



THE EVOLUTION OF COMBAT MOTIVATION IN THE MILITARY

Endrynixon. A^a, Ananthan. S^b

^a Centre for Leadership and Professional Development National Defence University of Malaysia

^b Faculty of Defence Studies & Management National Defence University of Malaysia

*Corresponding author: nixonendry@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received

16-07-2020

Received in revised

29-09-2020

Accepted

31-10-2020

Available online

12-11-2020

Keywords:

Conflicts, cohesion,
motivation,
motivational factors,
military

e-ISSN:

Type: Article

ABSTRACT

Motivation has always been a critical element in any military force in managing soldiers in military missions. The article reviews the evolution that has taken place in motivation factors in managing soldiers over the hostile decades of war and conflicts. Relevant literatures were reviewed to examine motivational factors among soldiers during World War I, World War II and other conflicts in the 20th century. The analysis highlights that although primary cohesion plays an important role, secondary group cohesion has become an additional motivating factor during combat as the nature of conflict progressed from a single combat force to a combined force involving other combat support elements or multinational forces for military missions. The study concludes that the influencing factors of motivation in the military can be categorized into three perspectives. First; individual that surrounds on what is conscientiously right and self satisfaction. Second; social that refers to social responsibility to the country, nation, organisation and unit and finally; organisational which relates to those that provide guidelines and the necessary support to achieve the organisational goal. The review provides an overview of the evolution in motivational factors in a combat environment and suggest for further exploration in non-combat situations.

© 2020 UPNM Press. All rights reserved.

1.0 Introduction

Competitive edge is often the key factor associated with organisational success and the critical element in achieving it lies on human resources. People being the most important asset have often been echoed by CEOs or General Managers. As such, the quality of human potential should always be the emphasis as it affects sustaining the competitive edge of an organisation. In other words, human resource management plays a crucial role for organisational effectiveness. Likewise, in the military, soldiers are unique defence product that requires a different approach in human resource management as compared to other government or public sectors. Human resource management in the military is ultimately a leadership function that ensures that soldiers are raised, trained and maintained in their various skills sets and roles.

Hence, the primary role of human resource management in the military is to ensure its workforce, the soldiers accomplish the tasks or mission assigned. One of the unique characteristics in the application of human resource management in the military is the exercise of violence. The core business of any military organisation is managing violence. Be it a street riot, crisis, conflict or war, violence is the crux that cannot be ignored. Violence can be defined as behaviour involving physical force intended to hurt, damage or kill someone, which may include the threat of force against another (Asher, 2014). While

managing violence in war remains the basis of military capability, the need to understand the challenges soldiers face, the stresses related to military life and more importantly the unmet needs of soldiers are crucial to sustain their combat professionalism. Zulkifli (2014) describes a soldier as one “*who kills without care or remorse, shows no fear, able to fight battle after battle without fatigue and generally behave more like a machine than a man*”. In the same note, soldiers are expected to protect and save lives as seen in Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief Operations. On one hand, a soldier is expected to be a killing machine and on the other hand, a soldier to be a saviour.

Human resource in the military represents an extraordinary human potential that requires to be understood, nurtured and inspired, not only in accomplishing a mission but also to balance the mind and willpower to sustain the attributes of a military soldier. The need to understand, nurture and inspire can be clustered into one word, which is motivation. Motivation is an internal state of an individual that sometimes referred as expectations of human needs (Hersey and Blanchard, 1993). In the military context, motivation is an impulse that compels the soldier to face the enemy on the battlefield or the determination that induces soldiers to fight, in spite of the adversity and the inherent dangers of war (Reuvan, 2013). Davenport and Prusak (1998) denotes that the military organisation is created to pursue the purpose of a nation and as such motivation becomes the utmost important element in managing human resource in the military.

Motivation has always been an important factor in any organisation as it is the essence of influencing people, the prime assets of an organisation to deliver their best output which relates to organisational performance. In corporate or military organisation, people are important as Drucker advocates that “*people determine the performance capacity of an organisation*” (Hamel, 2007). Although motivation is critical in enabling military forces to win battles or conflicts (Sergio, 2004), the primary question is, what makes soldiers determine the performance capacity of a military unit?

Motivation in the military has been proven to be a crucial factor since time immemorial. Xenophon, a Greek historian once quoted, “*not numbers or strength bring victory to war; but whichever army goes to battle stronger in soul, their enemies generally cannot withstand them*” (Sergio, 2004). The strong soul in modern times refers to motivation. Clausewitz, a Prussian strategist have also viewed motivation as an important factor when he wrote that it is the “*will*” which determines the outcome against an enemy, where in a modern term the “*will*” reflects motivation (Maginnis, 1985). In addition, Picq (1989) emphasize that the basic factor in the crux of a battle lies on the human heart which again refers to motivation. These studies illustrate that it is pertinent to understand motivation as it relates to the basic need of a human element in any organisation. In the military, the will to fight depends largely on the high esteem of motivation to achieve success in combat missions set by the military hierarchy. Hence, the primary aim of the paper is to examine the evolution of motivation factors in the military. The essence of the study is to enable military commanders to understand their soldiers better in their command as military leaders.

Since the term motivation is often associated to people and influencing behavior to act in a certain way, it is interesting to establish; first, why men fight and what factors motivate them to fight even when death is certain. Secondly, as a military leader, it is a need to understand motivational factors that would cultivate soldiers to optimize their potential and increase the probability for a success in a military mission. Thirdly, it is also of interest to examine for any changes in motivational factors in the progress of change in the manner war or conflicts are conducted. To satisfy these curiosities’, it is essential to examine combat motivational factors in cognizance with managing soldiers. For the purpose of this study, the paper will examine combat motivation factors in three eras, namely, the World War I and II, and the conflicts in the 20th century.

2.0 Motivation

The term “*Motivation*” is a Latin word which means movement (*movere*) and based on this concept, Atkinson (1964) defines motivation as an influence on “*direction, vigour and persistence*”, while Vroom (1964) adds value to it by stating that motivation is a choice made among other alternatives by a person voluntarily. In addition, Bartol and Martin, (1998) define motivation as “*a force that energizes behavior, gives direction to behavior and underlies the tendency to persist*”. These definitions illustrate that to achieve goals; individuals must be stimulated to be energetic and must be given a clear objective of achievement, and be committed to achieving the objective. According to Endrynixon (2013) motivation describes processes by which people seek to obtain their needs, goals and desires.

In organisation and human resource theories, motivation is considered as a key element that harnesses human potential to maintain organisation’s competitive advantage (Srinivasan, 2008). Likewise, in the military, motivation has been a keen interest by most military forces around the world. However, most studies relate motivation in the context of conflicts and war where the need for highly motivated force is pertinent to succeed in military missions (Primortz, 2002; Sergio, 2004; MacCoun, Kier and Belkin, 2005; Blocq, 2010). In various occasions, quantitatively inferior armies have been able to win battles and conflicts because of their fighting spirit, aggressiveness and high morale that were brought about by motivation (Sergio, 2004). Examples of these are the Vietnam War, where the Americans withdrew having failed to overcome the Vietcong’s and the Afghanistan War, where the Russians failed to overcome the insurgents collectively known as the “Mujahedeen’s”. The US, Canadian, Australian, Russian and other military forces have viewed motivation as a critical factor in managing human resource in the military (Wong, 2006; Kirke, 2009; Jan and Jans, 2009; Blocq, 2010). This is because motivation relates to what people do in performing their task that determines the productivity and commitment to a job and eventually brings organisational success.

Combat Motivation during World War I and World War II

Studies illustrate that in World War I patriotism and nationalism were the prime factors used by the British government in enlisting men for war. The British government used patriotic propaganda to keep its army and the population motivated (Hunter, 2012; Wessely, 2006). Other studies denote that many enrolled due to war enthusiasm but the majority volunteered because of the economic climate in the country (Messinger, 1992; Marshall, 1947). In World War I, soldiers were compelled to keep fighting for a number of reasons. First, there was a firm hierarchy in the army. Soldiers were trained to obey and officers had military regulations to ensure compliance. Minor infractions could be punished heavily and with little recourse, while deserting or running away from the front could result in a death penalty. Wessely (2006) and Faris (1995) studies illustrate that the will to continue the war was down to the bonds of friendship developed among the group of men where they rely on each other for moral support. The bond includes to staying alive for oneself, their friends and for the group. Studies on motivational factors in the military by Henderson (1985), Shils and Janowitz (1948) and Samuel Stouffer (1974) also indicate that the primary group as a source of continuing the war. Further explorations by Moskos (1970), Kellet (1982) and Traversa (1995) among American and German soldiers during World War II established prominent motivational factors as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Motivation Factors in the Military during World War I and II

Samuel Stouffer (1940)	Shils and Janowitz (1948)	Moskos (1970)	Kellet (1987)	Traversa (1995)
Primary Group	Primary Group	Primary Group	Primary Group	Primary Group
Patriotism		Ideology	Ideology	Ideology
			Leadership	Leadership
		Attitude against enemy		Vindictiveness
			Personal values	Religion
			Preconception of combat	Propaganda
Concern for war				Desire to end war
	Survival	Combat Survival	Combat Survival	
			Duty, Honor and Unit Spirit	Duty, Honor and Country
Emotional Bonds	Cohesion			Coercion
			Training	Personal
		Discipline	Discipline	Gratification

A distinctive factor from the cluster of combat motivation factors from the various studies indicates a close relationship between emotional bonds, cohesion and the desire to end the battle. Comradeship, cohesion, fear and the will to survive were seen as the source of combat motivation in this era.

Combat Motivational Factors in 20th Century

Since the end of cold war, the need for soldiers and units to be ready for military missions continued to be of importance in the military and for soldiers to perform effectively, they must be equipped, trained and motivated (Faris, 1995). Studies on motivation in the military continued to examine factors that sustain individual motivation in war and conflicts in the 20th century. Sergio (2004) study on military motivation involved the Israeli Defence Forces during the Arab-Israeli war and his research concludes that; unit cohesion relating to bonding of members in the organisation, regiment's achievements and success in battles; the concept of *achavattlochameem* (combatant's brotherhood) and mutual trust were found to be key elements for motivation among the Israeli soldiers during the war. In addition, Sergio (2004) illustrated that communication among leaders and subordinates on battle information, leaders concern for their soldier's well-being and providing the best equipment played an important role in motivation as soldiers perceived these as the best chance for survival in combat situations. Other motivating factors include training as soldiers build self-confidence through rigorous training and combat experience when undertaking military tasks.

Shalom et al. (2005) conducted their study on combat units that were grouped on a short-term and ad-hoc basis for military missions during the Arab-Israeli conflict (Al-Aqsa Intifada), where the focus was on cohesion during military operations. In this scenario, integration among the military units grouped for military operation played a critical role. The study established that cohesion was the key factor for motivation among troops in undertaking military missions. The nature of cohesion explored in this study depicts that cooperation and collaboration became the main factors as the mode of operation included a variety of military units combined to perform a task. In the context of cohesion, shalom et al. (2005) study indicate that elements pertinent in influencing a force in battle were; the sense of commitment to the unit's goal in cognizance with the ethos of the professional force, esprit de corps as a stimulant to overcome fear and responding to combat situations, mutual trust among the hierarchy in the unit and reliability among the combat support units were crucial in maintaining the soldiers' confidence. These elements played a crucial role in the integration of ad-hoc military units and subsequently build confidence for military mission, which in turn reflects motivation to fight among troops.

MacCoun et al. (2005) study on American soldiers in Iraq war argued that a strong interpersonal bond among unit members determines successful unit performance. MacCoun et al. (2005) further explains cohesion from two perspectives; social cohesion that refers to the bonding of friendship, caring and close-relationship among unit or organisational members and task cohesion which refers to the collective effort of a group in achieving a goal through shared commitment. The study concludes that military performance depends on the commitment of members towards a common goal and was not based on interpersonal bonding of social cohesion. In other words, task cohesion played a higher role as a motivating factor among combat troops to complete a military task.

Ben-Dor et al. (2008) examined motivational factors among military reservist during the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and the second Intifada in the year 2000. The objective of their study was to examine motivation during wartime and peacetime among military reservist of the Israeli Defence Force. Although the findings suggest that motivation in wartime was higher than in peacetime, the reservist tend to be more motivated by individual needs rather than collective incentives in both situations.

Robben (2006) compared motivation among Argentinean troops from two perspectives; during the counter-insurgency warfare from 1975-1980 and against the British forces in the Falklands War in 1982. The comparison of study highlights four lessons on motivation during combat. First, that motivation in combat does not necessarily depend on the state of mind but on a social process relating to contextual and combat related factors that are experienced differently over time by the troops and thus changes according to the social, political and military circumstances of the war. Secondly, the type of warfare also influences motivation as situations, responsibilities, battle engagement and objectives differ between counter insurgency and conventional warfare. While intelligence gathering was crucial in counter insurgency warfare, success and failures in battle engagements were pertinent in the Falklands war to boost motivation among the troops. Third, there was a difference in motivation before and when the war began. Troops were eager to fight for the sovereignty over the Falklands Islands but deteriorated rapidly

when it began because the forces felt that there was no proper battle plan made by the military hierarchical command and poor equipments, and finally; motivation takes a higher precedence when the heat of the battle dies down as individuals begin reassessing their willingness to continue fighting. It is in these circumstances the military leaders must play an important role to sustain their troop’s motivation but in this case, the Argentinean commanders were too absorbed by the tasks at hand that concern for their troops lacked.

In addition, the study further relates that patriotism in terms of pride, unity of purpose; discipline and obedience being the main factors of motivation prior to the Falklands war. These motivational factors decline as the war progressed due to poor training and lack of equipments. Other motivational factors that were observed in the study include sense of belonging, especially in the primary group level where both informal and formal interactions among group members and sharing of common goals played important roles (Kellet, 1987). According to Manning (1991), religion, a clear conscience for fighting the war and mental preparation for war were also viewed as a prime concern in the Falklands war. A summary of motivational factors derived from these studies in the modern era is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Motivation Factors in the 20th Century

Israeli Defence Force (Sergio, 2004)	Arab-Israeli War (Shalom et al., 2005)	Iraq War (MacCoun et al., 2005)	Argentinean Counter insurgency and Falklands War (Robben. 2006)	Israel -Palestinian Conflict (Ben-Dor et al., 2008)
Unit cohesion	Cohesion	Task cohesion	Primary Group	Income
Regiment’s achievements	Cooperation	Shared commitment	Patriotism	Individual commitment
Combatant’s brotherhood	Collaboration	Strong interpersonal bond	Religion	Patriotism
Communication between leaders and subordinates	Sense of commitment		Clear conscience	Work conditions
Best combat equipment	Espirit de corps		Mental preparation through training	Well-being
	Mutual trust			Military leaders concern for unit members
	Integration			

3.0 Development in Combat Motivation Factors

In comparison, the motivational factors derived from the World War I and II tends to be individualistic in nature. Individualistic refers to motivational factors which are implicit and driven by personal perception, need or belief that would influence the behavior of an individual to execute a task or activity. Motivational factors such as ideology, religion and duty, honor and country are beliefs one carry in one’s mind which encourages accomplishing a task or activity. Leadership, discipline and coercion are organisational factors, viewed as external forces that influence an individual towards the organisational goal. Basically, during the World War II and II, there are two fundamental motivational factors that played an important role in combat fighting, the internal motivational factors which derives from within the mind and belief, and the external motivational factor that derives from influenced by organisational requirement.

On the other hand, motivational factors derived from the 20th century tend to be a combination of individual and collective in nature. Collective is meant when motivational factors are explicit and driven by a collective interest, shared commitment or common goal that would influence an individual’s behavior to work as a group in executing a task or activity. Motivational factors such as cooperation, collaboration, mutual trust and integration form the fundamental base for combining effort, experience and expertise in achieving success during military missions. In this perspective, battles are not viewed at tactical level, defined as the level involving manoeuvre units of platoon size or equivalent but at the operational level, defined as the level involving manoeuvre units of company size to army groups levels where military missions are fought involving various military units required for that specific task as a combined force (US Army, 2006). Basically, motivational factors in the modern era also lie on two

fundamental perspectives; internal and external, in which the study believes the external motivational factors takes a higher precedence. As the nature of the military mission requires a combine effort, the confidence level in achieving success lie on the question by the host military unit responsible in undertaking the military mission, "What can the other units do to bring success to my military mission?" It ultimately depends on the unit's capability, achievements and experience that are viewed as external factors (Robben, 2006). Therefore, motivation drawn from these external factors provides a stronger support as compared to the internal motivation factors towards the common goal.

4.0 Conclusion

Most motivational factors derived from World War I and II falls under primary group cohesion which involves individual mindset relating to personal bonding, belief, serving for the country, fear of punishment and combat survival. The motivational factors in this era tend to be from individual perception and the influence one has in the war one is fighting. Primary group cohesion was the primary motivating factor during the period of World War I and II. As studies progressed into the 20th century, primary cohesion was still an important criterion as they indicate esprit de corps, comradeship, commitment and bonding were essential factors in combat (Sergio, 2004; Shalom et al., 2005; MacCoun et al., 2005). However, the nature of conflict progressed from a single combat force to a combined force involving other combat support elements or multinational forces that are required for military missions. In this perspective, secondary group cohesion became an additional motivating factor during combat missions. Integrating factors such as cooperation, collaboration, reliability and mutual trust among units involved became an important role in troop motivation.

Therefore, studies on motivation in the military indicates that influencing factors which determines motivation can be categorized in three perspectives; *First, individual* pertaining to beliefs, perception and attitudes that centers around on what is conscientiously right and self-satisfaction. Motivational factors such as ideology, religion and clear conscience are some that falls under the individual factor; *second, social* that refers to social responsibility to the country, nation, organisation and unit. Motivational factors such as patriotism, commitment, duty, honor and country are some that fall under the social factor and *third, organisational* which relates to those that provide guidelines and the necessary support to achieve the organisational goal. Motivation factors such as leadership, cohesion, coercion, discipline, expectations, goals and vision are some that falls under the organisational factor. In addition, the effectiveness of a combat force also depends on the soldier's belief on the ability of his or her unit to achieve the mission without undue number of casualties. The force depicted is defined as an operational unit that merges combat, logistic support and other military assets for a particular military mission. In other words, a soldier's trust in the unit's probability of success is related to the confidence one has in the effectiveness of the unit's weapon systems, logistics, operational doctrine, working strategies, and command and control elements. The trust on the unit's capability is equally important as it has an effect on motivation of an individual in combat. It is also pertinent for military leaders to balance the need for unit's combat capability and the morale of the troops to stimulate their vigour and enhance the will to fight from within.

As most of the studies discussed were conducted in a combat environment, it can be concluded that combat motivational factors in the military emphasises on primary cohesion and if the military operation expands to include other military forces, secondary cohesion becomes important too. It is also noted that motivation in the military tends to vary according to the complexity of war or conflict, individual perception, organisation goals and the unit's perceived capability for a combat mission. It would be interesting to explore further on motivation factors to examine whether the fundamental nature of wars has changed in the 21st century as compared to the past. Enemies have become invisible; rules of engagement are disputed for self interest and terms such as hybrid tactics and non-state actors are getting prominent as the security environment becomes unpredictable with emerging threats and risks. Although the question is pertinent to explore further in military motivation on conflicts in the 21st century, this study highlights that the fundamentals factors for motivation lie on individual, social and organisational perspectives in cognizance with the unit's combat capability for a mission. These form a basis for cohesion among members of a force and coalition force to fulfil the targeted mission set by the military hierarchy.

References

- Ananthan, S. (2019). The impact of leader development climate on participation in leadership roles of military cadets. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(1), p. 1309–1321.
- Asher, K. (2014). Thinking about direct violence, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 46(2), p. 441-444.
- Atkinson, J. W. (1964). *Towards experimental analysis of human motivation in terms of motives, expectancies and incentives*. New York: Free Press.
- Bartol, K. M., & Martin. D. C. (1998). *Management, 3rd ed*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Ben-Dor, G., Pedahzur, A., Canetti-Nisim, D., & Perliger, A. (2008). I versus We: Collective and individual factors of reserve service motivation during war and peace. *Armed Forces and Society*, 34(4), p. 565-592.
- Bloq, D. (2010). Western soldiers and the protection of local civilians in UN peacekeeping operations: Is nationalist orientation in the armed forces hindering our preparedness to fight? *Armed Forces and Society*, 36(2), p. 290-309.
- Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998), *Working knowledge: How organisations manage what they know*, Harvard Business School Press.
- Endrynixon, A. (2013). A Review of motivation factors in the military, *Journal of Defence and Security*, 4(2), p. 212-225.
- Faris, J.H. (1995). The Looking-Glass Army: Patriotism in the Post-Cold War Era, *Armed Forces and Society*, 21(3), p. 411-434.
- Hamel, G. P. (2007). *The future of management*, Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Henderson, J. & William, D. (1985), *Cohesion, the human element in combat*, Washington, D.C.: *National Defense University Press*.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. (1993), *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*, 6th Edition, Englewood Cliffs.
- Hunter, S.T., Cushenbery, L., & Friedrich, T. (2012). Hiring an innovative workforce: A necessary yet uniquely challenging endeavor. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22(4), p. 303–322.
- Jans, N., & Jans, F.J. (2009). Still the Pragmatic Professional: Pre and Post 9/11 Professional Orientation in the Australian Army. *Armed Forces and Society*, 35(2), p. 241-265.
- Kellet, A. (1982). *Combat motivation: The behavior of soldiers in battle*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijh of publishing.
- Kirke, C. (2009). Group cohesion, culture and practice. *Armed Forces and Society*, 35(4), p. 745-753.
- MacCoun, R. J., Kier, E., & Belkin, A. (2005). Does social cohesion determine motivation in combat? An old question with and old answer. *Armed Forces and Society*, 32(1), p. 646-653.
- Marshall, S.L.A. (1947), *Men against fire. The problem of battle command in future war*, New York, p. 42.
- Manning, F.J. (1991). Morale, cohesion and esprit de corps in Reuven Gal and Mangelsdorff, A.D. (eds), *Handbook of Military Psychology*. Published by U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command.
- Messinger. G, (1992). *British Propaganda and the state in the First World War*, Manchester University Press.
- Moskos, C.C. (1970). *The American enlisted man*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Picq, A.D. (1989). *Battle Studies: In Roots of Strategy: Book II* (ed). John N. Greely and Robert C. Cotton, StackpoleBooks.
<https://www.abebooks.co.uk/Roots-Strategy-Book-Military-Classics-Picqs/11402553983/bd>.
- Primoratz, I., (ed). (2002). *Patriotism*. Amherst, New York: Humanity Books.

- Radical, I. & Ahmad, Z. (2008). Employee motivation: A Malaysian Perspective. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 18(4), p. 344-362.
- Reuven, G., Amit, K., Fleischer, N., & Strichman, N. (2013). Volunteers of national youth service in Israel: A study on motivation for service, social attributes and volunteer's satisfaction, Working paper for center for social development, Global service Institute, Washington University.
- Robben, A.C.G.M. (2006). Combat motivation, fear and terror in the twentieth-century Argentinian warfare, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 41,
- Sergio, C. (2004). Motivating soldiers: The example of the Israeli Defence Forces. *The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters*, 34(3), p. 108-121.
- Shalom, B.U., Lehrer, Z., & Ari, B.E. (2005). Cohesion during military operations: A Field Study on combat units in the Al-Aqsa Intifada. *Armed Forces*, 32(1), p. 63-79.
- Shils, E. A. & Janowitz, M. (1948). Cohesion and disintegration in the wehrmacht in World War II, *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12(2), p. 280-315.
- Srinivasan, M.S. (2008). Motivation and human growth: A development perspective, *Journal of Human Value*, 14(1), p. 63-71.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1974), *The American Soldier*. New York, N.Y. Arno Press.
- Traversa, D.J. (1995). Motivational factors in combat: A comparison of German and American soldiers in World War II using content analysis. *Master Thesis, Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base OH. Report Number: A424103.*
<http://www.stormingmedia.us/42/4241/A424103.html>
- US Army. (2017). The US Army functional concept for movement and maneuver. *Tradoc Pamphlet 525-2-6*. <https://adminpubs.tradoc.army.mil/pamphlets/TP525-3-6.pdf>
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wessely, S. (2006). Twentieth century theories on combat motivation and breakdown, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 41(2), p. 276.
- Wong, L. (2006). Combat motivation in today's soldiers. *Armed Forces and Society*, 32(4), p. 659-663.
- Zulkifli, Z.A. (2014). The human dimensions of soldiering: A perspective on future requirements in the complex operational environment. *European Scientific Journal August 2014 /Special/edition*.