

THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF DESTRUCTIVE MOTIVATION

NONA GYULAMBARYAN

National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia

International Scientific Educational Center

PhD student

nona.gyulambaryan@gmail.com

DOI: 10.54503/2579-2903-2024.1-63

Abstract

One of the leading factors determining the effectiveness of work in a modern organization is the motivation of its employees. In the scientific psychological literature, this phenomenon is understood mainly as constructive forms of motivation and the search for ways to increase it. At the same time, the motivation of employees can sometimes lead to a decrease in the productivity of the organization, i.e. destructive motivation is usually not considered from the point of view of various motivational theories. This article provides an analysis of various forms of destructive motivation of employees. These forms include formalism in labor behavior, inadequate assessment of the work done, and an imbalance of personal and organizational interests. The destructive motivation of personnel has certain negative consequences both for the employees themselves and for the entire organization - it leads to a decrease in the rate of production and the quality of products or services, increased conflict in the behavior of employees, etc. Currently, there is an increase in scientific interest in the study of destructive motivation. The subject of psychological research is not only modern socio-psychological processes, but also the achievements of scientific thought in the field of theories of motivation and management. This article examines the theoretical approaches of J. S. Adams and Porter-Lawler, provides an analysis of theoretical concepts, and emphasizes the main characteristics of the destructiveness of motivation. Destructive work motivation is presented at the macro, meso, and micro levels. These levels express various directions of development of motivation stimuli, such as social, organizational, and personal ones. At the macro level, the most important characteristics of destructive motivation are the high-income gap between employers and employees, a high degree of unemployment, weak social protection of workers, non-compliance by employers with labor legislation, and emergencies. At the organizational level, the main characteristics are decreasing the diversity of work, and insufficient work conditions. At the personal level, the main characteristic of destructive motivation is a discrepancy between personal and organizational interests. A comparative analysis of the theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of motivation makes it possible to identify not only the main characteristics of destructive motivation but also to determine the contours of psychological counseling to reduce destructiveness in the behavior of employees.

Keywords and phrases: Destructive motivation, employee, main characteristics, theoretical models, constructive motivation.

ԴԵՍՏՐՈԿՏԻՎ ՄՈՏԻՎԱՑԻԱՅԻ ՀԻՄՆԱԿԱՆ ԲՆՈՒԹԱԳԻՐԸ

ՆՈՆԱ ԳՅՈՒԼԱՄԲԱՐՅԱՆ

ՀՀ Գիտությունների ազգային ակադեմիայի
գիտակրթական միջազգային կենտրոնի
հայցորդ
nona.gyulambaryan@gmail.com

Համառոտագիր

Ժամանակակից կազմակերպությունում աշխատանքի արդյունավետությունը որոշող առաջատար գործոններից մեկը աշխատակիցների մոտիվացիան է: Գիտական հոգեբանական գրականության մեջ այս երևույթը հասկացվում է հիմնականում մոտիվացիայի կառուցողական ձևերի բնութագրման և այն բարձրացնելու ուղիների որոնման համատեքստում: Միևնույն ժամանակ, աշխատակիցների մոտիվացիան, որը հանգեցնում է կազմակերպության արտադրողականության նվազմանը, այսինքն՝ ապակառուցողական, դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիան սովորաբար չի դիտարկվում հայտնի մոտիվացիոն տեսությունների կողմից: Այս հոդվածում ներկայացվում է աշխատակիցների դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիայի տարբեր ձևերի վերլուծությունը: Դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիայի ձևերից առանձնացվում են աշխատանքային վարքագծի ֆորմալիզմը, կատարված աշխատանքի ոչ համարժեք գնահատումը և աշխատակցի անձնական ու կազմակերպության շահերի անհավասարակշռությունը: Անձնակազմի դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիան ունի որոշակի բացասական հետևանքներ ինչպես աշխատակցի, այնպես էլ ամբողջ կազմակերպության համար: Այն հանգեցնում է արտադրության տեմպի, ապրանքների կամ ծառայությունների որակի նվազմանը, աշխատակիցների վարքագծում կոնֆլիկտայնության բարձրացմանը և այլն: Ներկայումս աճում է գիտական հետաքրքրությունը դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիայի հիմնախնդրի ուսումնասիրության նկատմամբ: Հոգեբանական հետազոտությունների առանցքում դրվում է ոչ միայն ժամանակակից սոցիալ-հոգեբանական գործընթացների ուսումնասիրումը, այլ նաև գիտական մտքի ձեռքբերումները մոտիվացիայի և կառավարման տեսությունների ոլորտում: Այս հոդվածը ուսումնասիրում է Դ.Ադամսի և Փորթեր-Լոուլերի տեսական մոտեցումները, ներկայացնում է տեսական մոտեցումների համեմատական վերլուծությունը և ընդգծում մոտիվացիայի դեստրուկտիվության հիմնական բնութագրերը: Աշխատանքի դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիան ներկայացված է մակրո-, մեզո- և միկրո մակարդակներով: Այս մակարդակներն արտահայտում են մոտիվացիոն խթանների զարգացման տարբեր ուղղություններ՝ սոցիալական, կազմակերպչական և անձնական: Մակրո մակարդակում դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիայի ամենակարևոր բնութագրերն են գործատուների և աշխատողների եկամուտների չափի ակնառու տարբերությունները, գործազրկության բարձր աստիճանը, աշխատողների թույլ սոցիալական պաշտպանվածությունը, գործատուների կողմից աշխատանքային օրենսդրության չկատարումը, արտակարգ իրավիճակները: Կազմակերպչական մակարդակում հիմնական բնութագրերն են աշխատանքի միատարրությունը և անբավարար աշխատանքային պայմանները: Անձնական մակարդակում դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիայի հիմնական բնութագիրը անձնական և կազմակերպչական շահերի անհամապատասխանությունն է: Մոտիվացիայի ուսումնասիրության տեսական և մեթոդաբանական հիմքերի համեմատական վերլուծությունը հնարավորություն է տալիս բացահայտելու ոչ միայն դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիայի հիմնական բնութագրերը, այլև որոշելու հոգեբանական խորհրդատվության ուրվագծերը՝ աշխատակիցների վարքագծում

դեստրուկտիվությունը նվազեցնելու նպատակով:

Բանալի բառեր և բառակապակցություններ. դեստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիա, աշխատակից, հիմնական բնութագիրներ, տեսական մոտեցումներ, կոնստրուկտիվ մոտիվացիա:

ОСНОВНЫЕ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ ДЕСТРУКТИВНОЙ МОТИВАЦИИ

НОНА ГЮЛАМБАРЯН

Национальная академия наук Республика Армения
Международный научно-образовательный центр,
соискатель

nona.gyulambaryan@gmail.com

Аннотация

Одним из ведущих факторов, определяющих эффективность работы в современной организации, является мотивация ее сотрудников. В научной психологической литературе этот феномен понимается в основном в качестве конструктивных форм мотивации и поиска путей её повышения. При этом мотивация сотрудников, приводящая к снижению продуктивности организации, т.е. деструктивная мотивация, обычно не рассматривается с точки зрения различных мотивационных теорий. В данной статье приводится анализ различных форм деструктивной мотивации сотрудников. К ним относятся формализм в трудовом поведении, неадекватная оценка проделанной работы, дисбаланс личных и организационных интересов. Деструктивная мотивация персонала имеет определенные негативные последствия как для самого сотрудника, так и для всей организации - приводит к снижению темпов производства, качества продукции или услуг, повышается конфликтность в поведении сотрудников и т.д. В настоящее время наблюдается рост научного интереса в области изучения деструктивной мотивации. Предметом психологических исследований становятся не только современные социально-психологические процессы, но также достижения научной мысли в области теорий мотивации и менеджмента. В данной статье исследуются теоретические подходы Д. Адамса и Портера-Лоулера, проводится анализ теоретических концепций, акцентируются основные характеристики деструктивности мотивации. Деструктивная мотивация труда представлена на макро-, мезо- и микроуровнях. Эти уровни выражают различные направления развития мотивационных стимулов: социальные, организационные и личностные. На макроуровне важнейшими характеристиками деструктивной мотивации являются высокий разрыв в доходах работодателей и работников, высокая степень безработицы; слабая социальная защита работников, несоблюдение работодателями трудового законодательства, чрезвычайные ситуации. На организационном уровне основными характеристиками являются снижение разнообразия труда, недостаточные условия труда. На личностном уровне основной характеристикой деструктивной мотивации является несоответствие личных и организационных интересов. Сравнительный анализ теоретических и методологических основ исследования мотивации позволяет выявить не только основные характеристики деструктивной мотивации, но и определить контуры психологического консультирования в целях снижения деструктивности в поведении сотрудников.

Ключевые слова и фразы: деструктивная мотивация, сотрудник, основные характеристики, теоретические модели, конструктивная мотивация.

Introduction

The problem of motivation is one of the most relevant in management psychology. Despite a large number of studies on this topic, there is no consensus on the issue of motivation approaches. There are a wide variety of approaches to defining motivation, each suited to solving specific tasks [6; 11; 15]. Generally, there are two conceptual models in the theoretical understanding of the motivation phenomenon. One model explains motivation through a biological lens and determines motivational reactions based on instincts. It means that the motivation of a person forms in spontaneous ways and a person is not able to control it. The other conceptual model of understanding motivation is the social approach. Following this, motivation is considered an active formation and a person may form or develop his motivation to work. The modern scientific approaches to motivation theories show that activity motivation, particularly, work motivation, is a complex concept in psychology that does not have a single definition and reflects the complexity of human behavior determined by internal and external, biological and social factors [5; 8]. However, the key directions of psychological thought aim at the definition of constructive forms of work motivation. These forms include such notions as the employee's desire to satisfy his needs through work activity, the mobilization of employees by managers to do their work, the work-activating process, etc. Thus, modern views on the phenomenon of motivation are mostly one-sided and insufficient to identify the full range of motivational behavior and needs of employees and the entire organization.

Theoretical-methodological bases

Problems of employees' motivation remain the most relevant to this day, especially in areas of implementation of innovative processes in production, and events of scientific and technological progress.

The term "motivation" first appeared in 1813 in the work of Schopenhauer, and was defined as "causality visible from the inside." There is no doubt that work motivation attracted attention long before the term itself appeared. However, only from the beginning of the twentieth century did the phenomenon of motivation become the subject of discussion within various theoretical circles related to social sciences or the humanities [14; 18].

Motivation as a dynamic process is considered in the works of Mescon, Albert, Hedouri, etc., and seems to be the process and result of motivating oneself and others to activity [22; 30]. It is no secret that the basis of the motivation process is human needs and expectations. The theory of motivation developed by Lyman Porter and Edward Lawler incorporates elements from both expectancy theory and other theories. The Porter-Lawler model includes five motivation variables: effort, perception, outcomes, reward, and satisfaction.

A person's productivity depends on many factors: effort, personal qualities, perception of one's role, and the conditions of the social environment. The employee's effort, in turn, depends on the value of the reward and the individual's expectations. The system of expectations of an employee of an organization is mainly characterized by the proportionality of his efforts and possible reward. This model made a huge contribution to the understanding of motivation since it showed that motivation is determined by a whole chain of cause-and-effect relationships, which is aimed at increasing labor productivity and the degree of satisfaction with the work done [24].

Thus, the dynamics of the scientific interpretation of work motivation led to a new understanding of Schopenhauer's causality. An important component of the Porter-Lawler model is the employee's skills and abilities, in the absence of which even a high level of

motivation will not help him achieve satisfaction [13]. In other words, motivation can lead to increased productivity if the employee has the appropriate knowledge needed to complete the assigned tasks. The nature of the task, among other things, influences the degree of satisfaction with the work performed. The importance of the employee's subjective (personal) assessment of the quality of his work is especially noted. The higher the employee's assessment of the quality of his work, the higher the expected level of remuneration. If the amount of expected remuneration does not correspond to the assessment of the quality of the work performed, the employee develops destructive motivation. For the amount of remuneration to correspond to the quality of work, the employee gradually becomes interested in reducing the efforts and resources spent on the latter. In other words, the employee is motivated to work less or slower. Only matching the employee's expectations with the level of remuneration can affect the increase in his level of job satisfaction. Otherwise, destructive motivation is formed and a decrease in the level of labor productivity is observed. This means that staff motivation can only be managed by setting the right goals, monitoring task completion, and the right reward system for the work done. More productive employees should understand that they can expect better benefits and rewards. Any increase in effort and intensity of work must be directly related to an increase in payment [4; 16; 25].

Adams' theory of justice, which is based on work experience, is also related to the concept of destructive motivation's boundary-pushing. The theory of fairness was investigated during a famous scientific experiment, in which the researchers distinguished three groups of workers. All groups were told to do the same job, but the first group was told that they would earn more than the other workers. The second group of subjects was informed that they would earn less than the workers of the other groups, and the third group was formed from those workers who received equal pay with the other groups for performing similar work. As a result of the experiment, the researchers recorded the following results.

1. Workers who believed they were paid more than others showed higher work productivity,
2. Workers who believed they were underpaid showed the least productivity at work.
3. Job satisfaction was lower among workers who were paid less than those who received equal pay.

Thus, the researchers concluded that each employee compares his effort and pay with those performing similar work. Moreover, when an employee is paid more, psychological defense mechanisms (rationalization, sublimation, etc.) are activated. The employee with whom employees compare themselves should be in a similar position, involved in similar tasks, or perform similar work.

According to Adams' equity theory, each employee compares his effort and output ratio with other employees. As a result of the comparison, he evaluates whether he is treated fairly or unfairly.

In many cases, the feeling of injustice brings psychological stress to employees, therefore, the employee develops a destructive motivation toward his work, which is expressed in the following types of behavior:

1. Labor input decreases in anticipation of fairness.
2. As income changes, so do job demands (eg asking for a bonus from a manager).
3. The employee reevaluates his time spent on work.
4. The employee may decide to change his job.

According to Adams' theory of justice, until people begin to believe that they have received a fair wage, they will reduce the intensity of their work [1; 25].

Summarizing various approaches, we can make a general conclusion that labor

motivation is aimed at creating incentives for labor behavior under the influence of external and internal factors.

Research methods

To identify the main characteristics of destructive motivation, the method of comparative analysis of theoretical approaches was used. As a result, it became possible to classify the main components of destructive motivation into clusters, which represent separate groups of characteristics of destructive motivation. Scientific and practical recommendations have been formed for each cluster to reduce the influence of destructive motivation on the work activity of employees.

Results

Thus, one of the leading factors determining the development of recommendations to limit the destructive motivation of personnel is possible only based on analysis of the mechanism of productivity in organizations. This mechanism will be reflected below using our developed models. However, before moving on to its description, it seems necessary to clarify the meaning of the concept of “destructive motivation” within the framework of this article since it has only relatively recently entered into scientific circulation and is interpreted very ambiguously. Also, an important role in determining destructive motivation is played by personal characteristics and the needs of the employee, since it is the correlation of objective reality with human needs that is the direct source of behavior. The destructive motivation of personnel often carries a latent nature, which complicates the identification of this process and the fight against it. Processes of destructive motivation exist in almost any organization, but they are not always conspicuous [29]. In this regard, employees who are influenced by destructive motivation often prefer not to openly demonstrate destructiveness in their behavior.

Thus, to determine destructive motivation, it is necessary to consider the personal characteristics of the employee. Depending on their values, goals, and personality traits, employees may have different expectations from the employer and the degree of reward for the work done.

Systematization of personal characteristics of employees can be shown in the following personality types:

Avoidant type:

- The employee does not care what work to do, there are no preferences
- agrees to low payment - provided that others do not receive more
- low qualifications
- low responsibility, desire to shift it to others
- minimizing effort

Instrumental type:

- Interested in the price of labor, not its content
- price justification is important,
- the ability to independently provide for one's life is important

Professional Type:

- Interested in the content of the work
- interested in difficult tasks
- freedom of action during work
- professional recognition.

Patriotic type:

- Interested in public recognition

- the main reward is the awareness of indispensability in the company
- social significance of the work [20].

Destructive motivation of personnel has certain characteristic features. Depending on the employee's personality type, the main characteristics of destructive motivation can also be determined.

Destructive motivation occurs mainly unintentionally, as an unplanned, negative, or side effect in the work process. This side effect is usually not immediately recorded and is not realized by either the employees or the employer. In general, the entire organization continues to function as usual. Destructiveness becomes noticeable as a result of the multiplicity, ambiguity, and often unpredictability of the consequences of actions leading to a decrease in labor productivity [10; 23]. In other words, destructive motivation becomes more and more noticeable as the functionality of the organization decreases [21].

Identification of the characteristics of destructive motivation of personnel makes it possible to determine its causality in the sense of changes in the functionality of the organization. The interaction of an employee's personal qualities with factors of the internal and external environment of the organization is assessed from the point of view of committing actions or inactions that are detrimental to the organization [23].

The complexity and negative potential of the phenomenon of destructive motivation of personnel determines the need to understand, predict, and control this phenomenon, which can be carried out only based on building a model reproduction of this phenomenon [2].

The general model we have developed for the reproduction of destructive motivation of personnel reflects the mechanism of determination of employee behavior under the influence of the unity of environmental factors and personal characteristics.

Modeling destructive work motivation is presented at three levels: macro-level or the level of the external social environment, meso-level or internal level of the organization, and micro-level or personal level of the employee. At the macro-level of modeling, it is necessary to study the characteristics of key spheres of social life: political-legal, economic, socio-psychological, and moral-spiritual, containing the prerequisites for destructive work motivation. The most important of them are:

- the high-income gap between entrepreneurs, top managers, and employees;
- high degree of unemployment;
- weak social protection of workers;
- non-compliance by employers with labor legislation;
- emergencies, etc [23].

The characteristics of an organization's external environment have a direct impact on the organization itself and employee identity. Under the influence of the external environment, the structure of the organization, its goals, values, and the business and social processes existing in it are formed.

The Meso-level of the presented model contains key characteristics of specific organizations that can lead to destructive motivation at the level of the organization's internal environment. This means that destructiveness at this level will manifest itself in the form of a tense psychological climate within the organization, conflict in interpersonal relationships, which negatively affects intragroup cohesion, etc.

At the micro level, the personal qualities of an employee are identified, which, when interacting with external and internal environmental factors of the organization, determine his behavior. The internal target determination of the subject, aimed at work activity, can form destructiveness in organizational behavior, expressed in the imbalance of personal and

collective interests in favor of personal interests. In general, personal interests in social and labor relations are determined by a contradiction of interests and awareness, competition, confrontation, and imbalance of motivational and value orientations of the employee and management organizations. The degree of severity of this conflict has a direct impact on the destructiveness in motivation [28].

Being in a situation of conflict of interest, the employees carry out a personally significant analysis of the work situation to identify various opportunities to satisfy their interests. At this stage, they evaluate such parameters of the organization as:

- the presence of “gray zones”, that is, space for the implementation of destructive behavior that is not regulated by organizational and legal norms;
- size of anti-stimuli, i.e. negative consequences when a manager identifies signs of destructive behavior;
- the likelihood of receiving retaliatory measures if the manager identifies facts of destructive behavior;
- the amount of benefit that the employee will receive from the implementation of destructive behavior [23].

A comparative analysis of constructive and destructive behavior patterns allows us to identify the dominant factors in satisfying the personal interests of employees. As a result of this analysis, it becomes possible to rank constructive and destructive factors simultaneously influencing the employee's behavior. Next, we propose a choice of behavior strategy that allows you to realize your interests to a greater extent and more easily. This strategy involves choosing types of behavior: destructive for the organization or constructive. It should be noted that in the absence of unambiguous linear determination, a return to earlier stages of the motivational process occurs. Before finally choosing a behavioral strategy, an employee can, for example, analyze the work situation several times, being influenced by prevailing constructive or destructive motives. Based on the results of passing all stages of the analysis, the employee exhibits one of two types of behavior - destructive or constructive [9; 19]. Thus, the entire mechanism of determining organizational behavior in the process of destructive motivation grows out of the mediation of organizational conditions by the characteristics of the employee's personality, the characteristics of which, in turn, are largely determined by the external environment of the organization. Analysis of the general mechanism for the reproduction of destructive motivation of personnel allows us to develop recommendations for limiting it. At the level of the internal environment of the organization, a set of recommendations for limiting destructive motivation can be differentiated into clusters regarding functional differences.

As many authors note, most of the abuses in the labor process are committed by company employees [3; 7; 12]. All these facts indicate that the destructive motivation of personnel is one of the significant factors hindering the development of the organization. In this regard, the development of methods for limiting destructive motivation is a necessary condition for the formation of a constructive working environment for the organization.

Thus, at the level of the labor organization, the most important recommendations for limiting the destructive motivation of personnel are:

- improving the organization of work through clarification and a clear definition of the composition performed by employees' functions;
- optimization of business processes occurring in the organization, delimitation of areas of responsibility of various departments;
- increasing the diversity of work, independence, introducing additional responsibility

for employees;

- improvement of working conditions;
- constant updating of equipment and labor technologies.

As part of monitoring the activities of employees, personnel assessments and punishment of violators of organizational order are recommended:

- improvement of documents regulating organizational behavior and regulating labor relations, and first of all, such as regulations on departments and job descriptions;
- formation of key indicators of employee performance, allowing to take into account the contribution of each employee in achieving the goals of the organization;
- development of an objective personnel assessment system using various methods: “360 degrees”, assessment center, etc.;

– establishment of sanctions for various forms of destructive organizational behavior. The greatest influence should be given to recommendations for limiting the causes of destructive motivation, highlighted in the subsystem of rewards, benefits, and career management such as the following:

- motivational diagnostics of enterprises, identification of motivational profiles, leading motives, and individual characteristics of the motivational mechanisms of the organization’s employees;
- the optimal combination of material and non-material benefits, taking into account the identified motivational profiles of employees;
- a direct connection between performance assessment and career growth;
- ensuring the fairness of salary levels shared by all employees, their strict compliance with the range of tasks performed duties, their complexity, and responsibility;
- maintaining comparability of salary levels for different categories of personnel.

At the level of the organizational culture subsystem, we can recommend:

- formatting of constructive organizational culture through formal means and informal channels, that best suit the phase of the organization’s life cycle;
- creating a sense of involvement in organizational culture among employees;
- creating internal information channels (messages by email, company website, publication of information brochures, corporate press) [23].

Within the framework of group communications, to limit the causes of the reproduction of destructive motivation, it is recommended:

- taking into account the interests and personal opinions of employees by the managers;
- creating an atmosphere of mutual assistance and support;
- joint decision-making where possible and appropriate;
- holding joint events and festive ceremonies [17; 23].

To eliminate or limit destructive motivation, it is necessary to take into account the personal qualities of employees that determine their susceptibility to destructive motivation. It must find its expression in the marketing and personnel selection system [23; 26].

Each group of causes of destructive motivation can and should be the object of independent research, taking into account not only the theory of motivation (including the concept of destructive motivation as its component) but the characteristics of organizations and organizational situations themselves. In general, it seems that the most effective method to limit this negative phenomenon is building a personnel management system in the organization, focused on compliance with the principles of social partnership. Social partnership is based on respect for the interests of workers and employers, aimed at achieving the goals of the organization and its constructive development [23; 27]. This approach proposes a model of an organization that minimizes the spread of destructive motivation of

personnel.

Conclusions

Analysis of the mechanism of reproduction of destructive motivation showed that the existence of this negative phenomenon in the organization is the result of the interaction of macro-, meso-, and micro-levels of causes existing in the external environment of the organization, its internal environment, as well as those inherent in the employee's personality. Based on the model of determining of destructive motivation of personnel, we can propose general recommendations for limiting this negative phenomenon at the level of individual organizations. Of course, due to the variety of societal, organizational, and personal reasons for destructive motivation, such recommendations can be formulated only in the most general form. Following this, the most effective approach to limiting destructive motivation seems to be possible to introduce a practice of modeling constructive motivation scenarios in the organization management based on the principles of social partnership and to minimize conflicts of interests of employees and employers.

References

1. Adams, J.S. Towards an Understanding of Inequity, *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1963, Vol. 67, No. 5.
2. Anjum A., Parvez M., Counterproductive Behavior at Work: A Comparison of Blue Collar Workers and White Collar Workers, *Pakistan Journal of Commerce & Social Sciences*, 2013, Vol. 7. No 3. pp. 417–434.
3. Cameron J., Negative Effects of Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation – a Limited Phenomenon, *Review of Educational Research*, 2001, 71, pp. 29–42.
4. DiClemente, C. C., Velasquez, M. M., Motivational interviewing and the stages of change, In W. R. Miller, & S. Rollnick, (Eds.). *Motivational interviewing* (2nd ed., pp.201–216), 2002, New York: Guilford Press.
5. Dudasova L., Vaculik M., Prochazka J., Svitavska P., Patton G., Causality of the Satisfaction–Performance Relationship: A Task Experiment, *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 2023, 19, 1, pp. 48–66, 10.5964/ejop.4075.
6. French E. G., Motivation as a variable in work–partner selection, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1956, 53, pp. 96–99.
7. Hakobyan N., Dabaghyan A., Khachatryan A., The Phenomenon of Anomie in the Context of Marginality, *Katchar Scientific Periodical*, 2022, 1, pp. 89–104, 10.54503/2579–2903–2022.1–89.
8. Hakobyan N., Khachatryan A., The Case Study of Value System in a Post–War Society, *Katchar Scientific Periodical*, 2023, 1, pp. 133–145, 10.54503/2579–2903–2023.1–133.
9. Locke E. A., Latham G. P., *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works*, 1984, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
10. Martinko M.J., Gundlach M.J., Douglas S.C. Toward an Integrative Theory of Counterproductive Workplace Behavior: A Causal Reasoning Perspective, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 2002, 10, pp. 36–50.
11. Maslow H. A., *Motivation and Personality*, 1987, New York: Harper and Rowe.
12. McClelland D. C., *Human Motivation*, 19878, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Porter L., Lawler E., The Effect of Performance on Job Satisfaction, *Industrial Relations*, 1967, 7, 1, pp. 20–28. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-232X.1967.tb01060.x>
14. Schopenhauer A., *On the Fourfold Root of the Principle of Sufficient Reason*, 2007, Cosimo Inc., 412 p.
15. Winter D. G., Power Motivation Revisited, In C. P. Smith (Ed.). *Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis*, 1992, pp. 301–310, New York: Cambridge University.

16. Winter, D. G., The Power Motive in Women and Men, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1988, 54, pp. 510–519.
17. Борисов А.Ф., Челенкова И.Ю., Исследование механизмов согласования интересов участников корпоративных отношений (на примере промышленных корпораций Тамбовской области), Вестн. Тамбовского ун-та. Сер. Гуманитарные науки, 2014. № 11 (139), с. 195–196.
18. Едренова В.Н., Бутина Р.И., Анализ практики корпоративных подходов к мотивации труда, Экономический анализ, 2004, 15, 30, с. 16–21.
19. Иванова С.В., Мотивация на 100%: А где же у него кнопка? М., 2013, 148 с.
20. Кибанов А.Я., Основы управления персоналом: учебник, Москва, 2002.
21. Кузнецова Е.А., Демотивация персонала: причины, факторы, методы устранения, Современные исследования социальных проблем (Электронный научный журнал), 2012, 11, 19, URL: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/demotivatsiyapersonala-prichiny-factory-metody-ustraneniya>
22. Мескон М., Альберт М., Хедоури Ф., Основы менеджмента, 2017, 672 с.
23. Нарожная Д.А., Деструктивная мотивация как объект управления, Государственное управление. Электронный вестник, 2014, 44, с. 25–26. URL: http://e-journal.spa.msu.ru/vestnik/item/44_2014narognaya.htm
24. Нарожная Д.А., Социальная детерминация деструктивного трудового поведения работников в современной России, Государственное управление. Электронный вестник, 2015, 48, с. 92–98. URL: http://e-journal.spa.msu.ru/vestnik/item/48_2015narozhnaia.htm
25. Нюттен Ж., Мотивация, действие и перспектива будущего, М., 2004.
26. Осеев А.А., Социально-психологический портрет руководителя: идеальная модель и способы ее измерения, Вестн. Моск. ун-та, Сер. 18, Социология и политология, 2011, 1, с. 126–144.
27. Осипов Е.М., Социальное партнерство как фактор стабилизации социально-трудовых отношений, Социология власти, 2011, 7, с. 119–126.
28. Петрунин Ю.Ю., Пурлик В.М., Корпоративная социальная ответственность и ее отражение в современных управленческих концепциях, Вестн. Моск. ун-та, Сер. 21 (государство и общество), 2012, 4, с. 22–23.
29. Пугачев В.П., Деструктивная деятельность в государстве и обществе: теоретико-методологический аспект, Вестн. Моск. ун-та. Сер. 21. Управление (государство и общество), 2014, 3, с. 5.
30. Ричи Ш., Мартин П., Управление мотивацией: учебное пособие для вузов. Перевод с англ. Под редакцией проф. Е.А. Климова, Москва, 2004.

The article has been submitted for publication: 15.03.2024

Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է լրագրության. 15.03.2024

Статья представлена к публикации: 15.03.2024

The article is sent for review: 05.04.2024

Հոդվածն ուղարկվել է գրախոսության. 05.04.2024

Статья отправлена на рецензию: 05.04.2024

The article is accepted for publication: 26.04.2024

Հոդվածն ընդունվել է լրագրության. 26.04.2024

Статья принята к печати: 26.04.2024