

Dynamic Model of Polymotivational Behavior

Irakli Imedadze

Academy Member, Georgian National Academy of Sciences, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

The phenomenon of polymotivation points to the fact that activity is determined by more than one need. It is explained by diversity of human needs and a person's tendency to use all behavioral resources in order to satisfy use many needs as possible. In spite of being quite common, the phenomenon of polymotivation is poorly investigated theoretically and empirically. All complex forms of human behavior are determined by a system of needs. Some of them are, more or less, directly related to behavioral process or its result (internal motivation), others – are not (external motivation). Some needs are not “linked” to a certain, specific behavior (e.g. needs for achievement, prestige, affiliation, self-actualization, etc.). These constant motivators of a personality are satisfied through various behaviors and create systems, ensembles of needs. The structure of polymotivational system is dynamic. In the process of activity, it is permanently transformed. Some are satisfied, others, on the contrary, become even stronger. A new need can be involved in the polymotivational system of a current behavior; the configuration or hierarchical organization of the system might also undergo changes, etc. All this is reflected both on the activity dynamics and its content. © 2020 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.

Polymotivation, need, motivation dynamics

The term polymotivation points to the fact that activity is determined by several needs. This is a well established fact. Research into different forms of behavior (creative and intellectual activities, sports activities, recreation and entertainment) reveals their polymotivational nature. Empirical research shows that main forms of human behavior (studying, working) are, actually, always polymotivational. In short, typical and even a universal characteristic of human behavior is that it is polymotivational [1-4].

Generally, the phenomenon of polymotivation is explained by the fact that a person, by nature, is

multidimensional, connected to reality in many different ways and has a rich and complex system of needs. Some constituents of this system are in more or less activated state. Consequently, the fact that a separate behavior is polymotivated, is quite natural and understandable; a person tries to satisfy as many of his/her needs as possible through one, single behavior, if the existing situation and available operational means allow to do so. It often happens unconsciously. Polymotivated behavior from motivational view, is the most optimal one. Human activity is mainly organized in accordance with the principle of economical use of energy and

time economy. Polymotivation manifests of this principle directly and evidently. The more economically psychophysical resources and time are used, the more effective the activity is. Based on this criterion, polymotivational activity is certainly much more effective than monomotivational one, because, it encompasses a person's diverse interests in one complex behavior. In addition, polymotivated behavior is often more efficient, as it has a stronger dynamic charge coming from numerous needs. And it is well known how close the relationship between effectiveness of behavior and strength of motivation is. Such an activity is also more resistant to hindrances. Compared to monomotivational behavior, it can easily be prolonged. The energy of one, single need might soon diminish, but polymotivational system is much more stable. Apart from dynamic aspect, any behavior has its content. The activity with varied motivational content has greater personal value and brings more behavioral satisfaction, which is not surprising – such an activity combines pleasant and useful.

The phenomenon of polymotivation can be understood only within the framework of the models, which present a person's motivational sphere as consisting of numerous and diverse needs. The issue of co-participation of needs in human behavior becomes meaningful only in such a case.

In the motivational conception of psychoanalysis, for example, such question will newer arise. One of the most substantial analysis of the diversity of motivation belongs to H. Murray [5]. He put forward the issue of interrelation of needs and referred to the phenomenon of polymotivation in this context.

Murray distinguished four types of interrelation of actual needs: dominance, conflict, fusion and subordination. In the case of dominance one of the needs reaches such a level of intensity, that it becomes impossible to postpone its satisfaction (e.g. pain, hunger, thirst). Its minimal satisfaction is

a necessary precondition for other simultaneously existing needs to be manifested in behavior.

Needs come into conflict when two or more equally intensive motivational forces require the performance of activity in different directions. Conflict between needs is about the priority of their satisfaction and represents the state preceding dominance. If several needs are satisfied through one and the same behavior, we speak about the fusion of needs and, finally, if one need serves the satisfaction of another one, helps its realization, we deal with subordination.

It is not difficult to see that these four versions of interrelation of needs do not create a basis for polymotivation. For example, dominance, is a manifestation of monomotivation, i.e. the phenomenon opposite to polymotivation. In this case, one need totally dominates over behavior and prevents other needs from any kind of satisfaction.

Conflict is not polymotivation, either. Here needs are not integrated within one behavior; they are sources of different, event contradictory behaviors. As for fusion, it totally fits into the polymotivational framework, although, just like conflict, fusion does not imply a full harmony among needs. In general, the term fusion creates a sort of difficulty, because it points to such integrity of elements, where they lose their specificity and create something qualitatively new (e.g. fusion of colors). As for needs, because of being clearly object directed, they do not fuse with each other and their interrelation does not create a new need. So, it is more reasonable to speak not about fusion of needs, but about polymotivation, when needs create such a system where each element retains its nature. In polymotivated behaviors, interrelation between needs is quite complex, depending on the character of co-acting needs, their strength the way they are related to behavior, etc. Hence, polymotivational system of behavior is always hierarchical, which is reflected in Murray's term "subordination of needs".

Leading or subordinative position might be taken by totally different types of needs. The most important point is the character of each need's connection to behavior, e.g. internal or external. In the first case, needs are directly related to behavior or its result, in the second – they are not. If a pupil studies because of he/she is interested in a subject, or satisfies the need of developing skills the act of studying is internally motivated, but if the same process pursues some other goals or is caused by the fear of punishment, then it is determined by external motivation. In most cases, these two sources of motivation co-exist.

The process that takes place in this situation became the object of empirical study. Unfortunately, the results of experimental research do not provide incontrovertible picture. Some data show that involvement of external motivation in behavior weakens internal motivation. This sometimes leads to radical conclusions about principle incompatibility of these motivational tendencies, excluding their combination or positive interaction within the same behavioral framework [6]. However, there are some data indicating that including external motivation in behavior does not weaken internal motivation, and, in some cases, even increases it. Such effects are foreseen in G. Allport's and R. Woodworth's models. According to H. Heckhausen, mutual influence of internal and external motives is demonstrated in the experimental situations where behavior is over or under motivated [7]. This weakens obtained effects and might point to the inconsistency between internal and external motivation. But it is very likely that the relationship between these components taking place at the normal motivational level will be different. Here we can expect summation effects because behavior is rarely motivated by internal or external motives, only. The so-called instrumental models of motivation imply just this kind of interrelation of motives. According to these models, total valence of behavioral outcome (or its subjective attraction) is

the sum of individual valencies (or of the outcomes of the given behavior following the gratification of different needs) [8].

It has to be noted that the empirical research into polymotivation is rather poor which is caused by the fact that this phenomenon (along with its various manifestations) has not been fully described, systematized or understood. Also, interrelationship between external and internal motivational effects needs to be discussed within a wider theoretical context. However, these issues still contain a lot of ambiguities. Some of the descriptive models of behavior are based on the principle of their total consistency, i.e. the character of behavior is consistent with the character of need and vice versa. Forms of behavior are distinguished by those needs that are specific to them. If we strictly follow this principle, it will lead to far-off theoretical conclusions. One of the conclusions could be that behavior can be only internally motivated. However, such a description of behavior is not consistent with the empirical data and does not make the theory more convincing.

The nature of behavior is certainly determined by underlying needs, but the specific form and content of behavior is determined not only by motivational, but by situational and instrumental factors as well. At the same time, needs also differ in terms of their relevance to behavior. As a rule, vital needs have their own behavioral pattern. For example, hunger is related to more or less specific activities, like obtaining food, its preparation and intake. But there is a larger number of needs that are not related ("linked") to the relevant forms of behavior. Connection between these needs and behavior is not as natural and straightforward as in the case of vital needs. They are gratified through different behaviors. For example, achievement need is gratified through different behaviors that lead to achievement and success. This need does not form a separate 'achievement' behavior. Other typical human needs have the same nature (need for prestige, dominance, affiliation, power, search for

essence of life, self-actualization, etc). Need for prestige can be satisfied through different social activities, whereas need for self-actualization is gratified through the achievement of different goals. Therefore, truly human needs represent the person's basic, permanent tendencies, that are constantly gratified through this or that behavior. Therefore, they normally co-exist with other needs and jointly create complex patterns that determine behavior.

Let us now discuss several cases of co-activity of needs. Very often, the activation of one of the needs creates another need, after which these two co-act within the framework of one, single behavior. This happens when the situation, creating conditions for the gratification of one of the needs, involves the aspects stimulating other needs. These aspects are usually related with need satisfaction means; the needs stimulated by them act in parallel with the initial need and jointly determine behavior. In addition to having the need for food, a civilized person also has the needs related to the ways of food intake, the corresponding rituals (like cultural norms) that regulate the food intake process. Such needs are formed in the course of upbringing and largely determine the performance and subjective value of corresponding behavior. In usual, everyday situations, they are automatically satisfied and are not experienced as related to a special form of behavior. However, we start to notice them as soon as the factors impeding their satisfaction appear in the situation. At this point, they immediately become conscious and demand that the individual gratifies them or changes his/her behavior if gratification is impossible.

There are many needs, satisfaction of which implies the existence of other needs. The social and personality needs, mentioned above, belong to this category. They constantly stimulate the person's behavior and are satisfied through different behaviors, i.e., are satisfied together with other needs. For example, cognitive needs are often linked with other needs. They situationally arise in

the course of performance of practical behavior and interact with other needs in a certain way. However, the joint motivation of behavior by substantive and functional needs is the case which is encountered most often. Functional needs are satisfied through activity, through, to the process of functioning, whereas substantive needs – through things and events [9]. Any behavior that unfolds in time involves different psychophysical functions. Each of them is characterized by functional tendency and has the dynamic aspect. For this reason, the substantive motivation of this or that behavior is normally accompanied and supported by functional motivation of certain intensity.

Collective behaviors satisfy the activated need for interpersonal relations along with other needs and are polymotivational by nature. Behaviors related to entertainment and different hobbies belong to the same category. For example, if mushroom picking and sport hunting are considered particular forms of behavior, they should be regarded as principally polymotivational, since they imply a simultaneous satisfaction of several needs (functional needs, like need for movement, need to be in nature, needs related to the value of the product to be obtained, etc.). Every need participating in the motivational system of such behavior contributes to the specificity/distinctiveness of these forms of behavior. In principle, each of these needs can independently motivate behavior, but in such a case, we will have a totally different form of behavior as an outcome. But if each need co-acts with others, it creates a specific motivational basis of behavior. If the activity is only motivated by the value of game, it will transform into the hunter's behavior but the activity motivated by the functional tendency of movement only, will develop into strolling. It is the co-activity of needs that produces sport hunting as a distinctive form of behavior.

Motivation is a dynamic process. It often involves transformations, that, first of all, affect needs, or the initial point of the motivational

process. This is directly reflected in the behavior dynamics (energy aspect) and the subjective value of behavior (semantic aspect). The latter is quite sensitive to the changes taking place in the needs underlying the given behavior.

The subjective value of behavior changes already at the initial stage of activity, immediately after decision making. This fact was revealed by L. Festinger. Festinger's experiments show that the value of the chosen behavior increases thanks to the cognitive dissonance reduction mechanism [10]. Such changes take place in the final phase. This is manifested in the phenomenon called the "motivational gradient" or the "approximation gradient". While performing a behavior the increase of its subjective value "enriches" underlying motivation through the activation of new needs and their involvement. The opposite might also happen. Motivational system is impoverished by losing its components. For example, "functional needs", described by D. Uznadze, that are often a part of motivational patterns are constantly reduced in the course of behavior and might reach even full satisfaction. As a result, functioning in the same direction no longer gratifies the corresponding need. Moreover, it becomes even difficult to carry out the given activity which has lost its attraction as a process. Gratification of functional or some other need in the course of activity changes the subjective value of behavior to such an extent that it might be terminated and replaced by some other behavior. But, in most cases, a person does not terminate the behavior and completes it. He/she is not a hostage of the changes in the mechanics of motivational forces. The human being is able to control and adjust these processes. This is where voluntary self-regulation or the self regulation on the personality level manifests itself [11].

The changes in the composition of the needs pertinent to a specific behavior are not limited to quantitative transformations, only. Quite often, polymotivational system transforms in such a way

that its quantitative composition remains unchanged. In like cases the configuration, relative strength and importance of its components undergoes changes. Some needs become less dominant, move to the periphery and develop into secondary, subordinated needs.

What has been said above refers to polymotivation understood as the motivation of behavior by several needs. This case has to be clearly distinguished from another instance, in which the person simultaneously performs several behaviors. The latter case could be regarded as an example of polymotivation to a certain extent, because it implies the activation of several needs during a certain period of time, but the difference is that these needs are satisfied through different behaviors. If we take into consideration the fact that the behaviors in question can also have several motives, the situation will become even more complex. But this is what reality is and it is impossible to produce a comprehensive descriptive model without taking this into consideration. It is definitely true that in a certain segment of his/her life, the individual exists within the space of more than one behavior. At the given point, the analysis of the polymotivation phenomenon transcends an individual behavior and comes to new reality – the level of hierarchical organization of simultaneously performed behaviors. A simple example from everyday life can illustrate this behavioral reality. Suppose a person is going to a concert with his/her colleague. At the same time, he/she is discussing an important scientific problem and smoking a cigarette. It is clear that all these behaviors (going to a concert, scientific dispute, smoking a cigarette), apart from their own operational system, have their own motivational system too. They are aroused by different needs which creates a complex, polimotivational activity.

Polymotivation and the simultaneous performance of different behaviors are common phenomena. For this reason, their description is quite an important task. At the next stage, the described

phenomena have to be analyzed within the framework of an explanatory model which enables us to understand the mechanism of performing a behavior. Here, interpretations might differ according to the principles of the general psychological theory applied. The most important point is how the theory understands the mechanism integrating behavioral factors. If we follow

D. Uznadze's theory, the mechanism determining the purposeful performance of polymotivated behavior is set, understood as the integral state of the subject of the given activity formed on the basis of all the behavioral factors (including motivational ones) [12].

ფსიქოლოგია

ქცევის პოლიმოტივაციის დინამიკური მოდელი

ი. იმედაძე

აკადემიის წევრი, საქართველოს მეცნიერებათა ეროვნული აკადემია, ივანე ჯავახიშვილის თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი, თბილისი, საქართველო

პოლიმოტივაციის მოვლენა აქტივობის ერთზე მეტი მოთხოვნილებით აღმგრაში მდგომარეობს. ეს ფენომენი თავის ახსნას ნახულობს ადამიანის მოთხოვნილებათა სფეროს მრავალფეროვნებასა და მის ბუნებრივ ტენდენციაში, მაქსიმალურად გამოიყენოს ქცევითი რესურსები რაც შეიძლება მეტი მოთხოვნილების დაკმაყოფილებისთვის. ამიტომ პოლიმოტივაციის მოვლენა ერთობ გავრცელებულია, თუმცა ძალზე ცუდად გამოკვლეული თეორიულად და ემპირიულად. ადამიანის ქცევის ყველა შედარებით რთული ფორმა ფაქტობრივად მოთხოვნილებათა სისტემით აღიძვრება. ზოგიერთი მოთხოვნილება მეტ-ნაკლებად მჭიდროდ არის დაკავშირებული მოცემული ქცევის პროცესთან ან შედეგთან (შინაგანი მოტივაცია), სხვა შემთხვევაში – არა (გარეგანი მოტივაცია). ზოგიერთი მოთხოვნილება არ არის „მიზნული“ რაიმე კონკრეტულ სპეციფიკურ ქცევაზე (მაგალითად, მიღწევის, პრესტიჟის, ავილაციის, თვითაქტუალიზაციის და ა.შ. მოთხოვნილებები). ეს პიროვნების მუდმივმოქმედი მოტივატორები სხვადასხვა ქცევებში ნახულობენ რეალიზაციას და ქმნიან მოთხოვნილებათა სისტემებს, ანსამზლებს. პოლიმოტივაციური სისტემის სტრუქტურა დინამიკურია. ქცევის მსვლელობაში იგი მუდმივ ტრანსფორმაციას განიცდის. სისტემაში შემავალი ზოგიერთი მოთხოვნილება კმაყოფილდება, ზოგიერთი პირიქით – ძლიერდება. შესაძლებელია მიმდინარე ქცევის პოლიმოტივაციურ სისტემაში ჩაერთოს სხვა ახალი მოთხოვნილება, შეიცვლოს სისტემის მდგენელთა კონფიგურაცია, იერარქიული წყობა და ა.შ. ეს ყოველივე აისახება, როგორც აქტივობის დინამიკაზე, ისე მის შინაარსზე.

REFERENCES

1. Ilin E. P. (2006) *Motivatsia i motiv*. SPb. (in Russian).
2. Leontiev D. A. (1999) *Psikhologija smisla*. M. (in Russian).
3. Nutten J. (1981) *Motivation, planning and action: a relational theory of behavior dynamics*. Leuven University Press, Leuven.
4. Vilunas V. K. (1990) *Psikhologicheskie mekhanizmi motivatsii cheloveka*. M. (in Russian).
5. Murray H. A. (2007) *Explorations in personality*. Oxford University Press, New York.
6. Deci E. L. (1975) *Intrinsic motivation*. Plenum, New York.
7. Heckhausen J., Heckhausen H. (2008) *Motivation and action*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
8. Imedadze I. V. (1991) *Kategoriia povedeniia v teorii ustanovki*. Tbilisi (in Russian).
9. Uznadze D. N. (2003) *The forms of human behavior*. In: D. Uznadze – *Psychology of child*. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
10. Festinger L. (1964) *Conflict, decision and dissonance*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
11. Ryan R. M., Deci E. L. (2017) *Self-determination theory. Basic psychological needs in motivation, development and wellness*. Guilford, New York.
12. Uznadze D. N. (1966) *The psychology of set*. Consultants Bureau, New York.

Received February, 2020