

MOTIVATIONAL DYNAMICS OF INTERNAL AUDITOR'S MANAGERS: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE OF IRAN

Mahdi Salehi*, **Mehrdad Yahyavi****, **Mehrdad Alipour*****

Abstract

Internal auditors play critical roles in any company. The managers of such departments should managed subordinates so well. To happening this condition at first the managers motivations should be recognized and neither satisfied otherwise nether managers nor subordinates practice auditing well. The results of this study show some high rated areas of internal audit departments' managers' motivation.

Keywords: Internal auditors, Motivation, Iran

* (Corresponding author). Assistant Prof. Department of Accounting and Management, Zanjan University, Iran

E-mail: Mahdi_salehi54@yahoo.com, Tel+989121425323

**Assistant Prof. Chahabhar International University, Iran

***Assistant Prof. Management Department, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University

Introduction

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

A manager, who creates trust and confidence in the minds of his subordinates, motivates his or her employees to be more trust-worthy, diligent, accountable and responsible. He or she wins their hearts and minds. This is what is required of motivation today. Development of trust and confidence building cannot be achieved within a short period of times. It is a constant and continuous process of creating a climate of trust and confidence among the subordinates. A manager needs to possess qualities like accountability, trustworthiness, consistency, constructive behaviour, genuine motive, ideal foresight, flexibility, evenhandedness, competence, communication skill, appreciating mindset, commitment and thoughtfulness etc., in order to win over his subordinates. What constitutes a manager is very succinctly brought out by Monappa and Saiyadain (2003) in the following words: "The term, 'manager' is a wide one. Most people are

managers in a general sense. Anyone trying to achieve a goal through the efforts of others is a manager. A manager is defined as one holding a managerial position in the organization. A manager is the principal factor in determining the productivity of the workforce. The viability of business organizations and consequently the economic well being of a nation depends to a large extent on the efforts of the managerial class. The effective manager is one who is properly developed in terms of basic intellectual abilities and the predispositions necessary for carrying out the task smoothly." Further, Hoven (1982) observes: "People's needs, values and expectations change with the conditions around them. What will remain crucial at all times is that managing will always be a human activity and thus ultimately influenced by the interplay of human forces." Changing the work-related needs, motives, aspirations, beliefs and values of managerial group in an organization is a daunting challenge. Managers at different levels work for a wide variety of various reasons. Even managers within the same culture or organization have a wide array of needs, motives and aspirations. Some managers want money, some want challenge and some want power. What each unique manager in an organization wants from work plays an instrumental role in determining his or her motivation to work. Motivation is vital to all types of organization. Often the difference between highly effective organizations and less effective ones lies in the motivation of their managers.

Internal Auditing: An Historical Perspective

The demand for both external and internal auditing is sourced in the need to have some means of independent verification to reduce record-keeping

errors, asset misappropriation, and fraud within business and non-business organizations. The roots of auditing, in general, are intuitively described by accounting historian Brown (1905), as follows: “The origin of auditing goes back to times scarcely less remote than that of accounting. Whenever the advance of civilization brought about the necessity of one man being intrusted to some extent with the property of another, the advisability of some kind of check upon the fidelity of the former would become apparent.” As far back as 4000 B.C., historians believe, formal record-keeping systems were first instituted by organized businesses and governments in the Near East to allay their concerns about correctly accounting for receipts and disbursements and collecting taxes. Similar developments occurred with respect to the Zhao dynasty in China (1122-256 B.C.). The need for and indications of audits can be traced back to public finance systems in Babylonia, Greece, the Roman Empire, the City States of Italy, etc., all of which developed a detailed system of checks and counterchecks (Salehi, 2008). Specifically, these governments were worried about incompetent officials prone to making bookkeeping errors and inaccuracies as well as corrupt officials who were motivated to perpetrate fraud whenever the opportunity arose. Even the Bible explains the basic rationale for instituting controls rather straightforwardly: “...if employees have an opportunity to steal they may take advantage of it.” The Bible also contains examples of internal controls such as the dangers of dual custody of assets, the need for competent and honest employees, restricted access, and segregation of duties (O’Reilly et al., 1998). Historically then, the emergence of double-entry bookkeeping in circa 1494 A.D. can be directly traced to the critical need for exercising stewardship and control. Throughout European history, for instance, fraud cases — such as the South Sea bubble of the 18th century, and the tulip scandal provided the justification for exercising more control over managers.

Within a span of a couple of centuries, the European systems of bookkeeping and auditing were introduced into the United States. As business activities grew in size, scope, and complexity, a critical need for a separate internal assurance function that would verify the information used for decision-making by management emerged. Management needed some means of evaluating not only the efficiency of work performed for the business but also the honesty of its employees. Around the turn of the 20th century, the establishment of a formal internal audit function to which these responsibilities could be delegated was seen as the logical answer. In due course, the internal audit function became responsible for “careful collection and interpretive reporting of selected business facts” to enable management to keep track of significant business developments, activities, and results from diverse and voluminous transactions (Mautz, 1964). Companies in the railroad, defense, and

retail industries had long recognized the value of internal audit services, going far beyond financial statement auditing and devoted to furnishing reliable operating reports containing nonfinancial data such as “quantities of parts in short supply, adherence to schedules, and quality of the product” (Whittington & Pany, 1998). Similarly, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) and numerous State Auditors’ Offices, for instance, the State of Ohio Auditors’ Office, have traditionally employed large numbers of internal auditors.

In sum, the collective effect of growing transaction complexity and volume, the owner/manager’s (“principals”) remoteness from the source of transactions and potential bias of reporting parties (“agents”), technical (accounting) expertise required to review and summarize business activities in a meaningful way, need for organizational status to ensure independence and objectivity, as well as the procedural discipline necessary for being the “eyes and ears” of management all contributed to the creation of an internal audit department within business organizations. Starting as an internal business function primarily focused on protection against payroll fraud, loss of cash, and other assets, internal audit’s scope was quickly extended to the verification of almost all financial transactions, and still later, gradually moved from an “audit for management” emphasis to an “audit of management” approach (Reeve, 1986).

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

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

The National Industrial Conference Board underscored the importance of internal auditing thus (Walsh, 1963): “The widening gap between management and action has made it necessary to develop a series of controls by means of which the business may be administered efficiently.

The internal auditor perfects and completes each of these activities by providing on-the-scene appraisal of each form of control. There is no known substitute for this activity.”

By 1957, the *Statement of Responsibilities of Internal Auditing* had been considerably broadened to include numerous services to management, such as:

1. Reviewing and appraising the soundness, adequacy, and application of accounting, financial, and operating controls.
2. Ascertaining the extent of compliance with established policies, plans, and procedures.
3. Ascertaining the extent to which company assets are accounted for, and safeguarded from, losses of all kinds.
4. Ascertaining the reliability of accounting and other data developed within the organization.
5. Appraising the quality of performance in carrying out assigned responsibilities.

There was no doubt that, by the late 1970s, the field of internal auditing had earned the right to be called a “full-fledged profession,” even using Carey’s (1969) seven, fairly stringent qualifying conditions for a “profession.” Sometime after 1974, when the Certified Internal Auditor (CIA) exam was sponsored by The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA), internal auditing had a sufficiently respectable profile and merited being called an established profession because: it had a body of specialized knowledge, a formal educational process (a minimum prescribed course of formal education), standards governing admission as a full member of The IIA (prescribed course of study, passing CIA exam, professional experience requirements, and the *Standards*), a Code of Ethics (first approved in 1968), a recognized status indicated by a license or special designation (the CIA, or the MIIA, recognized in several jurisdictions worldwide), a public interest in the work that the practitioners perform (perhaps more evident in the work performed by internal auditors in government, education, and nonprofit organizations rather than in the private sector), and a recognition by professionals of a social obligation (again, perhaps more evident in government, education, and nonprofit organizations).

Ratliff & Reding (2002, p. xi) capture the expanded responsibilities and skill-set of the 21st century auditor as follows:

“Auditors of the 21st century must be prepared to ‘audit’ virtually everything operations (including control systems), performance, information and information systems, legal compliance, financial

statements, fraud, environmental reporting and performance, and quality. Auditors must master:

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

Nature and Concept of Motivation

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

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

Table 1. Synonyms of Motivation

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

Source: Institute of Manpower Studies (1988).

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

According to Berelson and Steiner (1964), "Motivation refers to all those inner striving conditions, which have been described as wishes, desires, drives, etc. It is an inner state, which activates or moves." In the words of Hodge and Johnson (1970), "Motivation in organizational settings refers to the willingness of an individual to react to organizational requirements in the short run." The dynamic forces, which actuate the individual, may also be explained as motivation. It is the drive to reduce tension caused by an unsatisfied need (Klatt: 1978). Putti (1981) observed that motivation means different things to different individuals. For some, it may be an incentive and for others a psychological backing or setting a good example and it is the act of inducing an individual or oneself to follow a desired course of action.

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

Goleman (1998) observes: "Motivation is a passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status and also means a propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence. The hallmarks of these definitions are strong drive to achieve optimism even in the face of failure and organizational commitment." According to Cummings and Elsalmi (1968), "Motivation has been defined in terms of 'need satisfaction', that is, the needs that employees seek to satisfy on their jobs, the manner in which they perceive their work environment as satisfying or dissatisfying." Miller et al., (1996) observe: "Motivation is an internal process through which human wants, needs and desires are satisfied. Each person is unique and possesses different attitudes, experiences and opinion."

Jones (1955) states that "Motivation is concerned with how behaviour gets started, is energized, is


sustained, is directed, is stopped, and what kind of subjective reaction is present in the organism while all this is going on." According to Gray and Starke (1988), "Motivation is the result of processes, internal or external to the individual that arouse enthusiasm and persistence to pursue a certain course of action." Luthans (1989) describes motivation as "...a process that starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates behaviour or a drive that is aimed at a goal or incentive." Steers and Porter (1991) define the term as "...the set of forces that causes people to engage in behaviour rather than some alternative behaviour." Chandan (1997) observes: "People differ by nature, not only in their ability to perform a specific task but also in their will to do so. This "will" to do is known as motivation. The force of motivation is a dynamic force, setting a person into motion or action."

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

Allan (2001) states: "To motivate means to encourage, influence, inspire and stimulate people, providing them with a reason for working well and to make people feel that they want to work, making them feels good about the work that they are doing. In simple terms, motivation is the force that drives people to do things." Motivation in an organization is the willingness of an employee to respond to organizational requirements. The more positive the individual's motivation towards the organization, the more effective is his performance. His motivation to a large extent is determined by his perception. Motivation refers to the propensity towards a particular behaviour pattern to satisfy a need or deficiency."

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

Table 2. Basic motivational framework



Source: Moorhead and Griffin (1999).

Importance of Motivation

Interest on motivation in work organizations has escalated dramatically in recent years. Steers and Porter (1975) observe that several factors appear to account for the prominence of this topic as a focal point of interest. The increased attention towards motivation is justified by several reasons. In this regard, Gray and Starke (1988) state: “Motivated employees are always looking for better ways to do a job. A motivated employee generally is more quality oriented. Highly motivated workers are more productive than apathetic workers. The high productivity of Japanese workers is attributable to many reasons but motivation is the main factor.” Motivation is considered as one of the most important aspects of actuating because it is motivation that energizes the behaviour of people while behaviour activates action and action leads to actuation. Michael (2001) observes: “Motivation is a set of processes concerned with the force that energizes behaviour and directs it toward attaining some goal. It is the need that leads to motives resulting in motivation. The terms like wants, needs, desires, wishes, aims, goals, drives and motives are related to motivation. The relationship between needs drives and goals can make an integral part of motivation. Motivation implies a goal toward, which the movement occurs; it means that motivation causes action. Needs are synonymous with wants, motives or impulses, which result in action while a drive is a force that affects a situation by pushing on a specific direction. Goals on the other hand are ultimate objectives for the achievement of which behaviour and action are directed. Motivation may include any inner condition of the person that initiates or directs his behaviour towards a particular goal. The motivation can be defined as the inner drive of a person, which energizes his action for the achievement of certain goals for the satisfaction of the given wants or needs. Motivation can have one or more motives backed by needs and wants with an internal drive to act. It is related to behaviour on the one hand and action on the other and is a moving or guiding force.”

The importance of motivation of managerial group cannot be over-emphasized. The success of an organization depends considerably upon the level of motivation of its managers. A highly motivated managerial group can help the organization sustain

even the worst type of environmental conditions. On the other hand, the success of an organization’s business strategy might be jeopardized if the managers of the organization are not motivated individuals. Each person is different. Each situation is disparate. Each solution must be carefully crafted. Any problem, which stems from lack of commitment, enthusiasm and concern, can only successfully be addressed by providing motivation. Ghosh and Ghorpade (1997) state: “Motivation is the ultimate test of effectiveness of industrial and business organizations because it directly relates to the results achieved. Looking at it from a broader perspective, work motivation of employees in the organization ultimately determines the state of the national economy, as it is an aggregate of unit organizational performance, which determines the national economy.” Work effective managers are concerned about motivation, because the work motives of employees affect their productivity and quality of their work (Chandan: 1997) through the mid-1970s the term motivation was mentioned 611 times compared with 860 times for leadership in twenty-eight management textbooks (Aronoff: 1975).

The Problem of the Study

Motivational dynamics is the key catalyst for economic success of a nation. Motivation is indeed the life force, the muscle and drive of any business organization. Further, the social economic scenario is changing fast with macro economic reforms sweeping across the countries. There is an imminent pressure for success mainly through the philosophy of working harder. The main trends of downsizing and mergers demand new approaches, work norms and different mindsets in employees. As a result, the role of managers has significantly increased in managing the people to meet the organizational goals. Quite often, the management concentrates on quality control, research and development, marketing strategies, technical knowledge, expertise, organizational structures, operational systems and tools, motivation of its employees and virtually ignores the motivation of managers at different levels either deliberately or through a lack of complete awareness. Further, it is not only important that the workers are to be motivated, but also there is a need for motivating the managers, who play a pivotal role in any organization. In this regard, Pestonjee and Basu (1972) observe: “The

problem of executive motivation assumes significance because management mainly deals with men and modern business consists of about 85 percent men, 10 percent material and 5 percent money.” Leaving apart the problem of motivating the managers themselves, they also have one of the hardest jobs dealing with people. Although working with people can be enjoyable, it does have its drawbacks. Knowing how to motivate employees is a fundamental asset for managers to possess. Because each individual is different, discovering the right motivation tactic becomes a tough task to undertake. In other words, the challenge lies in motivating the managers, who in turn have to motivate the managed. These managers have to work in this twin role under fast changing environmental surroundings. In this regard, Cofer and Appley (1964) state: “The changing environmental conditions make the motivational issues and problems even more complex and pragmatic. No matter where we begin the study of psychological processes or phenomena, we must sooner or later deal with the problem of motivation.” At present, the motivational dynamics has drifted from job security of 1940s and 1950s to the interesting and challenging job in recent year on one hand and from emphasis given to already satisfied needs to the unsatisfied needs on the other. The problem at present in motivational dynamics revolves around the leverage effect of interesting and challenging job and meeting the dissatisfied needs.

Research methodology

The present study is essentially based on sample survey of selected companies which had internal audit department. According to the above literature and the objective of this study the useful data was collected. So far finding motivation dimensions, the authors design and developed a questionnaire based on method used in previous researchers. The questionnaire contains two parts namely (A) bio-data and (B) this section includes some questions regarding to factors affecting to internal auditor’s managers motivation. The data was collated and interpreted by adopting SPSS package. The study was carried out by adopting relevant statistical techniques, which consisted of mean value, standard deviation, frequency analysis.

180 respondents were completed the research questionnaires. According to Table 3, out of 180 participants 55 were male (30.60 percent) and 125 were female (69.4 percent). Further, 135 participants were younger than 40 (75.00 percent) and 45 participants elder than 40 (25percent). Among these 52.50 percent had less than one year experience, 36 percent had experience between 10 to 20 years and 21.50 percent had more than 20 years experience.

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

Table 3. Frequency table of participant

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

Analysis and Results

The empirical study begins with a comprehensive analysis, which includes the perception of 180 respondents on the level of motivation prevalent and the expected level of motivation covering the ten variables used in the study. These ten variables include benefits, pay, reward, friendly co-workers, friendly management and supervision, good working environment, interesting and challenging job, job

security, opportunity for power and promotion. The comprehensive analysis has been presented under (i) Actual Level of Motivation; (ii) Expected Level of Motivation; (iii) Motivational Gap; and (iv) Comparison with Maslow’s Needs Priority.

(i) Actual Level of Motivation:

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

substantially higher level of motivation with the standard deviation of 0.65.

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

Table 4. Actual Level of Motivation

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

Note: Figures in brackets indicate percentages.

Table 5. Overall Mean Value Difference Analysis: Actual Level

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

This motivational level was found to be very much influenced by friendly co-workers; opportunity for power; interesting and challenging job; working environment; and friendly management and

supervision and the respective mean values were found to be 2.91, 2.88, 2.83, 2.76 and 2.57. However, the influence of job security, reward, promotion, pay and benefits on motivational level achieved in the selected

units was found to be low at 2.46, 2.07, 2.06, 2.05 and 2.04 respectively. The most significant factor influencing the motivational level was found to be friendly co-workers having the mean value of 2.91 with standard deviation of 0.35 as against benefits variable acting as a motivational factor having the mean value of 2.04 with the standard deviation of 0.83. It was also interesting to note that the non-monetary variables influenced more significantly than the monetary variables and the respective overall mean value of these two groups of variables stood at 2.79 and 2.46 respectively as revealed in Table 5.

(ii) Expected Level of Motivation:

Table 6 highlights the extent to which these ten variables should be reoriented to achieve the desired motivational level. The overall expected level was found to be 2.83 with the standard deviation of 0.45 both revealing a highly focused perception by the respondents. The expectation level was found to be the highest regarding working environment, which had a mean value of 2.95 with the standard deviation of 0.29.

Table 6. Expected Level of Motivation

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

Note: Figures in brackets indicate percentages.

Table 7. Overall Mean Value Difference Analysis: Expected Level

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

The lowest expectation was found in job security, which had a mean value of 2.64 and the standard deviation of 0.67. The higher expectations were found to be in working environment, which was followed by friendly co-workers, opportunity for power, interesting and challenging job and reward with the mean values of 2.94, 2.90, 2.89 and 2.86 respectively. It was also observed that the above variables had higher level of concentrated opinion as observed from standard deviations. Further, Table 7 presents the expected level of motivation from the viewpoint of average mean value with higher averages and low averages. It was evident that the expectation from non-monetary variables and monetary variables stood at 2.91 and 2.75 respectively in comparison with the overall mean value of 2.83. In other words, more weightage was given to non-monetary variables in leveraging the motivational level when compared to monetary variables.

(iii) Motivational Gap:

An extension of analysis of actual and expected motivational level has been the analysis of the gap

between the above two. Table 8 presents the motivational gap between the actual and the expected levels. The overall gap between the actual and the expected levels stood at 0.37 from the viewpoint of mean value. In other words, the gap in motivational level stood at 15.04 percent from the actual level. From the viewpoint of gap in different variables, it was observed that the highest gap was found to be in the reward with the value of 0.79, which was followed by the gaps of 0.75, 0.75 and 0.69 in case of promotion, benefits and pay respectively. Smaller gaps were found in case of friendly management and supervision; working environment; job security; interesting and challenging job; friendly co-workers and opportunity for power with the respective gaps standing at 0.21, 0.19, 0.18, 0.06, 0.03 and 0.02. To conclude, the respondents expected more from the monetary factors. The expectation gaps from non-monetary factors were found to be low and it seemed that they were not very much fulfilled already to a substantial level or the respondents were not concerned very much.

Table 8. Motivational Gap

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

(iv) Comparison with Maslow’s Needs Priority

Another dimension of the study is a comparison of needs priority developed by Maslow with the empirical results of the present study. Table 9 presents the comparative analysis of actual level and expected level of motivation in the background of Maslow’s needs priority. The motivational level was found to be highly influenced by social needs having the mean value of 2.74 and the standard deviation of 0.50. This was followed by esteem needs, self-actualization needs, physiological needs and security needs. In other words, the security needs, physiological needs and self-actualization needs were found to be highly dissatisfied and they acted as deterrent to motivation level. According to Maslow, the lower level needs

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

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

Table 9. Comparison With Maslow's Needs Priority

(A) Actual Level	Mean	SD	Rank	Maslow's Rating
Social Needs				
Friendly management and supervision	2.57	0.65		
Friendly co-workers	2.91	0.35		
Overall	2.74	0.50	1	3
Esteem Needs				
Reward	2.07	0.86		
Opportunity for power	2.88	0.38		
Overall	2.48	0.62	2	4
Self-Actualization Needs				
Interesting and challenging job	2.83	0.48		
Promotion	2.06	0.82		
Overall	2.45	0.65	3	5
Physiological Needs				
Pay	2.05	0.83		
Working environment	2.76	0.56		
Overall	2.41	0.70	4	1
Security Needs				
Job Security	2.46	0.76		
Benefits	2.04	0.83		
Overall	2.25	0.80	5	2
(B) Expected Level				
Self-Actualization Needs				
Interesting and challenging job	2.94	0.26		
Promotion	2.93	0.26		
Overall	2.94	0.26	1	5
Social Needs				
Friendly management and supervision	2.75	0.59		
Friendly co-workers	3.00	0.00		
Overall	2.88	0.30	2	3
Esteem Needs				
Reward	2.86	0.45		
Opportunity for power	2.90	0.31		
Overall	2.88	0.38	3	4
Physiological Needs				
Pay	2.79	0.57		
Working environment	2.95	0.38		
Overall	2.87	0.48	4	1
Security Needs				
Job Security	2.89	0.31		
Benefits	2.68	0.61		
Overall	2.79	0.46	5	2

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

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

Conclusion

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

The highest level of expectation was from working environment and the mean value stood at 2.95 as against the lowest expectation from job security having the mean value of 2.64.

The expectation levels were found to be low in case of pay, friendly management and supervision, benefits and promotion and their respective mean values stood at 2.64, 2.74, 2.78 and 2.79.

The higher expectations were found in non-monetary needs than in monetary needs with the exception of friendly management and supervision and the respective group mean values stood at 2.91 and 2.75. In other words, the respondents did not expect much from most of the monetary needs even though they were dissatisfied with these monetary needs.

The overall gap between expected and actual levels of motivation stood at 0.37. The highest gap was found in case of reward with the gap of 0.79, which was followed by benefits, promotion and pay with the respective mean value gaps standing at 0.75, 0.75 and 0.69. The higher gaps were found more in case of monetary factors with 0.75 than in case of non-monetary factors with 0.12. When rating was applied in the context of Maslow's needs priority, the highest level of motivation was found to be in social needs with the mean value of 2.74 and the self-actualization needs were found to have the highest expectation having the mean value of 2.94. In sum, the results of this study showed some motivational weakness in internal audit departments in Iran. The authors believe that from any aspects internal audit departments should satisfied different motivation of managers, further chief executive managers should seriously followed this department motivation.

References

1. Allan, John., (2001). *How to be Better at Motivating People*, New Delhi: Kogan Page India Private Limited, p.15.
2. Aronoff, C., (1975). *The Rise of the Behavioural Perspective in Selected General Management Textbooks: An Empirical Investigation through Content Analysis*, Academy of Management Journal, 18, no.4.
3. Bedeian, A.G., (1993). *Management*, Third Edition, New York: Dryden Press.
4. Berelson, Bernard., and Gary A. Steiner (1964). *Human Behaviour: An Inventory of Scientific Findings*, New York: Harcourt Brace and World, p. 240.
5. Brink, V.Z., and J.A. Cashin (1958), *Internal Auditing* (New York: Ronald Press).
6. Brown, D. and Mendenhall, S. (1995), Stress and components of the internal auditor's job, *Internal Auditing*, Vol. 10, Winter, pp. 31-9.
7. Brown, Richard A., (1905). *History of Accounting and Accountant* (Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, 1905).
8. Buford, J.A., Jr., A.G. Bedeian and J.R. Lindner (1995). *Management in Extension*, Third Edition, Ohio: Ohio State University Extension.
9. Carey, J.L., (1969). *The Rise of the Accounting Profession: From Technician to Professional* (New York: American Institute of Certified Public Accountants,
10. Chandan, J.S., (1997). *Management: Concepts and Strategies*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., p.326.
11. Cofer, C.N., and M.H. Appley (1964). *Motivation Theory and Practice*, New York: John Wiley, p.1.
12. Cummings, L.L., and A.M. Elsalmi (1968). *Empirical Research on the Bosses and Correlates of Managerial Motivation: A Review of Literature*, Psychological Bulletin, vol.70, No.2, pp.127-144.
13. Ghosh, P.K., and M.B. Ghorpade (1997). *Industrial Psychology*, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House, p.279.
14. Goleman, Daniel., (1998). *What Makes a Leader?*, Harvard Business Review, Nov. – Dec., p. 92-102.
15. Gray, J.L., and F.A. Starke (1988). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts and Applications*, Columbus: Merrill Publishing Co., p.104.
16. Gray, J.L., and F.A. Starke (1988). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts and Applications*, Columbus: Merrill Publishing Co., p.104.
17. Higgins, J.M., (1994). *The Management Challenge*, Second Edition, New York: Macmillan.
18. Hodge, B.J., and H.J. Johnson (1970). *Management and Organizational Behaviour*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., p.195.
19. Hodgetts, R.M., (1977). *Introduction to Business*, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, p.168.
20. Institute of Manpower Studies (1988). *What Makes a Manager?*, New York: Institute of Manpower Studies, Quoted in Adair, John., (1996). *Effective Motivation: How to Get Extraordinary Results from Everyone*, New Delhi: Rupa and Co., pp. 9-11.
21. Jones, M.R., (1955). *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
22. Klatt, Lawrence A., (1978). *Human Resources Management: A Behavioural Systems Approach*, Illinois: Richard D Irwin, p. 30.
23. Kreitner, R., (1995). *Management*, Sixth Edition, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
24. Lillis, J.C., (1958). *Motivation: What Makes Sammy Run?*, Advanced Management Journal, pp.5-8.
25. Luthans, Fred., (1989). *Organizational Behaviour*, Second Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, p.231.
26. Mautz, R.K., *Fundamentals of Auditing*, 2nd Ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964).
27. Michael, V.P., (2001). *Human Resources Management and Human Relations*, Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House, pp. 17 & 21.
28. Miller, Donald S., Stephen E. Carr and James B. Carlson (1996). *Fundamentals of Management*, Cincinnati: South Western Publishing Company.
29. Moorhead and Griffin (1999). *Organizational Behaviour: Managing People and Organization*, Fifth Edition, Delhi: AITBS Publishers and Distributors, p. 119.
30. Moorhead, Gregory., and Ricky W. Griffin (1999). *Organizational Behaviour: Managing People and Organizations*, Fifth Edition, Delhi: AITBS Publishers and Distributors, p.119.

31. O'Reilly, V.M., P. McDonnell, B.N. Winograd, J.S. Gerson, and H.R. Jaenicke, *Montgomery's Auditing*, 12th Ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1998).
32. Pestonjee, D.M., and G. Basu (1972). *A Study of Job Motivation of Indian Executives*, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 8(1), pp. 3-16.
33. Putti, Joseph M., (1981). *The Essence of Management*, New Delhi: National Publishers, p. 186.
34. Ratliff, R.L., and K.F. Reding (20012). *Introduction to Auditing: Logic, Principles, and Techniques* (Altamonte Springs, FL: The Institute of Internal Auditors).
35. Reeve, John T., Internal Auditing, pp. 8-1 to 8-39. In Cashin, J.A., Neuwirth, P.D., and Levy, J.F. (eds.), *Cashin's Handbook for Auditors*, 2nd Ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1986).
36. Salehi, Mahdi (2008). Evolution of Accounting and Auditors in Iran, *Journal of Audit Practice*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 57-74.
37. Sears, B.P. (1992), Travel trauma, *Internal Auditor*, Vol. 49, June, pp. 53-8.
38. Stanley, Vance., (1959). *Industrial Administration*, p.159.
39. Steers, R.M., and L.W. Porter (1991). *Motivation and Work Behaviour*, Fifth Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill, pp.5-6.
40. Viteles, M.S., (1953). *Motivation and Morale in Industry*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, p.73.
41. Walsh, Jr., F.J., (1963). *Internal Auditing: Business Policy Study No. 111* (New York: National Industrial Conference Board.
42. Weaver, T., (1988). *Motivating with Money: Cornell Hotel & Restaurant*, Administration Quarterly, vol. 29, pp. 40-45.
43. Whittington, O.R., and K. Pany, *Principles of Auditing*, 12th Ed. (Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw Hill, 998).