

Analyzing Human Nature Assumptions Through “Hierarchical Balance Theory”

Authors: Gong Zhen, Gong Zhen

Date: 2024-10-07T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Human nature assumptions constitute the point of departure for all social sciences. Behind any theory or policy in management, economics, psychology, political science, or sociology, there must necessarily be a human nature assumption serving as its theoretical foundation. In his book *Organizational Psychology*, Edgar Schein classifies human nature assumptions into four categories: Economic Man, Social Man, Self-Actualizing Man, and Complex Man, which continue to be widely disseminated and applied as classical theories to this day. The basis of “human nature assumptions” must necessarily be the physiological and psychological needs common to all humanity; otherwise, they would become water without a source or a tree without roots. The author’s monograph *Research on Psychological Needs and Their Laws of Motion* (hereinafter referred to as *Xin*) proposes the “Theory of Need Motion,” a theory concerning the common needs of humanity and their laws of motion. The motion of needs is divided into two aspects: vertical and horizontal. The vertical law of motion refers to the law governing the movement of needs between higher and lower levels, termed the Hierarchical Convection Law; the horizontal law of motion refers to the law governing the movement of needs between positive and negative directions, termed the Need Balance Law. Therefore, the “Theory of Need Motion” is also called the “Theory of Need Hierarchy and Balance,” abbreviated as the “Hierarchical Balance Theory.” This paper employs the “Hierarchical Balance Theory” to analyze the four basic human nature assumptions, pointing out that the “Economic Man assumption” only sees external need-satisfaction factors while overlooking internal need satisfaction; the “Social Man assumption” confuses external satisfaction factors with internal need satisfaction and contains significant omissions in both vertical and horizontal need dimensions; “Self-Actualizing Man” does not exist; and the “Complex Man assumption” is tantamount to having no assumption at all. On this basis, this paper proposes the assumption of “Hierarchical Balance Man.”

Full Text

An Exploration of Human Nature Assumptions Through the “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory”

Gong Zhen

School of Business Administration, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510641, China

Abstract

Human nature assumptions constitute the foundational starting point for all social sciences. Every theory and policy in management, economics, psychology, politics, and sociology necessarily rests upon a particular assumption about human nature as its theoretical underpinning. In his *Organizational Psychology*, Edgar Schein classified human nature into four types: economic man, social man, self-actualizing man, and complex man—a framework that remains widely disseminated and applied as a classic theory today. Moreover, any valid human nature assumption must be grounded in universal human physiological and psychological needs; otherwise, it becomes like a river without a source or a tree without roots. In my monograph *Research on Psychological Needs and Their Motion Rules* (hereinafter referred to as *The Book*), I propose the “Motion of Needs Theory,” which addresses the universal needs of humanity and their patterns of movement. This motion operates along two dimensions: vertical and horizontal. The vertical motion rule governs movement between higher and lower levels of needs, termed the hierarchy convection rule, while the horizontal motion rule governs movement between positive and negative directions, termed the need equilibrium rule. Consequently, the “Motion of Needs Theory” is also called the “Hierarchy and Equilibrium of Needs Theory,” or simply the “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory.” This article employs the Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory to analyze these four fundamental human nature assumptions, arguing that the economic man assumption recognizes only extrinsic need-gratification factors while ignoring intrinsic need satisfaction; the social man assumption conflates extrinsic gratification factors with intrinsic need satisfaction and exhibits significant omissions in both vertical and horizontal dimensions; the self-actualizing man does not exist; and the complex man assumption amounts to no assumption at all. Building upon these critiques, this paper proposes the “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man” assumption.

Keywords: hierarchy and equilibrium theory, economic man, social man, complex man, hierarchy and equilibrium man

As Hume observed, “All sciences have a relation, greater or less, to human nature. Even mathematics, natural philosophy, and natural religion are in some measure dependent on the science of man.” [1] Douglas McGregor similarly noted: “The central problem of management is the understanding of human

nature, which forms the foundation for all management strategies and methods. Different assumptions about human nature inevitably lead to different management strategies and methods, which in turn affect employees' professional behavior and produce different management outcomes." [2] Human needs provide the basis for human nature assumptions. Maslow's hierarchy of needs represents the classic theory in this domain, with successive formulations proposing five, six, seven, and even eight levels [3]. Beyond the five-level version, Maslow never clarified whether the additional three levels could be integrated into his hierarchical system or how they should be sequenced, leading subsequent scholars to variously claim their interpretations as faithful to Maslow's original intent. *The Book* argues that while Maslow's initial contribution in establishing a hierarchical classification of human needs was monumental, his categorization was arbitrary, suffering from conflation, misalignment, omission, and inversion—problems that render many practical issues inexplicable and create theoretical contradictions. I propose methodological standards such as observation, inference, and experimentation to adjudicate need hierarchies, comprehensively reorganizing Maslow's various classifications by separating conflated levels, eliminating misaligned ones, adding omitted levels, and correcting inverted sequences. This establishes a new need hierarchy system encompassing both vertical levels and horizontal directions, distinguishes between need-gratification factors and need satisfaction itself, and proposes laws of needs motion including the hierarchy convection rule and its derivatives, as well as the need equilibrium rule [4]. Grounded in the Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory, this paper examines four widely disseminated human nature assumptions—economic man, social man, self-actualizing man, and complex man—from the perspectives of appearance versus essence, part versus whole, and the applicability of related management theories, ultimately proposing the "Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man" assumption.

1. The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory

1.1 "Needs" and Derived Concepts

Since the concept of "needs" emerged, numerous definitions have been proposed, yet none have penetrated to its essence. The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory defines needs as: the desire of a particular subject within an actor to achieve a specific comfortable state. Alternatively, it may be defined as: a specific comfortable state that a particular subject within an actor seeks to realize. This definition cuts through superficial appearances to reflect the deepest essential characteristics of "needs," applicable to all contexts and conditions.

The *subject* refers to the tissue or component within an actor's organism that generates desire. Research on needs must first clarify who is the subject and who is the object; who generates the need and who satisfies it. To date, nearly all scholars have treated the actor's entire organism as the subject. Statements such as "you need to wear clothes," "I need to eat," "he needs to drink water," "Zhang wants to play games," or "Li wants to become a manager" all conceptually

alize the actor's whole being as the need subject. Deeper analysis reveals that this perspective generates irresolvable contradictions. For instance, if Li suffers from stomach pain and cures himself through massage, both his hand and stomach are components of his organism. Treating Li's entire being as the "subject" eliminates the "object"—the subject both generates and satisfies its own needs without external factors. Just as perpetual motion machines cannot exist, the subject generating needs and the object satisfying them cannot be identical. This contradiction resolves when we recognize different components of the human organism as distinct subjects: Li's stomach generates the need, while his hand satisfies it. In contexts where precision is unnecessary, the actor's whole being may serve as a generalized subject. For example, when Zhang says, "I feel uncomfortable" without knowing exactly where, "I" (the actor's whole being) can serve as a generic subject. Similarly, "I need to eat" need not be specified as "my mouth and stomach need to eat." However, precise research on needs cannot rely on such generalizations.

State refers to the condition presented by a particular subject within an actor under the influence of external stimuli, measurable through physical, chemical, physiological, or psychological indicators. When a subject is in an uncomfortable state, it desires transformation into a comfortable state, thereby generating a need. For example, illness-induced suffering represents an uncomfortable state; eliminating illness represents a comfortable state; the desire to eliminate illness constitutes a need. Alternatively, achieving the state of illness elimination is the need. Hunger is an uncomfortable state; satiety is a comfortable state; the desire to eat constitutes a need. Boredom is an uncomfortable state; playing games is a comfortable state; the desire to play games constitutes a need. The distinction between state and need is that state represents an already realized condition, while need represents a not-yet-realized but pursued condition. When a particular state becomes what the subject seeks to achieve, it becomes a need.

1.2 The Needs Hierarchy System

The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory posits that the human organism contains six levels of subjects, from low to high: survival, sensation, cognition, identity, emotion, and value. These generate six corresponding levels of states and needs.

The *survival subject* comprises all components of the human organism except brain tissue. Survival state refers to the operational condition of the survival subject's metabolism, while survival need refers to the survival subject's desire to achieve its target metabolic state.

The *sensation subject* refers to brain tissue that directly receives and processes information uploaded from the survival subject, reflecting objective properties of things and generating corresponding sensory states. Examples include visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, and tactile subjects. The organs located in the head—eyes, ears, nose, tongue—are not brain tissue but belong to the survival subject. Sensation state is the feeling generated by the sensation subject during

its reflection of objective properties, while sensation need refers to the sensation subject's desire to achieve its target state.

The *cognition subject* refers to brain tissue that directly receives and processes information uploaded from the sensation subject, cognizing connections and characteristics of objective things and generating corresponding cognitive states. Cognitive state refers to the condition produced by the cognition subject during its reflection of objective characteristics and connections, while cognitive need refers to the cognition subject's desire to achieve its target state.

The *identity subject* (also called identity cognition subject) refers to brain tissue that directly receives and processes information uploaded from the cognition subject, cognizing relative role relationships between oneself and others and generating corresponding feeling states. All subjects above the cognition subject are cognitive subjects at different levels, differing only in their objects of cognition. Identity state (also called identity cognition state) refers to the feeling state produced by the identity subject during its cognition of relative role relationships between oneself and others, while identity need refers to the identity subject's desire to achieve its target state.

The *emotion subject* (also called emotion cognition subject) refers to brain tissue that directly receives and processes information uploaded from the identity subject, cognizing relative ideological and emotional relationships between oneself and others and generating corresponding emotional cognition states. Emotion state (also called emotion cognition state) refers to the feeling state produced by the emotion subject during its cognition of relative ideological and emotional relationships, while emotion need refers to the emotion subject's desire to achieve its target state.

The *value subject* (also called value cognition subject) refers to brain tissue that directly receives and processes information uploaded from the emotion subject, cognizing relative ideological and emotional relationships between oneself and society and generating corresponding feeling states. Value state (also called value cognition state) refers to the feeling state produced by the value subject during its cognition of relative ideological and emotional relationships with society, while value need refers to the value subject's desire to achieve its target state.

Beyond differing from Maslow's hierarchy, the Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory further proposes that each subject and each level possesses both positive and negative directional states. Positive states represent the subject's income or gain, while negative states represent expenditure or payment. Each subject constitutes a coordinated unity of income states and expenditure states. Each directional state is divided into five distinct intensity levels (see Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper]). Level, direction, and intensity together constitute the state hierarchy system. Since needs are states that subjects seek to achieve, the state hierarchy system is also called the needs hierarchy system. Due to space limitations, the process of reorganizing Maslow's hierarchy and 论证 the

new needs hierarchy system is omitted.

1.3 Laws of Needs Motion

(1) Law of Needs Hierarchy Interdependence

This law states that the existence and functional performance of higher-level subjects presuppose the existence and functional performance of lower-level subjects. In other words, lower-level subjects support higher-level subjects, which depend upon them. For example, if the survival subject ceases to exist or function, all higher-level subjects cannot exist or function. The same principle applies to other levels.

(2) Law of Needs Hierarchy Dominance

This law states that, provided lower-level subjects exist and can function, once higher-level subjects generate needs, they compel lower-level subjects to act to obtain gratification factors and satisfy their own needs. Whether lower-level needs are satisfied becomes subordinate to higher-level need satisfaction. In short, higher-level needs dominate lower-level needs, which obey higher-level needs.

(3) Law of Needs Hierarchy Convection

This law describes the cyclical movement of needs hierarchies from bottom to top and top to bottom. Specifically, when the comfort level of higher-level states falls below a certain threshold while that of lower-level states reaches a certain level, the needs hierarchy moves upward. Conversely, when the comfort level of lower-level states falls below a certain threshold while that of higher-level states reaches a certain level, the needs hierarchy moves downward.

(4) Law of Needs Equilibrium

This law states that when positive and negative states become imbalanced, the subject necessarily generates desire to restore equilibrium. If the intensity in one directional state exceeds that in the opposite direction, an equally intense state in the opposite direction becomes the pursued state—a need. The target state has equal absolute intensity but opposite sign to the counter-state. The formula is:

Target State Intensity = -Counter-state Achieved Intensity

Unsatisfied Intensity (State Imbalance Degree) = Target State Intensity - Same-direction Achieved Intensity

Target State Intensity = Same-direction Achieved Intensity + Unsatisfied Intensity

Thus, both positive and negative states can become “good states” or pursued states, and both can become “bad states” or avoided states, depending on whether intensity exceeds the appropriate range. States within the appropriate range are good; those exceeding it are bad. Balanced states are good; imbalanced states are bad.

(5) Law of Needs Hierarchy Convection

This law describes the cyclical movement of needs hierarchies from bottom to top and top to bottom. Once higher-level subjects generate needs, they dominate lower-level subjects to act and obtain gratification factors to satisfy themselves, causing upward movement. Once higher-level needs are satisfied, higher-level subjects relinquish dominance, allowing lower-level subjects to pursue their own need satisfaction, causing downward movement. This cycle continues like convection currents of hot and cold air. Maslow's hierarchy theory suggests humans pursue higher-level needs only after satisfying lower-level ones, reflecting only bottom-up movement without capturing top-down movement.

Needs between high and low levels constitute vertical needs; needs between positive and negative directions constitute horizontal needs. The hierarchy convection law reflects the motion pattern of vertical needs, while the needs equilibrium law reflects the motion pattern of horizontal needs.

1.4 Factors of Needs Generation and Gratification

All human needs arise under the influence of stimuli and are satisfied through stimuli. Based on the nature of stimulus effects, we can distinguish between needs generation factors and needs gratification factors.

(1) Needs Generation Factors

These are factors that cause subjects to deviate from target states, thereby triggering desire to achieve target states. By definition, needs generation factors possess two characteristics: first, they cause deviation from target states; second, they trigger desire to achieve target states—that is, they trigger needs. The first characteristic represents what has occurred; the second represents what is being pursued.

For the subject, stimuli causing deviation from target states must be passively endured. This yields the law for identifying needs generation factors: all factors passively endured by the subject are needs generation factors.

(2) Needs Gratification Factors

These are factors that push subjects toward target states. Needs gratification factors differ from needs generation factors. For example, hepatitis viruses are needs generation factors, while hepatitis medication is a needs gratification factor. Cold wind is a needs generation factor, while warm clothing is a needs gratification factor. Difficult games are needs generation factors, while gaming skills are needs gratification factors. Contempt from leaders and colleagues is a needs generation factor, while praise from them is a needs gratification factor. This yields the law for identifying needs gratification factors: all factors that subjects actively seek to obtain are needs gratification factors.

The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory reveals human nature and needs, serving as a comprehensive framework for examining various human nature assumptions.

2. Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory vs. “Economic Man”

Adam Smith, father of classical economics, posited “complete self-interest” as human nature and the basis for all behavior in his 1776 masterpiece *The Wealth of Nations* [5]. Subsequent economists developed the “economic man” hypothesis, which became the theoretical cornerstone of economics. The economic man is defined as one who maximizes economic benefit as the ultimate motive for all behavior. This assumption has generated longstanding controversies in both economics and management. In economics, the primary controversy is the “Smith Paradox.” In his other major work, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Smith argued that humans possess innate altruistic nature [6], which later economists summarized as the “moral man” hypothesis. The conflict between the self-interested economic man and the altruistic moral man created an inexplicable contradiction. My paper “Understanding ‘Unitary Nature’ and Resolving the ‘Smith Paradox’” demonstrates that humans possess only self-interested nature, not altruistic nature; that only the completely self-interested economic man exists, not the “completely altruistic” moral man, thereby proving the Smith Paradox nonexistent [7]. In management, Taylor’s scientific management theory, based on the economic man assumption, used economic benefits as the primary employee motivator. Critics argued that economic benefits were not the main driver of employee motivation. The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory contends that the economic man assumption’s primary flaw lies in conflating gratification factors with need satisfaction and mistaking appearance for essence.

In the economic man assumption, “economics” or “economic benefit” refers to wealth owned by humans, and economic activity refers to wealth creation, exchange, and distribution. According to the Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory, “economic benefit” or “wealth” constitutes external stimuli—needs gratification factors—that subjects at various levels use to achieve target states. Obtaining gratification factors is not the end; using them to achieve target states is. Acquiring external gratification factors does not equal achieving intrinsic need satisfaction. First, improper use of gratification factors can cause harm. At the survival level, food is a needs gratification factor, but overeating damages health. At the sensation level, sensual pleasures are gratification factors, but excessive indulgence harms sensation needs and even survival needs. At the cognition level, entertainment and games are gratification factors, but excess damages cognitive capacity. At the identity level, brand-name products, work performance, and honorary titles are gratification factors, but they can also provoke jealousy, slander, and attacks, harming identity need satisfaction. Second, wealth may attract others’ covetousness and even plunder, endangering personal safety. Third, in real society, phenomena of voluntarily abandoning economic benefits abound, such as donating to disaster areas, impoverished and vulnerable groups, or even wealthy individuals pledging to donate all their wealth—these aim to achieve higher-level, greater need satisfaction. Economic benefits are altruistic in means but self-interested in ends; appearance is al-

truistic while essence is self-interested. Ultimately, human nature is not about maximizing economic benefit acquisition but maximizing satisfaction at all need levels. Human nature assumptions should be based on intrinsic needs, yet the economic man assumption is based on needs gratification factors—seeing only external factors, not intrinsic needs; only appearances, not essence; only means, not motives. For a long time, scholars in economics, management, and other social sciences have questioned the economic man assumption, but having never addressed this fundamental issue, their critiques have missed the point.

3. Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory vs. “Social Man”

Between 1924 and 1932, Harvard professor George Elton Mayo conducted the famous Hawthorne Experiments at the Hawthorne Works in the United States. He discovered that working conditions, rest periods, and compensation were not primary factors affecting productivity; rather, relationships between management and employees and among employees themselves were the main factors. This led to the “social man” assumption—that employees pursue not only material benefit satisfaction but also social need satisfaction. Based on this assumption, Douglas McGregor proposed Theory Y, arguing that satisfying employees’ social needs was more effective for improving productivity than economic incentives. He advocated changing traditional economic incentive approaches, emphasizing the role of formal and informal organizations, and implementing emotional management, improving interpersonal relationships, and enhancing employees’ sense of respect, belonging, friendship, and social status as primary motivational methods. Applying the Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory reveals deficiencies in the social man assumption and its corresponding management theories.

3.1 Conflating Extrinsic Needs Gratification Factors with Intrinsic Needs

If the economic man’s primary problem is seeing only extrinsic needs gratification factors while ignoring intrinsic needs, the social man’s primary problem is conflating extrinsic gratification factors with intrinsic needs. The social man assumption holds that humans pursue not only income or material need satisfaction but also social needs such as friendship, respect, belonging, and social status. According to the Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory, “income” or “material benefits” are extrinsic needs gratification factors, while “friendship, respect, belonging, social status” are intrinsic needs. The former’s function is to satisfy the latter. For instance, the statement “humans pursue not only material needs like air, water, and food but also survival need satisfaction” is obviously wrong. Air, water, and food are not separate “needs” or “satisfactions” from survival; they are not an “not only...but also” relationship but rather a means-to-end relationship—a relationship between “use” and “satisfaction.” Similarly, “income” and “material benefits” serve as gratification factors for both lower and higher levels. As the ancient saying goes, “When granaries are full, people observe propriety; when clothing and food are sufficient, people know honor

and disgrace” (*Records of the Grand Historian: Biographies of Guan and Yan*). Without income and material factors, humans lack food, clothing, items for social reciprocity, objects to display status—not only failing to satisfy survival needs but also making it impossible to satisfy social needs like friendship, respect, belonging, and social status. By treating both “income,” “material factors,” and “social needs” as needs, the social man assumption confuses extrinsic gratification factors with intrinsic needs. In other words, the social man assumption is neither based on extrinsic gratification factors nor on intrinsic needs but rather conflates the two.

3.2 Incomplete Reflection of “Human Nature”

(1) Omission of Vertical Needs

The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory identifies six levels of subjects—survival, sensation, cognition, identity, emotion, and value—generating six levels of needs. The social man assumption includes only needs such as friendship, respect, belonging, and social status, covering at most the identity and emotion levels while omitting survival, sensation, cognition below and value above.

(2) Omission of Horizontal Needs

The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory posits that each level contains both positive and negative directional needs in dialectical unity. The social man assumption’s “respect” and “social status” represent positive “superior-position needs” at the identity level, excluding negative “inferior-position needs.” Its “friendship” and “belonging” represent positive “integration needs” at the emotion level, excluding negative “exclusion needs.”

3.3 One-Sidedness of Related Management Theories

The Hawthorne Experiments identified factors affecting employee work efficiency and proposed corresponding management theories. The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory clearly reveals the one-sidedness of these conclusions.

(1) Understanding Workplace Environment’s Impact on Efficiency Through the Law of Hierarchy Interdependence

The Hawthorne Experiments aimed to identify factors affecting employee efficiency, initially hypothesizing that workshop lighting brightness affected output. However, they found that output was influenced by interpersonal relationships rather than lighting brightness—only when lighting became too dim to see clearly did output significantly decline. This led to the conclusion that interpersonal relationships, not workplace environment, primarily affect efficiency. Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory analysis shows that while the experiments identified correct facts, they reached one-sided conclusions. The Law of Hierarchy Interdependence states that higher-level subjects’ existence and functioning depend on lower-level subjects’ existence and functioning. During production, sensation and cognition subjects must function. If lighting is too dim, lower-level visual subjects cannot function normally and cannot provide necessary

visual information to higher-level cognition subjects, preventing normal cognitive functioning and inevitably reducing productivity—regardless of how good interpersonal relationships are. If lighting brightness varies within a range that ensures normal visual functioning, cognition subjects can function normally, allowing higher-level interpersonal needs to become efficiency factors. Thus: when workplace environment can ensure normal lower-level functioning, higher-level interpersonal relationships have greater impact on efficiency; otherwise, workplace environment has greater impact.

(2) Understanding “Economic Benefits” Impact on Efficiency Through the Law of Hierarchy Dominance

“Economic benefits” are needs gratification factors that can satisfy both lower and higher levels. The Hawthorne Experiments directly equated “economic benefits” with lower-level physiological need satisfaction, concluding that interpersonal relationships affected efficiency more than economic benefits. They advocated changing traditional economic incentive methods and prioritizing improved employee relationships, enhanced respect, belonging, friendship, and social status as primary motivational methods. The Law of Hierarchy Dominance states that, provided lower-level subjects exist and function normally, higher-level subjects dominate lower-level subjects, which obey higher-level ones. Therefore, whether higher-level or lower-level need satisfaction has greater impact on efficiency depends on a fundamental premise: whether the “economic benefits” provided can ensure normal lower-level functioning. If not—if employees are starving, sweltering, freezing, ill, or homeless—productivity directly declines, and providing sufficient material benefits to ensure employees are fed, clothed, healthy, and sheltered becomes more important than improving interpersonal relationships. If yes, identity and emotion subjects at higher levels will dominate survival, sensation, and cognition subjects at lower levels to work diligently for their own need satisfaction, making interpersonal improvement more important than material benefits.

4. Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory vs. “Self-Actualizing Man”

In Maslow’s five-level hierarchy, “self-actualization” represents the highest level, leading scholars to propose the “self-actualizing man” assumption. Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory analysis reveals that “self-actualization” is purely fictitious both in name and content and should be eliminated from the needs hierarchy system.

4.1 Name Analysis of “Self-Actualization”

The English term “Self-actualized” can be decomposed into “self” and “actualized” for analysis.

(1) “Self”

“Self” means oneself or ego. Under this meaning, every level in Maslow’s hi-

erarchy represents “self’s” needs, not others’ needs. We could call them “self-physiological needs,” “self-safety needs,” “self-social needs,” “self-esteem needs,” “self-self-actualization needs,” etc. “Self” can apply to any level and cannot specify any particular level. If one level were named the “self level,” what would it refer to? Clearly, in defining levels, “self” is a redundant concept.

(2) “Actualized”

“Actualized” means realized or implemented, equivalent to “achieved” or “satisfied.” Satisfaction at any need level constitutes “actualization” at that level. For example, survival need satisfaction could be called “survival need actualization,” sensation need satisfaction “sensation need actualization,” etc. Like “self,” “actualization” can apply to any level and cannot specify any particular level. If a need level were named “actualization need,” what would it refer to? In defining levels, “actualization” is also redundant.

(3) “Self-Actualized”

“Self-actualized” means self-realization. Based on the above analysis, “self-actualization” can only mean “self-achievement,” “self-satisfaction,” or “satisfaction of one’s own needs” rather than others’ needs. It can apply to satisfaction at any need level, not specifying any particular level, let alone the highest level. In defining levels, both “self” and “actualization” are redundant and can be omitted; only the “ \times ” specifying the level cannot be omitted. If this “ \times ” is removed and a need level is named “self-actualization need,” what level does it refer to? It could be any level.

4.2 Content Analysis of “Self-Actualization”

Setting aside nomenclature, if Maslow and other scholars had assigned “self-actualization” unique content non-overlapping with other levels, it could be recognized as an independent need level despite poor naming. However, like its name, all content attributed to “self-actualization” by Maslow and others overlaps with other levels, containing nothing unique.

Maslow’s first sentence in the section “Self-Actualization and Beyond” states: “In this chapter I shall present a theory that is still far from proved, and that is offered not as a final statement but rather as a tentative formulation” [9]. After reviewing all related discussions in Maslow’s works, this assessment proves accurate. Maslow never defined any need level but only provided examples, leaving interpretation to readers—who understand them in vastly different ways. His example for “self-actualization” states: “A musician must make music, an artist must paint, a poet must write, if he is to be ultimately at peace with himself. What a man can be, he must be. He must be true to his own nature. This need we may call self-actualization” [10]. According to Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory, composing, painting, and poetry are merely needs gratification factors—means to satisfy needs—that can satisfy any need level, not specifying any particular level. People can sell music, paintings, or poems to satisfy survival and sensation needs; pursue them as hobbies to satisfy cognition needs;

gain praise and reputation to satisfy identity needs; or convey friendship and love to satisfy emotion needs. Workers working and farmers farming are essentially no different from composing, painting, or poetry—all can satisfy needs at various levels.

Maslow wrote: “The term ‘self-actualization’ was first coined by Kurt Goldstein. It is being used in this book in a much more specific and limited sense. It refers to the desire for self-fulfillment, namely, to the tendency for him to become actualized in what he is potentially” [11]. Developing talent and potential equals working hard—behavior and means to satisfy intrinsic needs that can satisfy any need level, not necessarily the highest. “The unique person” does not equal the highest-level person. “Fulfillment” is a synonym for “actualization” and “satisfaction.” Explaining “self-actualization” with “self-fulfillment” is tautological—equivalent to no explanation.

Chapter 11 of Maslow’s *Motivation and Personality* (3rd edition) enumerates 22 capacities or qualities of “self-actualizing people”: efficient perception of reality, acceptance, spontaneity, problem-centering, detachment, autonomy, continued freshness of appreciation, peak experiences, Gemeinschaftsgefühl (human kinship), humility and respect, interpersonal relations, ethics, means and ends, humor, creativity, resistance to enculturation, imperfections, values, resolution of dichotomies, etc. [12]. After reviewing this content and all other related discussions, readers inevitably find themselves in a fog, asking: What exactly does “self-actualization” mean? “There are a thousand Hamlets in a thousand people’s eyes.” Since “self-actualization” overlaps with all need levels, everyone labels their pursuits at any level—from low to high—as “self-actualization,” not specifying any particular level, let alone the highest.

5. Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory vs. “Complex Man”

In his 1965 *Organizational Psychology*, Edgar Schein argued that the first three assumptions were overly simple and one-sided, applicable only to certain people and situations, not all. He therefore proposed the “complex man assumption”—that humans possess complex needs or motivations—comprising two main points: first, at the same time, in the same environment, organization, and management system, each individual’s needs, motives, and responses differ; second, the same person has different needs, motives, and responses at different times, in different environments, organizations, and management systems. Any factor change produces enormous variation in human needs, motives, and responses. “Human needs vary with situations and times; they are diverse and constantly changing. Various needs and motives interact. Changing work and living conditions generate new needs and motives. Because people’s needs differ, they respond differently to different management methods” [13]. Most scholars accept this assumption as comprehensively explaining human needs and motives. I argue the complex man assumption has neither theoretical significance nor practical value.

5.1 No Theoretical Significance

Everything in the universe is complex—common knowledge since humanity’s emergence, not a new discovery or theory. If scientists proposed a “complex universe” assumption, astronomers a “complex heaven” assumption, geologists a “complex earth” assumption, physicists and chemists a “complex matter” assumption, biologists a “complex organism” assumption—would these constitute new theories? What would they discover, explain, or contribute to scientific research? Nothing! Similarly, when sociologists, psychologists, economists, and management scholars propose a “complex man” assumption, what does it explain or contribute to human nature research? Nothing! The complex man assumption equals no assumption.

Scholars’ task is not merely to note that studied phenomena are complex but to dissect complexity, revealing internal composition, essential attributes, and laws. Whether correct or not, assumptions like economic man, social man, and self-actualizing man represent efforts to identify graspable characteristics and patterns within complex human nature—to simplify the complex, clarify the vague, essentialize the superficial, and regularize the chaotic. The complex man assumption makes no such attempt, using the single word “complex” to solve all problems, thereby returning scholars’ efforts at simplification back to complexity. The complex man assumption provides a large basket into which all other scholars’ theoretical achievements, right or wrong, can be placed. It appears most comprehensive and correct—a treasure chest containing tools for every problem—but is actually a hodgepodge, a mishmash that solves nothing. Under its influence, a jungle of human nature assumptions has emerged. Discovering any psychological or behavioral phenomenon allows proposing an “ $\times\times$ man assumption,” with multiple possible combinations. Beyond economic man, social man, self-actualizing man, and complex man, we have knowledge man, decision man, culture man, autonomous man, concept man, realistic man, ecological man, tool man, contingency man, etc., with combinations creating even more “new men.” Two-way combinations include complex knowledge man, complex decision man, complex autonomous man, rational ecological man, rational concept man, autonomous realistic man, etc. Three-way combinations become even more complex. Theories based on superficial phenomena cannot constitute valuable scholarship. Scholars’ task is not to create jungles but to find paths out of them.

5.2 No Practical Value

Management theory based on the complex man assumption is contingency theory, which holds that management methods should be flexible and vary with time, place, and person—summarizable as two points: first, in the same time, environment, and organization, different individuals require different management systems and methods, meaning management must be individually customized for every employee, with as many management systems as employees. Second, the same person requires different management systems and methods at different

times, environments, and organizations, meaning even individually customized systems are unstable and short-lived. Any change in position requires new customized management; even without position changes, management systems must be periodically replaced. Schein states: “There is no universal management method applicable to any period, organization, or individual” [14]. This theory effectively negates the necessity and possibility of any management system or method. Can individually customized, constantly changing management systems and methods for every employee possibly exist? Can they be implemented? The answer is no.

6. Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory and “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man”

The human nature assumption compatible with Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory is “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man.”

6.1 “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man”

Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man refers to humans with multi-level needs and equilibrium needs at each level.

(1) Hierarchy Man

Humans possess six levels of subjects—survival, sensation, cognition, identity, emotion, and value—generating six levels of states and needs. However, specific individuals may not have all six levels. Based on each individual’s highest level, six types can be distinguished:

Survival Man refers to those with strong survival needs but weak or absent needs at sensation and higher levels. This includes two categories: first, those whose sensation and higher-level subjects exist but rarely function, such as religious ascetics who retreat to mountains, endure hardships, renounce all worldly pursuits, and even self-mutilate to demonstrate piety, willing to endure any suffering for longevity and afterlife happiness. Some may not retreat but remain indifferent to worldly affairs, desiring only longevity. Emperor Wu of Liang, Xiao Yan, was essentially a survival man—devoted to Buddhism, eating one simple meal daily, wearing coarse cloth, abstaining from sex, and despite being emperor, neglecting state affairs and repeatedly attempting to renounce his throne for monastic life. Second, those lacking or unable to normally function at sensation and higher levels due to congenital or acquired conditions, such as vegetative patients.

Sensation Man refers to those with strong sensation needs but weak or absent needs at cognition and higher levels. This includes those whose cognition and higher-level subjects exist but rarely function, such as alcoholics, drug addicts, or those obsessed with gastronomic and sexual pleasures without interest in anything else. It also includes those lacking or unable to normally function at cognition and higher levels due to congenital or acquired conditions, such as

cerebral palsy patients.

Cognition Man (also called Interest Man) refers to those with strong cognition needs but weak or absent needs at identity and higher levels. This includes those whose identity and higher-level subjects exist but rarely function, such as otaku and otome obsessed with mobile phones and games; those addicted to mahjong, chess, games, or cockfighting; or those fascinated by novelties without concern for worldly affairs (excluding those who make these activities their profession). This results from insufficient social education in their environment. It also includes “idiot savants” reported in media—individuals who have lost language and interpersonal abilities but possess unparalleled calculation, memory, or recognition abilities for specific things.

Identity Man refers to those with strong identity needs but weak emotion and higher-level needs. Identity man exhibits distinct positive superior-position needs and negative inferior-position needs. Regarding superior-position needs, they are extremely sensitive to respect expressed through others’ words, expressions, and behaviors in social interactions, readily engaging in intense arguments or even physical conflict over minor issues; they fiercely compete for identity, status, and honor within groups. Regarding inferior-position needs, they are extremely submissive to those they admire and respect, actively maintaining their status; they show genuine deference to experts; and they worship celebrities, tolerating no slander. Zhang Fei of Shu during the Three Kingdoms period was extremely rough with his soldiers—beating and cursing them frequently—demonstrating strong superior-position identity needs, yet he was utterly loyal and obedient to his elder brother Liu Bei and genuinely respectful and courteous to cultured people. As *Records of the Three Kingdoms* notes, Zhang Fei “respected gentlemen but showed no sympathy for common folk.” Identity man results from insufficient emotional and values education in his environment.

Emotion Man refers to those with strong emotion needs but weak value needs. Emotion man exhibits strong positive integration needs and negative exclusion needs. Regarding positive integration needs, they pursue family affection, friendship, and love, showing utmost care and protection for family members, especially children; they are utterly devoted to lovers; they value brotherhood and loyalty among friends; and they repay those who have helped them generously. Regarding negative exclusion needs, they hold strong exclusionary and hostile attitudes toward those who harm themselves or their loved ones, retaliating with maximum capacity. As the ancient saying goes: “Repay the debt of a meal, avenge the grievance of an angry stare.”

Value Man refers to those with strong value needs. Value man exhibits strong positive acquisition needs and negative expenditure needs. Regarding positive acquisition needs, they strongly pursue social reputation, beliefs, ideals, and careers. Regarding negative expenditure needs, they are willing to suppress all lower-level needs, even at the cost of their lives, to achieve social reputation and career success. Wen Tianxiang of the Southern Song Dynasty fought the Yuan army to the bitter end and refused to surrender after capture; Fang Xiaoru

of the Ming Dynasty preferred execution of his entire clan to surrendering to Emperor Yongle; Tan Sitong of the late Qing Dynasty refused to flee after the reform's failure, willing to contribute his head to awaken the Chinese people—all pursued value need satisfaction.

Which level an individual belongs to depends on their pursuits, not their social status. Common villagers can be high-level persons: “Though lowly, I dare not forget to worry about the state,” “When distant from the imperial court, I worry about my sovereign,” “Everyone shares responsibility for the nation's rise and fall” exemplify this. Monarchs can be low-level persons: many ancient emperors pursued only longevity and pleasure. Emperor Jiajing of the Ming, Zhu Houcong, spent his life cultivating Daoism, neglecting state affairs for decades. Emperor Xiao Baojuan of Southern Qi enjoyed playing small merchant and mouse-catching games, playing until dawn nightly, oblivious to state affairs. Emperor Xizong of Ming, Zhu Youxiao, enjoyed woodworking, leaving all state affairs to eunuchs.

(2) Equilibrium Man

Equilibrium man refers to individuals whose subjects at each level generate needs to restore equilibrium when positive and negative states become imbalanced. Unequal environmental stimulation in positive and negative directions creates state imbalance, generating desire for restoration. Failure to restore equilibrium produces physiological or psychological disease.

6.2 Management Theory Based on “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man”

Following the naming convention of Theory X, Theory Y, and Theory Z, management theory based on Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man can be called “HB Theory,” where H is the first letter of Hierarchy and B is the first letter of Balance. HB Theory comprises the following key points:

(1) “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man” is “Self-Interested Man”

The human organism contains six levels of subjects, each inherently self-interested, with the purpose of achieving positive-negative state equilibrium also being self-interest. At the survival level, inhaling and exhaling air, eating and excreting are self-interested. At the sensation level, sensory organs relaxing when experiencing pleasant stimuli and contracting when experiencing unpleasant stimuli are self-interested. At the cognition level, experiencing success and frustration during cognitive processes is self-interested. At the identity level, pursuing respect from others and respecting others are self-interested.

(2) Employee Recruitment and Selection

During recruitment and selection, interviews and psychological tests should identify high-level, high-equilibrium employees for appropriate positions.

Recruiting High-Level Employees

Employees' need levels correlate positively with their quality. Higher levels indicate higher quality, stronger capacity for demanding work, stronger desire

to acquire multi-level gratification factors, stronger motivation, and greater work responsibility and enthusiasm.

Recruiting High-Equilibrium Employees

Employees' state equilibrium correlates positively with mental stability and work stability. Higher equilibrium indicates stronger adjustment capacity, more peaceful and stable mentality. When work environments and conditions are unsatisfactory, they can propose reasonable suggestions to management and, if conditions prevent timely resolution, can adjust their mentality to understand and accept the situation. They rarely create interpersonal friction and, when it occurs, communicate and reconcile easily. Lower equilibrium indicates weaker adjustment capacity, greater interpersonal friction that is difficult to reconcile, and tendency to complain, threaten resignation, or actually resign when conditions are slightly unsatisfactory, resulting in poor work stability.

(3) Employee Motivation

The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory states that all human needs arise under stimulus effects and are satisfied through stimulus effects. Based on stimulus nature, these are divided into needs generation factors and needs gratification factors. Needs generation factors cause subjects to deviate from target states—they are disadvantageous, passively endured factors. Needs gratification factors push subjects toward target states—they are advantageous, actively pursued factors. Declining or lost work motivation results from stimuli in employees' work processes causing subjects at various levels to deviate from target states, becoming needs generation factors—disadvantageous, passively endured factors. The fundamental method of employee motivation is to carefully decompose all factors operating in employees' work processes, reduce needs generation factors, increase needs gratification factors, and transform needs generation factors into gratification factors. Among the six need levels, survival and sensation are physiological needs whose gratification factors are material; cognition, identity, emotion, and value are psychological needs whose gratification factors are spiritual or material factors transformed into spiritual ones.

Satisfying Employees' Lower-Level Equilibrium Needs

According to the Law of Hierarchy Interdependence, higher-level subjects' existence and functioning presuppose lower-level subjects' existence and functioning, and higher-level need pursuit and satisfaction require lower-level need satisfaction above tolerance thresholds. Enterprises must create conditions to fully satisfy employees' lower-level needs, providing strong support for higher-level need pursuit and satisfaction. Even startups with limited resources must ensure lower-level need satisfaction exceeds tolerance thresholds. At the survival level, extreme heat or cold, dust, polluted water, and poor-quality food are needs generation factors triggering health maintenance needs. Green work environments, exercise facilities, and quality food are gratification factors satisfying survival needs. At the sensation level, noise, odors, excessive or insufficient light, and excessive workload are needs generation factors causing sensory discomfort. Quiet, odor-free, appropriately lit work environments and moderate workload

are gratification factors achieving sensory comfort.

Satisfying Employees' Higher-Level Equilibrium Needs

Physiological need gratification factors are material; enterprises need only provide required material factors, and equilibrium naturally follows through physiological processes. Higher-level need gratification factors are spiritual or material factors transformed into spiritual ones; merely providing material factors without necessary psychological care proves ineffective. Management and management theory should focus on providing spiritual factors and materially-transformed spiritual factors to achieve need equilibrium. At the cognition level, work beyond employees' knowledge capacity or monotonous, tedious work are needs generation factors causing cognitive discomfort. Work matching employees' knowledge capacity and work that is interesting, innovative, and challenging are gratification factors achieving cognitive comfort. At the identity level, frontline employees generally experience excessive inferior-position stimuli and insufficient superior-position stimuli. Unreasonable distribution systems, cold attitudes and imperious behaviors from leadership are needs generation factors triggering inferior-position feelings. The more frontline the employee, the more sensitive to inferior-position stimuli—even weak stimuli can trigger strong reactions. Reasonable distribution systems and management's egalitarian attitudes and grassroots engagement are gratification factors achieving superior-position feelings. While employees' identity-level superior needs should be satisfied, excessive intensity causing positive-negative imbalance is harmful, potentially triggering arrogance, disregard for colleagues, leaders, authority, and organizational discipline. Balance must be achieved through inferior-position stimuli such as respect education, discipline education, institutional education, leadership authority establishment, and expert/scientist worship. At the emotion level, frontline employees generally experience excessive negative exclusion stimuli and insufficient positive integration stimuli. Management's indifference to employees' family and work difficulties beyond paying wages and enforcing regulations, and lack of daily emotional exchange are needs generation factors triggering exclusion states. Caring for and resolving employees' family and work difficulties and emphasizing daily emotional exchange are gratification factors achieving integration states. Excessive integration intensity causing imbalance is also harmful, potentially creating situations where criticism is rejected, individuals become overly dependent, and motivation is lost. Balance must be achieved through negative exclusion stimuli such as different opinion exchange and criticism/self-criticism. The ancient saying, "The friendship between gentlemen is as light as water; that between petty men is as sweet as wine" (*Zhuangzi · Mountain Trees*), illustrates that relationships among cultured, cultivated, morally noble individuals are moderate—excess is harmful. At the value level, frontline employees generally experience excessive negative expenditure stimuli and insufficient positive acquisition stimuli. Merely demanding employee contribution while rarely acknowledging it, leaving employees without deserved honor, meaning, or achievement are needs generation factors triggering negative expenditure feelings. Employees receiving honor, recognizing work meaning, increas-

ing achievement, and making corporate development their ideal and career are gratification factors achieving positive acquisition feelings. Similarly, excessive positive acquisition intensity is harmful, potentially generating superiority over group members and society. Balance must be achieved through dedication education and increased negative stimuli.

Using the Law of Hierarchy Dominance to Enhance Lower-Level Satisfaction

Lower-level need gratification factors are material; higher-level need gratification factors are spiritual or materially-transformed spiritual factors. Startups and small enterprises with limited financial and material resources face difficulties satisfying employees' material needs. Provided lower-level subjects can function normally, they can use spiritual factors to stimulate employees' higher-level pursuits, applying the principle that higher levels dominate and lower levels obey to enhance lower-level satisfaction. A small company owner wanted to hire a senior executive from a large corporation earning over two million annually but could only pay 5,000 monthly. The owner painted a bright future for his company, persuading the executive to make realizing this vision his ideal and career, successfully convincing him to abandon his high salary and join. Some companies unable to pay high salaries can offer higher positions to attract and retain talent by satisfying identity needs. Many famous politicians and scientists have housing and living standards below ordinary wage earners—higher-level pursuits suppress lower-level ones, or higher-level satisfaction enhances lower-level satisfaction.

Using the Law of Hierarchy Convection to Dynamically Enhance Satisfaction Under Changing Conditions*

According to the Law of Hierarchy Convection, pursuit and satisfaction at various need levels are not static or once-and-for-all but dynamic and changing. When lower-level needs are satisfied while higher-level needs remain unsatisfied, the needs hierarchy moves upward. After higher-level needs are satisfied, lower-level subjects incur losses while supporting higher-level subjects, generating new needs and causing the hierarchy to move downward. Higher and lower levels continuously cycle upward and downward. Enterprises must closely monitor employees' need satisfaction at different levels and continuously satisfy needs at all levels in dynamically changing environments.

Satisfying Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man's multi-level and equilibrium needs cannot rely solely on managers' personal behavior but requires establishing a series of effective management systems and methods. Human nature assumptions and management theories do not have a one-to-one relationship; the same human nature assumption can underlie many management theories. Existing management theories that help satisfy Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man's needs can become components of HB Theory, and new theories can be developed for this purpose.

Conclusion

Human nature assumptions must be based on universal human needs and their motion patterns, which must first be understood. The Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory (also called Motion of Needs Theory) reorganizes Maslow's hierarchy, establishes a new needs hierarchy system, and identifies vertical and horizontal needs. Vertically, six levels of subjects exist from low to high—survival, sensation, cognition, identity, emotion, value—generating six levels of states and needs. Horizontally, each level's subjects possess both positive and negative states and needs. Vertical needs follow the laws of hierarchy interdependence, dominance, and convection; horizontal needs follow the law of needs equilibrium. This paper examined four widely disseminated human nature assumptions—economic man, social man, self-actualizing man, and complex man—using Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory, identified their deficiencies, and proposed the Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man assumption.

The economic man assumption's primary flaw is seeing only extrinsic needs gratification factors while ignoring intrinsic need satisfaction. Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory shows that “economics” is an extrinsic gratification factor, not intrinsic need satisfaction; the economic man assumption is based on extrinsic factors, seeing only appearance, not essence. The social man assumption and its management theory have three main flaws: first, conflating economic benefits with social needs, mixing extrinsic gratification factors with intrinsic needs; second, covering only some need levels vertically while omitting others, and omitting negative needs horizontally; third, drawing one-sided conclusions about interpersonal relationships' greater impact on efficiency than workplace environment and economic benefits—flaws clearly revealed through the laws of hierarchy interdependence and dominance. The self-actualizing man does not exist; “self-actualization” cannot constitute a need level in either name or content. The complex man assumption has neither theoretical significance nor practical value. Theoretically, “complexity” is a fundamental property of all things; using “complex” as a human nature assumption proposes no meaningful new theory. Practically, management systems and methods based on the complex man assumption would require constant individual customization and change, making them unfeasible.

The human nature assumption derived from Hierarchy and Equilibrium Theory is “Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man.” The management theory based on it is “HB Theory,” with three main points: Hierarchy and Equilibrium Man is self-interested man; recruitment should select high-level, high-equilibrium employees; and employee motivation should transform needs generation factors into gratification factors to satisfy multi-level and equilibrium needs.

References

- [1] Hume, D. *A Treatise of Human Nature* (Vol. 1) [M]. Translated by Guan Wenyun. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1997.6.

- [2] McGregor, D. *The Human Side of Enterprise* [M]. Beijing: China Renmin University Press, 2008: 254.
- [3] Gong, Z. *Research on Psychological Needs and Their Motion Rules* [M]. Beijing: Economic Management Press, 2019: 119.
- [4] Gong, Z. *Research on Psychological Needs and Their Motion Rules* [M]. Beijing: Economic Management Press, 2019.
- [5] Smith, A. *The Wealth of Nations* [M]. Translated by Hu Changming. Chongqing: Chongqing Publishing House, 2009: 10.
- [6] Smith, A. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* [M]. Translated by Jiang Ziqiang, et al. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2014: 5.
- [7] Gong, Z. “Understanding ‘Unitary Nature’ and Resolving the ‘Smith Paradox’” ChinaXiv Preprint Platform. <https://chinaxiv.org/home.htm>. October 6, 2024.
- [8] Gong, Z. *Research on Psychological Needs and Their Motion Rules* [M]. Beijing: Economic Management Press, 2019: 148-161.
- [9] Maslow, A. H. *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature* [M]. Translated by Cao Xiaohui, et al. Beijing: World Book Publishing Company, 2014: 38.
- [10] Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and Personality* (3rd ed.) [M]. Translated by Xu Jinsheng, et al. Beijing: China Renmin University Press, 2007: 29.
- [11] Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and Personality* (3rd ed.) [M]. Translated by Xu Jinsheng, et al. Beijing: China Renmin University Press, 2007: 29.
- [12] Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and Personality* (3rd ed.) [M]. Translated by Xu Jinsheng, et al. Beijing: China Renmin University Press, 2007: 157-188.
- [13] Schein, E. H. *Organizational Psychology* [M]. Beijing: Economic Management Press, 2009: 65.
- [14] Schein, E. H. *Organizational Psychology* [M]. Beijing: Economic Management Press, 2009: 84.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.