actualized. A final point of similarity, both Maslow and SDT posit that fulfillment of these universal needs will lead to positive well-being and happiness.

Self-determination theory, however, does not consider self-esteem as a need (Ryan & Brown, 2003). It posits that a need to think of one's self implies that a more basic need has been deprived from the person, such that people may even engage in activities or compromise their values just to be accepted in a group. SDT instead considers self-esteem as a derivative product of having basic needs satisfied: When one experiences the needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness, one will have self-esteem; when one is compelled to undertake an activity that is uninteresting, it will lead one to feel a loss of control and, subsequently, a concern for self-esteem. This view is consistent with Kirkpatrick and Ellis' (2004) who posited that when individuals gauge a low level of social inclusion (i.e., the need for relatedness in the SDT tradition), they will be motivated to act to restore it to an acceptable level. However, though the salience of self-esteem has been considered a result of unnatural growth and having more basic needs unfulfilled (Ryan & Brown, 2003), a concern for the self has occupied a "center stage position in psychology" (as cited by Thomas, 2005; also in Kirkpatrick & Ellis, 2004). For example, in motivation studies relating to control and self-efficacy, just having a positive perception or belief in one's capability, regardless of the reality, has proven beneficial for individuals in coping with life's challenges (Maddux, 2002; Thompson, 2002). A popular therapeutic treatment entails changing attributions of failure from a stable factor to an unstable factor. Further, even among children with problematic peer relations or those who are considered "rejected," those who reported high self-concepts considered themselves as being no more at risk for future social maladjustment than the average child (Boivin & Begin, 1989). Indeed, positive psychology rests on the premise that a person's healthy navigation through life can be strengthened by one's positive beliefs in his own self. Taking care of one's self-esteem is one of positive psychology's main tenets.

The other point of differentiation is that while SDT enjoys strong empirical support, the same cannot be said about Maslow's hierarchy theory. Although hugely popular among organization managers when the theory was introduced (Dye et al., 2005), the lack of empirical support is considered its weaknesses (Thomas, 2005). The hierarchy of needs drew heavily on case analyses and self-reports—a preference for introspection that precluded, if not challenged, the scientific validation of its propositions. Maslow's theory has also been criticized as being applicable only to a limited segment of society, excluding those who are too busy satisfying lower-level needs. There is also no

empirical proof that the needs he proposed are arranged in the structure he described. Indeed, Haslam (2001) argued that no need is considered more important than others, that specific needs become more important to the individual depending on which of his identities is salient. Nevertheless, Maslow's theory remains one of the more popular motivation theories among practicing managers for its logic and simplicity (Dye et al., 2005; Robbins & Judge, 2011).

1.3   Need Satisfaction and Affect

Both Maslow and SDT posit that the adequate satisfaction of the needs they propose will lead to positive well-being and psychological thriving (Sheldon, 2011; Sheldon et al., 2001). Well-being has been traditionally studied from two perspectives, the hedonic and the eudaimonic (Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2004). The hedonic approach focuses on happiness and the pursuit of pleasure and avoidance of pain, while the eudaimonic approach focuses on meaning and self-realization. Eudaimonia occurs when people's life activities are congruent with their values and they are fully engaged. While eudaimonia pertains to the processes of living well, the hedonic approach focuses on outcomes of these processes, specifically, on the presence of positive affect and the absence of negative affect (Ryan, Huta, and Deci, 2008). Barsade and Gibson (2007) likened affect to an "umbrella term that includes feeling states, which are short-term experiences, and feeling traits, which are more enduring ways to feel and act" (p. 37). Within the feeling states are emotions and moods. Fredrickson (2002) differentiated these two states in that emotions are about something personally meaningful circumstances and are short lived. Moods, in contrast, are object-less, more long lasting, and at the background of consciousness. Fredrickson (2002) conceded that these differences are at the theoretical level only, as both emotions and moods are induced in the same manner in research practice.

Positive emotions open one's mind and lead to more exploration and experimentation in new ways of doing things (Fredrickson, 2003; also in Barsade & Gibson, 2007), building enduring personal resources. Unlike negative emotions, which limit behavior to specific actions, positive emotions widen the span of possibilities that one sees, allowing one to flourish and develop resilience to future challenges (Fredrickson, 2009). Positive affect is associated with positive organizational outcomes. In their review of the literature on affect in organizations, Barsade and Gibson (2007) cited research that show the association of positive affect with a variety of organizational outcomes, including enhanced negotiating ability, decision-making effectiveness, sales performance and performance of discretionary behaviors for the organization. Employing a variety of methods such as self-reports, peer ratings, and daily narratives to measure affect and creativity, Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, and Staw (2005) found a consistent relationship between positive affect and creativity among professionals. People experiencing positive moods are more apt to behave pro-socially (Lee & Allen, 2002; Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2004). Positive affect has also been found to be associated with psychological and physical health (Pressman & Cohen, 2005).

However, affect and emotions can also impact on the individual's immediate environment. Affect has a strong social component, allowing the sharing and transfer of the emotions of one to others (Barsade & Gibson, 2007). The positive or negative affect being experienced by one becomes the collective emotion. The affective events theory developed by Weiss and Cropanzano (as cited by Ashkanasy & Ashton-James, 2005) explained how events are linked to emotions. Briefly, this theory states that an individual's work behavior is determined by what is felt at a certain time, that the workplace setting is a source of discrete affective events that generate these feelings, and that an individual's response to these events affect subsequent attitudes and behaviors of others, creating a contagion of sorts. In an organizational setting, such emotions may ultimately affect other co-workers as well as customers (see Barsade & Gibson, 2007). Ashkanasy and Ashton-James (2005) defined an affective event as any event, or object, that hinders or facilitates an individual's ability to achieve his goals. As discussed earlier, an environment that thwarts the satisfaction of basic needs leads to ill-being. While other factors may affect how an individual ultimately reacts to events, the affective state of an individual may either enable or hinder his ability to work toward personal goals.

From the two motivation theories discussed above, Sheldon et al. (2001) identified seven candidate needs; there is an overlap between Maslow's need for belongingness and SDT's need for relatedness. Sheldon et al. (2001) then included three other needs from the extant literature on motivation. In

particular, the needs to experience pleasure, from Epstein's cognitive-experiential self-theory, and for popularity and money, were included to make up the final three needs that were tested. The ten needs that were explored were as follows; autonomy, competence, relatedness, self-actualization, self-esteem, security, physical, pleasure, popularity and money.

The phenomenological approach (Sheldon et al., 2001) relies on self-reports from participants on their own perspective and definition of satisfying. Introspection as a method is subject to human error (Locke, 1996; Matthews, Deary, & Whiteman, 2003). Information that is stored in memory is never neutral or objective; the event is stored in a way that has been interpreted by the individual (Hamilton, 2005). Thus, the phenomenological approach emphasizes subjective experience, capturing what is meaningful to the individual (Matthews et al., 2003). In exploring which of these ten needs were most salient, Sheldon et al. (2001) first asked respondents to think about a satisfying event that they experienced in the recent past. They then asked the participants to indicate their level of agreement with statements describing their experiences, based on statements that operationalized the ten needs discussed above. The participants were then asked to what extent they experienced certain emotions during this satisfying event.

Yang and Guy (2006) found no differences between two groups comprised of workers from different generations in terms of what motivated them at work; both cohorts valued needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Yao et al. (2005) found similar results in their survey of Filipino office workers; they see themselves as self-determining. The findings lend strong support to those needs proposed by SDT—the sample valued autonomy in decision-making and challenging tasks. Filipinos also value their groups, especially their families, which are the source of security and essential support (Jocano, 1999). Hence the following prediction,

H$_1$: The needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness would feature prominently (i.e., among the top) in the participants' satisfying experiences.

Maslow hypothesized that cultures will have an effect on the salience of certain needs (Dye et al., 2005). In a developing country, the lower-level needs proposed by Maslow (e.g., security, money) will be salient for this sample. As such, the following prediction,

H$_2$: The needs for security and money would be salient in experiences.

Finally, SDT posits that fulfillment of these needs will lead to well-being, to the experience of positive affect and absence of negative affect.

H$_3$: These needs would also be associated with the affect measures; these needs will be directly related with positive affect and negatively with negative affect.

2   Methodology

2.1   Participants

One hundred eighty-six college (135 female, 51 male, M_{age} = 18.76, age range: 17-24) students conveniently sampled from two universities in Metro Manila participated in the research. There were 117 students from a state university located in Quezon City who were enrolled in a course in organizational behavior. The remaining sixty-nine respondents came from a private, Catholic university located in Manila and were enrolled in an introductory course in psychology. The survey was administered during regular classes.

2.2   Procedure

The study used the instrument and followed the original methodology employed by Sheldon et al. (2001). Before the questionnaire was distributed to the students, the researcher provided the following introduction:

"The survey asks you to think about the most satisfying event that you have experienced in the last six months only. You can define satisfying in any way that you choose. Please take the time now to think of such an event. The survey will not ask you to write down this event but it is important that as you complete the questionnaire you only think about this particular satisfying event and nothing else."

Participants were asked to provide their age and gender. The survey questionnaire had two sections; the first section consisted of 30 statements that pertained to needs and the second section

consisted of twenty (20) adjectives describing different affective states. In the first section of the survey, the participants were asked to indicate their degree of agreement with the statements using a five-point Likert scale (1 = *Not at all* and to 5 = *Very much*). There were a total of 30 statements, with 3 statements for each of the needs. Each of the following statements was preceded with the phrase "*During this event I felt…*" Table 1 lists the statements referring to each need.

Table 1. Statements referring to each of the ten needs

Need	Item
Autonomy	• That my choices were based on my true interests and values.
	• Free to do things my own way.
	• That my choices expressed my "true self."
Competence	• That I was successfully completing difficult tasks and projects.
	• That I was taking on and mastering hard challenges.
	• Very capable in what I did.
Relatedness	• A sense of contact with people who are important to me.
	• Close and connected with other people who are important to me.
	• A strong sense of intimacy with people I spent time with.
Self-actualization	• That I was becoming "who I really am."
	• A sense of deeper purpose in life.
	• A deeper understanding of myself and of my place in the universe.
Physical	• That I got enough exercise and was in excellent physical condition.
	• That my body was getting just what it needed.
	• A strong sense of physical well-being.
Pleasure	• That I was experiencing new sensations and activities.
	• Intense physical pleasure and enjoyment.
	• That I had found new sources and types of stimulation for myself.
Money	• Able to buy most of the things I want.
	• That I had nice things and possessions.
	• That I had plenty of money.
Security	• That my life was structured and predictable.
	• Glad that I have a comfortable set of routines and habits.
	• Safe from threats and uncertainties.
Self-esteem	• That I had many positive qualities.
	• Quite satisfied with who I am.
	• A strong sense of self-respect.
Popularity	• That I was a person whose advice others seek out and follow.
	• That I strongly influenced others' beliefs and behavior.
	• That I had strong impact on what other people did.

The reliabilities of the sub-scales are reported in Table 4.

In the second section of the survey, participants were asked to indicate the extent that they felt certain moods during the event. These were general dimensions of positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA) from the expanded Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS-X). Watson and Clark (as cited by Matthews et al., 2003) developed the scale from factor-analytic studies, as a hierarchical model containing a set of narrowly defined affects. These were the dominant dimensions of emotional experience. Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they felt certain affects (Table 2) during the event using a five-point scale.

Table 2. Positive affect and negative affect

Positive Affect	interested, excited, strong, enthusiastic, proud, alert, inspired, determined, attentive, active
Negative Affect	distressed, upset, guilty, scared, hostile, irritable, ashamed, nervous, jittery, afraid

2.3 Measures

Needs. From the first section, the measures were average scores for Autonomy, Competence, Relatedness, Self-Actualization, Physical, Pleasure, Money, Security, Self-Esteem and Popularity. The scores for each of these needs were calculated by averaging the scores on the three statements that pertained to the specific need. The range of scores for each of these needs was from a maximum of 5.0 to a minimum of 1.0.

Affect. There were three measures derived from the second section; positive affect, negative affect, and affect balance. The scores for Positive Affect and Negative Affect were calculated by averaging the values participants assigned to the ten affective states that pertained to positive affect and to negative affect, respectively. As well-being is defined as the presence of positive affect and the absence of negative affect (as cited by Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2004; Ryan et al., 2008), this was operationalized as Affect Balance. Affect Balance was calculated by subtracting the score for Negative Affect from Positive Affect. The scores ranged from a maximum of 5.0 to a minimum of 1.0.In total, 13 measures were derived from the survey responses for this study.

2.4 Analysis

The objective of the study was to explore the reasons why university students found events satisfying. Students were asked how strongly they felt needs were satisfied and how strongly they experienced different emotions during the event. To determine which needs were satisfied most, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted, with the ten needs as a within-participants factor. Each of these mean scores was then correlated with the mean scores derived for the three affect measures. Finally, separate regressions were conducted on PA, NA and Affect Balance with the mean score for each need entered simultaneously as predictors.

3 Results

The results showed that the means of the ten needs were significantly different, F (6.59, 1219.89) = 55.78, $p < .001$. The needs for relatedness, self-esteem, autonomy, self-actualization and competence were ranked as the five most salient experienced during the satisfying events. Security and money, predicted to be salient, were ranked at the bottom. There were no significant differences among the needs at the top half at the $p < .01$ level. These five needs, however, were significantly different from those ranked at the bottom of Table 3—popularity, physical, security and money.

Table 3. Mean values of candidate needs

Need	M	SD
Relatedness	4.11_a	0.94
Self-esteem	4.08_a	0.71
Autonomy	4.07_a	0.77
Self-actualization	$3.92_{a,b}$	0.85
Competence	$3.83_{a,b}$	0.90
Pleasure	$3.69_{b,c}$	0.96
Popularity	3.47_d	0.96
Physical	$3.27_{d,e}$	1.01
Security	$3.18_{d,e,f}$	0.84
Money	2.89_f	1.12

Note: Means can range from 1.00 to 5.00. Means that do not have the same subscript are significantly different from each other at $p \leq .01$.

The correlations among the needs, as well as the reliabilities for each sub-scale, are presented in Table 4. There were moderate to strong correlations between the candidate needs. Six pairs of needs had significant correlations above .40, with the largest being between pleasure and physical needs. Another thirteen pairs had significant correlations of at least .30.

Eight of the ten needs correlated significantly with positive affect (Table 5). With the exception of their needs for money and security, as respondents felt these needs being satisfied, these were accompanied by experiences of positive affect. Only two of the ten needs—autonomy and relatedness, had significant associations with negative affect. This inverse relationship meant that as the students experienced these needs, for example, they felt more self-determined, these were accompanied by decreases in negative affect. There was, however, an unexpected result; competence had a positive though marginally significant correlation with negative affect (p = .08). When students felt that they were either successfully completing difficult tasks and projects or taking on and mastering hard challenges, this was accompanied by negative moods also albeit to a lower degree than positive moods. Upon closer inspection, the competence score was positively correlated with the following negative moods; nervousness, dread, fear and distress. As students took on and mastered hard and challenging tasks, they also experienced irritability and hostility.

Table 4. Reliabilities and correlations among needs

	Needs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Autonomy	(.64)									
2.	Competence	.15*	(.66)								
3.	Relatedness	.37**	-.10	(.83)							
4.	Actualization	.48**	.27**	.42**	(.74)						
5.	Esteem	.49**	.34**	.32**	.50**	(.69)					
6.	Physical	.36**	.03	.33**	.32**	.21**	(.75)				
7.	Pleasure	.34**	.11	.20**	.27**	.18*	.68**	(.68)			
8.	Popularity	.42**	.30**	.26**	.37**	.49**	.23**	.23**	(.75)		
9.	Security	.19*	-.03	.13	.09	.26**	.23**	.23**	.31**	(.43)	
10.	Money	.26**	-.01	.11	.11	.06	.32**	.34**	.22**	.36**	(.74)

Note: Figures on the diagonal are reliability scores. **p< .01; *p< .05.

Finally, nine needs correlated positively and significantly with affect balance (competence was marginally significant). Table 5 summarizes the correlations of the ten needs to positive affect, negative affect and affect balance.

Table 5. Correlations of Needs with Event-related affect

Need	Positive Affect	Negative Affect	Affect Balance
Self-esteem	.53**	-.10	.33**
Autonomy	.46**	-.22**	.42**
Physical	.45**	-.06	.30**
Self-actualization	.43**	-.11	.32**
Competence	.40**	.13	.14
Pleasure	.39**	.06	.15*
Popularity	.37**	-.01	.23**
Relatedness	.24**	-.18*	.23**
Money	.12	-.09	.16*
Security	.10	-.11	.17*

*p< .05, **p< .01.

There was no support for the prediction that the needs for security and money would be among the most salient in students' experiences although both had significant correlations with affect balance. Herzberg theorized that these extrinsic factors do not necessary lead to satisfaction but to an absence

of dissatisfaction (Robbins & Judge, 2011). So, while still important to individuals, these were not as essential as the others.

Following the methodology of Sheldon et al. (2001), all ten needs were entered simultaneously as predictors of each of the affect measures. This test removes the variance shared by all ten needs and identifies only those needs that contribute unique variance. Only four needs emerged as significant predictors of positive affect, $F(10, 183) = 20.40$, $p < .001$. In the order of largest to least impact, physical ($\beta = .32$), self-esteem ($\beta = .27$), competence ($\beta = .26$, all p's $< .001$) and autonomy ($\beta = .19$, $p < .01$) needs were the only ones that significantly predicted positive affect. The model predicted 54% of the variance in positive affect.

The needs for autonomy ($\beta = -.29$, $p < .01$) and for pleasure ($\beta = .23$, $p < .05$) significantly predicted negative affect, $F(10, 184) = 2.77$, $p < .01$. In situations that did not provide for the need for autonomy, negative affect was experienced. On the other hand, as the need for pleasure was satisfied, negative affect was also experienced. While the need for competence had a positive association with negative affect, this relationship was not significant in the regression analysis. The model predicted nearly 14% of the variance in negative affect. Similar to Sheldon et al.'s (2001) finding, it appears that needs satisfaction has a greater impact in producing positive affect than in reducing negative affect.

Finally, Affect Balance was predicted significantly only by autonomy ($\beta = .37$, $p < .001$), physical ($\beta = .26$, $p < .01$) and pleasure needs ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .05$), $F(10, 173) = 8.093$, $p < .001$. The model predicted 31% of the variance in affect balance. Only the need for autonomy was a significant predictor in all three affect measures.

The results are partially consistent with those found by Sheldon et al. (2001) in their cross-cultural study. There were similarities among the three samples, supporting the notion that certain motivations are common regardless of culture (Heine, 2007). For example, Sheldon et al. (2001) found strong support for those universal needs proposed by self-determination theory, with competence, autonomy and relatedness among the top five most salient for both US and South Korea samples. Self-esteem and pleasure were the other two in the top five. These same needs also had significant correlations with the affect measures. Finally, SDT received full support for the US sample as these were the only significant predictors of affect balance. The needs for autonomy and relatedness were significant predictors in the South Korea sample, along with self-esteem, security and money.

4   Discussion

The objective of the study was to explore the features of events that Filipino university students considered satisfying. The phenomenological approach captured what was meaningful to the students, which would provide insights on the types of experiences that would lead this cohort, future employees in Philippine organizations, to experience positive well-being. Studies have shown that this leads to salutary outcomes for the individual as well as for the organization.

In this study, the needs proposed by SDT—autonomy, competence and relatedness, along with the higher-level needs proposed by Maslow—self-esteem and self-actualization, were ranked among the top five most experienced during events considered as satisfying. The significant associations with positive affect and affect balance further supported this. The satisfaction of needs had a greater impact on producing positive affect than in reducing negative affect.

The prediction that the needs for security and money would be among the top for the Philippine sample did not have support as these needs were ranked last, significantly different from the top. The findings are consistent with those found by Yao et al. (2005) in their survey of working professionals in the Philippines. They found more employees with a preference for intrinsic, rather than extrinsic, rewards.

Two other outcomes from the study are discussed in view of the participant sample—the positive association between competence and negative affect and the salience of self-esteem. Competence was operationalized in the current study in terms of successfully completing difficult tasks and projects, and mastering hard challenges—which are characteristic of university life. Tamir (2009) argues that studying is often unpleasant but students persist in it in order to achieve future success. People are willing to feel unpleasant emotions when these lead to the realization of valued, long-term goals. Mansfield (2012) also argues that adolescents pursue goals that are inextricably linked to other goals,

and that goals are not pursued in isolation. Among the participants in this study, taking on and mastering hard challenges were positively associated with feelings of irritability, distress, nervousness and fear. Though it was positively associated with negative affect, once the other needs were taken into account in the regression, the need for competence was not a significant predictor. In achievement situations, Dweck and Leggett (1988) posited that implicit beliefs about one's self will lead to different goals and differences in cognitions, affect, and behaviors. Those individuals who view intelligence as fixed are concerned with gaining positive or avoiding negative assessments of their competence. However, those who view intelligence as malleable will seek goals that increase their competence or mastery. In the face of difficulty and challenge, different patterns will emerge; those with a "fixed mindset" (Dweck, 2006), who view intelligence as unchangeable, will experience anxiety and worry. On the other hand, those who view intelligence as malleable, will maintain their positive affect through difficulties (Dweck & Leggett, 1988).

With regards the salience of self-esteem in this study (see also Sheldon et al., 2001), the sample was comprised of university students, adolescents, and young adults who are still in the process of finding their identity. Individuals go through an evolution of their self-concept and various child development theorists have identified the adolescent stage (e.g., from ages 13 to 20) as a critical phase as individuals negotiate how they will see themselves as adults. Hattie (as cited by Thomas, 2005) theorizes an important process of confirmation and disconfirmation when adolescents go through social comparison, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and doubtful feelings about their appearance and actions. As a result, people will pursue self-esteem to avoid anxiety caused by these major changes in their lives (Pyszczynski, Greenberg, Solomon, Arndt, & Schimel, 2004). Erikson posits a critical stage during adolescence when individuals go through physical changes and experience new feelings as well as new expectations from adults and peers. Erikson labeled this confusion as an identity crisis. Those who are able to solve these problems will gain a strong sense of their own uniqueness and confidence as they enter early adulthood (Thomas, 2005). Finally, though findings from cross-cultural research have shown that East Asian cultures have a low need for self-esteem (Heine, 2007), experiences that addressed this need were considered satisfying, at least by participants in this study.

Only the need for autonomy had a consistent and prominent role in students' experience of satisfying events. It is the only need that had significant associations with and was a significant predictor of positive affect, negative affect, and affect balance. This result is consistent with those found by Yao et al. (2005) in their survey of full-time employees in the Philippines. Experiences that are self-determined will increase one's positive affect; controlling experiences increase negative affect (Deci & Ryan, 2000). This finding suggests the importance of addressing the need to provide opportunities for self-determination, or the environment that will satisfy this need (Latham & Pinder, 2005; Yao et al., 2005). For managers, it becomes crucial to provide autonomy-supportive environments in order to engage individuals in the work or in their tasks (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Stone, Deci, & Ryan, 2009). Deci and his colleagues (as cited by Ryan & Deci, 2008) prescribe ways to provide an autonomy-supportive environment: asking open questions that invite participation to solving problems (see also Locke, 1996), listening actively and acknowledging the other's perspective, supporting choices and using words that convey choice (e.g., can, may or could) and not words that control (e.g., should, must), providing honest and positive feedback (see Dweck, 2006), minimizing coercion through rewards and punishments, and providing a meaningful rationale so they will understand the need to do the task. A supportive environment that acknowledges effort may also serve to provide encouragement to individuals to persist amidst difficult challenges (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). This appears important especially given the positive association between competence and negative affect.

A supportive environment that provides choice leads to increases in intrinsic motivation, more persistence and higher satisfaction (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999; McGonigal, 2012).This is especially relevant in collectivistic cultures where the construal of the self involves important and valued others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) and actions of, or choices by, individuals involve a consideration of the opinion and expectations of important others (Heine, 2007). While valued others are integrated into one's self in collectivistic cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), conforming to and taking into account the wishes of others—the consideration of social expectations (Miller, 2003)—should not be compelled. One still needs to choose to do so (see Chirkov, Ryan, Kim, & Kaplan, 2003). If this need for autonomy is adequately satisfied, in addition to the other universal needs, then the individual will not be wanting in self-esteem (Ryan & Brown, 2003).

In summary, while it may entail more effort on their part, it behooves managers to consider the environment that they create at work. Environments that provide for an individual's most important needs, such as the needs for autonomy and self-esteem, may increase the odds that he or she will be in a positive affective state, which can affect the individual's ability to focus and persist on his or her work goals (Ashkanasy & Ashton-James, 2005; Isen & Reeve, 2005).

5   Limitations and Further Research

Although the findings in this study provide initial information on the features of experiences that satisfy the needs of this cohort of individuals, the respondents came from a convenience sample. Demographic information collected from the sample did not include socio-economic data. It would be worthwhile to include socio-economic data in the analysis in order to understand what effect this may have, if any, on the salience of lower-level needs vis-a-vis needs that emerged from this study.

The need for self-esteem was explained in terms of the developmental stage that the subjects in the study (i.e., adolescents) were going through. Previously, self-esteem was ranked in the top five of the most salient needs in the US, South Korean and Philippine samples, comprised of university-age students. However, as discussed above, there is a debate on whether self-esteem is a need or simply a result of more basic needs being unfulfilled. In future studies, the use of older respondents may help understand the need for self-esteem, on whether it is salient only at a certain life stage or remains an important facet of satisfying events. Further, a more organizationally-relevant study among working professionals could ask about a most satisfying event that occurred at work while using the same phenomenological approach.

Finally, this study was cross-sectional, thus, the suggestions of causality between needs and affect are inferred and not proven. Indeed, while both Maslow and self-determination theory posit that fulfillment of needs will lead to positive well-being, Isen and Reeve (2005) argued that individuals experiencing positive affect will choose to engage in activities that are intrinsically motivating (see Fredrickson, 2002). In fact, these individuals also persist in activities that are required to do but are not interesting, and they do so even if they have depleted psychological resources (Tice, Baumeister, Shmueli, & Muraven, 2007).

References

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science*, *50*, 367-403.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Ashton-James, C. E. (2005). Emotion in organizations: A neglected topic in I/O psychology, but with a bright future. In G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *20*, 221-268.

Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. (2007). Why does affect matter in organizations? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *21*(1), 36-59.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497-529.

Boivin, M., & Begin, G. (1989). Peer status and self-perception among early elementary school children: The case of the rejected children. *Child Development*, *60*, 591-596.

Buss, D. M. (1991). Evolutionary personality psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *42*, 459-491.

Chirkov, V., Ryan, R. M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism and independence: A self-determination theory perspective on internalization of cultural orientations and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(1), 97-110.

Deci, E. L., & Moller, A. C. (2005). The concept of competence: A starting place for understanding intrinsic motivation and self-determined extrinsic motivation. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 579-597). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227-268.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008a). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*(1), 14-23.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008b). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*(3), 182-185.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success, how we can learn to fulfill our potential*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, *95*(2), 256-273.

Dye, K., Mills, A. J., & Weatherbee, T. (2005). Maslow: Man interrupted: Reading management theory in context. *Management Decision*, *43*(10), 1375-1395.

Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2007). *Theories of personality*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2002). Positive emotions. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2003). The value of positive emotions: The emerging science of positive psychology is coming to understand why it's good to feel good. *American Scientist*, *91*(4), 330-335.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2009). *Positivity*. NY: Three River Press.

Goud, N. (1994). Jonah complex: The fear of growth. *Journal of Humanistic Education & Development*, *32*(3), 98-111.

Hamilton, D. L. (2005). *Social cognition*. NY: Psychology Press.

Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. London: Sage.

Heine, S. J. (2007). Culture and motivation: What motivates people to act in the ways that they do? *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, 719-33.

Isen, A. M., & Reeve, J. (2005). The influence of positive affect on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Facilitating enjoyment of play, responsible work behavior, and self-control. *Motivation and Emotion*, *29*(4), 297-325.

Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*(3), 349-366.

Jocano, F. L. (1999). *Towards developing a Filipino corporate culture*. Quezon City: Punlad Research House.

Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Ellis, B. J. (2004). An evolutionary-psychological approach to self-esteem: Multiple domains and multiple functions. In M. B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Self and social identity*, 52-77. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*, 485-516.

Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 518-530.

Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 131-142.

Locke, E. A. (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, *5*, 117-124.

Maddux, J. E. (2002). Self efficacy: The power of believing you can. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 277-287). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mansfield, C. (2012). Rethinking motivation goals for adolescents: Beyond achievement goals. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *61*(4), 564-584.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 224-253.

Matthews, G., Deary, I. J., & Whiteman, M. C. (2003). *Personality traits*. UK: University Press.

McGonigal, K. (2012). *The willpower instinct: How self-construal works, why it matters, and what you can do to get more of it*. NY: Penguin.

Miller, J. G. (2003). Culture and agency: Implications for psychological theories of motivation and social development. *The Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, *49*, 59-99.

Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (2001). *Personality theory and research*. John Wiley & Sons.

Pressman, S. D., & Cohen, S. (2005). Does positive affect influence health? *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*(6), 925-971.

Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Arndt, J., & Schimel, J. (2004). Why do people need self-esteem? A theoretical and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *130*(3), 435-468.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2011). *Organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Ryan, R. M., & Brown, K. W. (2003). Why we don't need self-esteem: On fundamental needs, contingent love, and mindfulness. *Psychological Inquiry*, *14*(1), 71-76.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68-78.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2008). A self-determination theory approach to psychotherapy: The motivational basis for effective change. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*(3), 186-193.

Ryan, R. M., Huta, V. & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*, 139-170.

Sheldon, K. M. (2011). Integrating behavioral-motive and experiential-requirement perspectives on psychological needs: A two process model. *Psychological Review*, *118*(4), 552-569.

Sheldon, K. M., Elliot, A. J., Kim, Y., & Kasser, T. (2001). What is satisfying about satisfying events? Testing 10 candidate psychological needs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(2), 325-39.

Sheldon, K. M., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2004). Achieving sustainable new happiness: Prospects, practices and prescriptions. In P. A. Linley & S. Joseph (Eds.), *Positive psychology in practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Stone, D. N., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Beyond talk: Creating autonomous motivation through self-determination theory. *Journal of General Management*, *34*(3), 75-91.

Tamir, M. (2009). What do people want to feel and why? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *18*(2), 101-105.

Thomas, R. M. (2005). *Comparing theories of child development*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Thompson, S. C. (2002). The role of personal control in adaptive functioning. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 202-213). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tice, D. M., Baumeister, R. F., Shmueli, D., & Muraven, M. (2007). Restoring the self: Positive affect helps improve self-regulation following ego depletion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *43*, 379-384.

Yang, S.-B., & Guy, M. E. (2006). Genxers versus boomers: Work motivators and management implications. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *29*(3), 267-284.

Yao, K. L., Franco, E. P., & Hechanova, M. R. M. (2005). Rewards that matter: What motivates the Filipino employee? In M. R. M. Hechanova & E. P. Franco (Eds.), *The way we work: Research and best practices in Philippine organizations.* Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.