

MOTIVATION THEORIES AND DESTRUCTIVENESS PHENOMENON

NONA GYULAMBARYAN

National Academy of Sciences,
Republic of Armenia
International Scientific-Educational Center
nona.gyulambaryan@gmail.com

DOI: 10.54503/2579-2903-2024.2-63

Abstract

The topical issue for this scientific research is the problem of human motivation in modern society. Various social sciences provide extensive material for studying the problem of motivation. In different historical periods, society treated the expressions of human motivation differently. According to the forms of the organization of society, various theories of motivation were presented, which found their application in psychological science, sociology, cultural studies, and anthropology. Along with the problem of studying motivation, there is a growing interest among theorists and practitioners in the phenomenon of destructiveness. In psychological science, there is a need to compare and analyze these phenomena. An interdisciplinary study of theories of motivation and the phenomenon of destructiveness revealed certain ties between destructive behavior of a person and his motivations. In particular, the article considered the psychological category of motivational frustration, which means the impossibility of achieving goals and the inadequate expression of motivations. One of the main problems in studying destructive human behavior is the lack of applied research on this issue in science. Therefore, when analyzing the phenomenon of human destructiveness, we mainly rely on works devoted to the study of aggression, crime, and various forms of deviation that contain a destructive component directed either outward – to the outer social environment, or inward – to the inner world of a person. Beginning in the 20th century, scientists and thinkers who tried to understand in one way or another the reasons for people's desire for destruction considered this problem in the context of aggression, considering destructiveness to be one of its extreme forms of manifestation along with cruelty and violence. Since this form of behavior (destructive) is conscious and characteristic, in our opinion, only of humans, it would be most correct to evaluate it as a way of human activity. Activity, in particular, professional activity, is an essential expression of a specifically human, personally meaningful being. According to social-psychological and anthropological concepts, human destructiveness is subject to social laws, depends on the motivational structure of society, and therefore can be predicted, and in some cases controlled. That is why we consider this phenomenon from the standpoint of motivation theories. The theoretical and methodological conclusions of this article may further lead to developing certain mechanisms to overcome

motivational frustration and destructive behavior of the person.

Keywords and phrases: motivation, frustration, society, destructiveness, theoretical models.

ТЕОРИИ МОТИВАЦИИ И ФЕНОМЕН ДЕСТРУКТИВНОСТИ

НОНА ГЮЛАМБАРЯН

Международный научно-образовательный центр
Национальной академии наук Республики Армения

nona.gyulambaryan@gmail.com

Аннотация

Актуальной темой для данного научного исследования является проблема мотивации человека в современном обществе. Различные социальные науки предоставляют обширный материал для изучения проблемы мотивации. В различные исторические периоды времени общество по-разному относилось к проявлениям мотивации человека. Соответственно особенностям организации общества, формировались различные теории мотивации, которые нашли свое применение в психологической науке, социологии, культурологии и антропологии. Наряду с проблемой изучения мотивации наблюдается растущий интерес среди теоретиков и практиков к феномену деструктивности. В психологической науке возникает необходимость сопоставления и анализа этих феноменов. Междисциплинарное исследование теорий мотивации и феномена деструктивности выявило определенные взаимосвязи между деструктивным поведением личности и мотивациями. В частности, в статье была рассмотрена психологическая категория мотивационной фрустрации, означающая невозможность достижения целей и неадекватного проявления мотиваций. Одной из основных проблем изучения деструктивного поведения человека является отсутствие прикладных исследований по этой проблеме. Поэтому при анализе феномена деструктивности человека мы в основном опираемся на работы, посвященные изучению агрессии, преступности и различных форм девиации, содержащих в себе деструктивный компонент, направленный либо вовне – во внешнюю среду, либо во внутренний мир человека. Начиная с XX века ученые и мыслители, пытавшиеся так или иначе понять причины стремления людей к разрушению, рассматривали эту проблему в контексте агрессии, считая деструктивность одной из крайних форм ее проявления наряду с жестокостью и насилием. Поскольку данная форма поведения (деструктивная) осознанна и свойственна, по нашему мнению, только человеку, наиболее корректно было бы оценивать ее как способ человеческой деятельности. Деятельность, в частности профессиональная, является сущностным выражением специфически человеческого, личностно

значимого бытия. Согласно социально–психологическим и антропологическим концепциям, деструктивность человека подчинена социальным законам, зависит от мотивационной структуры общества, а потому может быть прогнозируема, а в некоторых случаях и контролируема. Именно поэтому мы рассматриваем это явление с позиций теорий мотивации. Теоретико–методологические выводы данной статьи в дальнейшем могут стать основой для разработки определенных механизмов преодоления мотивационной фрустрации и деструктивного поведения личности.

Ключевые слова и словосочетания: мотивация, фрустрация, общество, деструктивность, теоретические модели.

ՄՈՏԻՎԱՅԻԱՅԻ ՏԵՍՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԸ ԵՎ ԴԵՍՏՐՈՒԿՏԻՎՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՖԵՆՈՄԵՆԸ

ՆՈՆԱ ԳՅՈՒԼԱՄԲԱՐՅԱՆ

Հայաստանի Հանրապետության գիտությունների ազգային ակադեմիայի
գիտակրթական միջազգային կենտրոն

nona.gyulambaryan@gmail.com

Համառոտագիր

Այս գիտական հետազոտության արդիական թեման է ժամանակակից հասարակության մեջ անձի մոտիվացիայի խնդիրը: Հասարակական տարբեր գիտակարգերը բազմաթիվ նյութեր են ներկայացնում մոտիվացիայի խնդիրը ուսումնասիրելու համար: Պատմական տարբեր ժամանակաշրջաններում հասարակությունը տարբեր վերաբերմունք է ունեցել մարդկային մոտիվացիայի դրսևորումների նկատմամբ: Ըստ հասարակության կազմակերպման առանձնահատկությունների՝ ձևավորվել են մոտիվացիայի տարբեր տեսություններ, որոնք իրենց կիրառությունն են գտել հոգեբանության, սոցիոլոգիայի, մշակութաբանության և մարդաբանության մեջ: Մոտիվացիայի ուսումնասիրման խնդրին զուգընթաց տեսաբանների և կիրառական ոլորտի մասնագետների շրջանում աճում է հետաքրքրությունը նաև դեստրուկտիվության երևույթի նկատմամբ, ուստի՝ հոգեբանական գիտակարգում անհրաժեշտություն է առաջանում այս երևույթները համեմատել և վերլուծել: Մոտիվացիայի տեսությունների և դեստրուկտիվության երևույթի միջառարկայական ուսումնասիրությունները բացահայտում են որոշակի փոխկապակցվածություններ դեստրուկտիվ վարքագծի և մոտիվացիայի միջև: Մասնավորապես, հոդվածում ուսումնասիրվել է մոտիվացիոն ֆրուստրացիայի հոգեբանական կատեգորիան, այսինքն՝ նպատակներին հասնելու անհնարինությունը և մոտիվացիայի ոչ համարժեք դրսևորումները: Անձի դեստրուկտիվ վարքագծի ուսումնասիրության հիմնական խնդիրներից մեկը այս հարցի վերաբերյալ կիրառական հետազոտությունների բացակայությունն է: Հետևաբար՝

անձի դեստրուկտիվության երևույթը վերլուծելիս մենք հիմնականում հիմնվում ենք ագրեսիայի, հանցագործության և շեղվող վարքի տարբեր ձևերի ուսումնասիրությանը նվիրված աշխատությունների վրա, որոնք պարունակում են դեստրուկտիվության բաղադրիչ, որն ուղղված է կան դեպի արտաքին միջավայր, կամ դեպի մարդու ներաշխարհ: 20-րդ դարից սկսած՝ գիտնականներն ու փիլիսոփաները, ովքեր այս կամ այն կերպ փորձել են հասկանալ մարդկանց կործանարար ցանկությունների պատճառները, այս խնդիրը դիտարկել են ագրեսիայի համատեքստում՝ դրա դրսևորման ծայրահեղ ձևերից մեկը համարելով դեստրուկտիվությունը՝ դաժանության և բռնության հետ մեկտեղ: Քանի որ վարքագծի այս (դեստրուկտիվ) ձևը գիտակցված է և, մեր կարծիքով, բնորոշ է միայն մարդկանց, ամենից ճիշտ կլինի այն գնահատել որպես մարդկային գործունեության ձև: Գործունեությունը, մասնավորապես՝ մասնագիտական գործունեությունը, հատուկ է մարդկանց: Սոցիալ-հոգեբանական և մարդաբանական հասկացությունների համաձայն՝ մարդկային դեստրուկտիվությունը ենթակա է սոցիալական օրենքների, կախված է հասարակության մոտիվացիոն կառուցվածքից և, հետևաբար, այն կարելի է կանխատեսել և, որոշ դեպքերում, վերահսկել: Այդ իսկ պատճառով մենք այս երևույթը դիտարկում ենք մոտիվացիայի տեսությունների տեսանկյունից: Այս հոդվածի տեսական և մեթոդական եզրակացությունները ապագայում կարող են հանգեցնել մոտիվացիոն ֆրուստրացիայի և անձի դեստրուկտիվ վարքագծի հաղթահարման որոշակի մեխանիզմների մշակմանը:

Բանալի բառեր և բառակապակցություններ. մոտիվացիա, ֆրուստրացիա, հասարակություն, դեստրուկտիվություն, տեսական մոդելներ:

Introduction

The recent interest of various sciences in studying the phenomenon of human destructiveness from the standpoint of motivation theories is connected, on the one hand, with the global nature of destructive tendencies, the scale of which extends to the area of motivational bases of human behavior in society, and on the other hand, with general tendencies of managing individual or social groups in modern society. It is possible to note the growing interest in interdisciplinary problems in this area of scientific knowledge – psychological, sociological, historical, anthropological, etc. Theories of motivation existing in management and personnel management answer the key question for the motivation process in different ways: how can the motivational structure of employees of the organization be effectively stimulated so that they voluntarily and responsibly work following the organization's goals? This motivational structure refers to the psychological and anthropological perspective of the study, according to which motivation is aimed at reducing the individual's destructive behavior and preserving socially significant values. As a result, the phenomenon of destructiveness not only complements the motivational structure of individual behavior but also constructs modern knowledge about values in modern society. Thus, the phenomenon of destructiveness is an interdisciplinary category, the study of which contributes to

the formation of knowledge about the nature of human motivation.

Theoretical-methodological bases

Considering the problem of destructiveness in the context of motivational theories, we will highlight two groups of motivation theories:

- Classical concepts.
- Modern theories of motivation.

Classical concepts of motivation have been widespread since the early times of the organization of society. The key to motivation in the classical sense was the “carrot and stick” policy – the most ancient and widespread method of motivation [25, 31]. The motivation algorithm for this type: if you do a good job you’ll get a reward; do not do it or do it poorly – you will be “punished”. This concept of motivation is found in myths and fairy tales of different peoples of the world: if the hero passes a series of tests, he will receive a gift. If he does not pass the test – he will lose his life. We find the socio-philosophical foundations of this concept in the works of D. Locke, who considered it obvious that when it first appears in the world, each person is a “white paper” without any ideas and knowledge, including destructive ones. According to the philosopher, the natural state of society is an atmosphere of equality, independence, and awareness of mutual responsibility [22]. The formation of the concept of mutual responsibility created the ground for the development of sensualism in thinking, which, in turn, fed the theoretical and philosophical foundations of the classical motivation concept. Based on the sensualism of D. Locke, F. Voltaire, following him, believed that all types of knowledge are based on experience, which indicates the motivational nature of man. Motivation began to be identified with the destructiveness of human activity; it was perceived as the basis for the manifestation of private personal needs and goals that did not coincide with the direction of society’s development. This opinion changed during the Enlightenment when philosophers believed that all people are equal in their inclinations and can develop their abilities to the maximum if they are brought up in favorable conditions. That is, in order to cultivate the best spiritual qualities in a person, it is necessary to change the environment, and the social system in which a person lives [26].

The main advantage of the carrot and stick concept is its proven centuries-old history of management practice in different countries and different sectors of the national economy. The disadvantage of the concept is its limited applicability. Trends in social development, the increasing complexity of public institutions, and the deepening of knowledge about the methods and forms of managing human work activities have led to the definition of destructiveness as an expression of crime [16]. Gradually, the founders of social utopianism adhered to approximately the same views, reflecting on crime as a manifestation of human destructiveness. Utopians saw the possibility of overcoming crime in the re-organization of society on socialist principles. They called for the elimination of a society based on the dominance of private property since they believed that the cause of crime lies

in the inequality of people, which is the source of all evil and gives rise to base feelings. Such followers of social utopianism as A. Saint-Simon, C. Fourier, and R. Owen were convinced that crime is rooted in the very nature of a private property society based on the exploitation and oppression of people and pointed out the futility of combating crime with the help of criminal punishments alone. Like the enlighteners, utopian socialists were characterized by the fact that they did not blame a person who had taken the path of crime but saw the reasons for such behavior in the vicious organization of a society based on private property and the exploitation of people [32]. Under the influence of industrialization and urbanization processes, beginning in the late 18th century, factors of economic motivation—class contradictions in society, capitalist exploitation, need, and poverty—acquired particular significance in assessing the causes of destructive behavior [10, 14]. In many Western countries in the late 19th – early 20th centuries, criminological studies were conducted to identify the connection between food prices and crime rates. Thus, according to G. Mayer's correlation [30], a half-penny increase in the price of rye resulted in a one-fifth increase in crime per 100,000 residents. Accordingly, a decrease in prices was accompanied by decreasing destructiveness in behavior and motivation for crime. Destructiveness began to be identified with a person's social affiliation and social status. In the period from 1886 to 1902, economists C. Booth and S. Burt [30] conducted a detailed study of the economic conditions of London and found that approximately 56% of offenders came from the four lowest economic classes, i.e. 37% of the population. As a result, the researchers concluded that offenders, as a rule, come from the lower socio-economic strata. It is noteworthy that property crimes increase during periods of economic downturns, and crimes against the person – during periods of prosperity, although the crime rate remains relatively stable, as a whole. At the same time, sociologists of that time, having identified the connection between the socio-economic conditions of society and social deviations, were unable to fully distinguish and explain the nature of destructive and motivational deviations.

The development of the social structure of societies and the deepening of motivational attitudes as a socio-stratification base for the formation of society led to the emergence of psychological theories of motivation. In 1923–1924, E. Mayo first used socio-psychological methods of motivating factory workers at a textile factory in Philadelphia. The turnover of personnel in the spinning department of the factory was 250%, while in other departments it was 5–6%. Material methods of stimulating workers did not produce results. With the permission of the factory administration, E. Mayo established two ten-minute rest breaks for the spinners. The results appeared quickly: the turnover of personnel decreased sharply, and the output of each worker increased, and the psychological state of the spinners improved. Subsequently, the factory administration canceled Mayo's innovations, and the situation returned to its previous state. E. Mayo did not create a psychological concept of motivation, but he proved that the carrot and stick policy is not enough to effectively motivate workers and reduce destructiveness in behavior. This was the time when the idea of destructiveness as a natural

essence of man gradually transformed into the idea of destructiveness as negatively motivated human behavior. Based on statistical data, sociologists conclude that the number of anomalies in human behavior inevitably increased every time during wars, economic crises, and social upheavals, which, in turn, refutes the theory of the “innate” criminal, pointing to the social roots of this phenomenon [17]. If for C. Lombroso “criminals are born”, then for A. Kettle “criminals are not born, they become them.” They become – under the influence of social conditions, and social factors. According to A. Kettle, “Society contains within itself the germ of all crimes that must be committed because it contains within itself the conditions that promote their development; it... prepares the crime, and the criminal is only an instrument” [18]. A. Kettle includes demographic, social (profession, education), and natural (climate, seasonality) factors influencing the commission of crimes. The main idea of A. Kettle, which is shared and developed to varying degrees by all representatives of the sociological direction, boils down to the following: 1) crime is generated by society; 2) it develops according to certain laws under the influence of social and other objective factors; 3) it is characterized by statistical stability; 4) it is possible to influence crime (reduce it) only by changing (improving) social conditions.

According to Yu. G. Volkov and V. S. Polikarpov, “Only in a society where there are no caste barriers, monopolies on material and spiritual goods and power, where a feeling of powerlessness and hopelessness of a person is not generated, is it possible to reduce to minimum various kinds of social destructive pathologies – crime, drug addiction, alcoholism, prostitution, nationalism, fanaticism and other forms of evil” [13]. The French researcher J. Tarde noted that “if the main cause of crime were physiological anomalies of criminals, then the number of crimes would always remain unchanged, whereas the crime figure fluctuates depending on social conditions” [29]. In other words, destructiveness was perceived as a phenomenon characterized by social pathology of behavior. A. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory was one of the first to present the motivation process as a mechanism for reducing destructiveness in human behavior. From A. Maslow’s works, effective motivation was understood as an impact on people’s current needs, as well as the fact that human needs are complex and line up in a certain hierarchy [12]. Maslow was the first to prove that effective motivation is aimed not at any, but only at the current needs of a person. The process of motivation through needs is endless, since human needs increase as they are satisfied (the law of accelerated growth of needs).

The advantage of A. Maslow’s motivation theory was the fact that theory made an extremely important contribution to management practice, to the understanding of what motivates people to work effectively and, conversely, what motivates people to be destructive. E. Durkheim, in turn, considered social deviations primarily as a consequence of the normative-value disintegration of society. His ideas were further developed in the works of researchers who recognized the leading causes of deviant behavior as contradictions between classes and various social forces, such as innovative and conservative ones. One of

the most prominent followers of E. Durkheim, R. Merton, also considered various manifestations of destructiveness to be a natural product of social conditions: “We proceed from the fact that certain phases of the social structure give rise to circumstances in which the violation of the social code is a “normal” reaction to the situation that has arisen” [15, 24].

Based on the general trends in the development of social sciences, the perception of the phenomenon of destructiveness has focused on the problems of criminal behavior. Now we often encounter destructive forms of behavior in work – many manifestations of ineffective management decisions, and unmet expectations from work can lead to destructive needs. That is why some process theories of motivation help us better understand the mechanisms of destructiveness formation. Process theories of motivation are considered more modern than substantive theories since they address such questions as:

- How does motivation arise?
- What are the dynamics of various motives and incentives used to ensure that an employee works effectively to achieve the goals of the organization?

In this context, Vroom’s expectation theory can be noted. According to Vroom, the current need of an employee does not yet motivate him to work effectively to meet his needs and achieve the goals of the organization. The motivating factor is the expectation that the chosen model of employee behavior will bring him the desired result (satisfaction of current needs).

Thus, the phenomena of destructiveness and constructiveness are defined by Vroom as the process of expectation as an individual’s assessment of the probability of a certain event. For example, most working people expect that if they work with full dedication, they will be able to get a promotion or a raise. According to V. Vroom, the main motivation for work is three interrelated factors, and all of them are in the area of psychological expectations of the employee:

- the employee’s expectations that his labor efforts will yield results;
- the expectation that the achieved result will entail a reward,
- the expected value of the reward for the obtained results of labor, which

V. Vroom calls valence.

V. Vroom emphasizes that if an employee of an organization does not see the connection between the result of his work and the desired reward, then his motivation for effective work will weaken. V. Vroom concludes: that all three factors are equally important for the effective motivation of employees of the organization. The advantage of V. Vroom’s motivation theory is an individual approach to motivating different employees of the organization. HR managers and managers should compare the proposed reward with the current needs of their employees and bring them into line with the goals of the organization. Adams showed that the motivation of an employee of the organization to work effectively is greatly influenced by the fairness of the assessment of his activities and the results achieved by him by the managers of the organization. Fairness is determined by the ratio of expenses and incomes of the employee of the organization, comparing the current assessment of his work with previous

assessments, as well as with the assessments of the costs and incomes of other employees of the organization. Adams emphasizes that each employee, consciously or not, always evaluates the ratio of his income and expenses in comparison with the income and expenses of other employees. In this case, the norm is an approximate equality of the ratio of his income and expenses and the ratio of income and expenses of other employees of the organization. The evaluation criterion is the employee's ideas about moral and legal justice [28]. If, as a result of such comparison and evaluation, the employee concludes that there are no violations of justice, then he continues to work actively. If a violation of justice is discovered, the employee begins to restore it in one or more of the following destructive or constructive ways:

1. Reducing one's energy costs in work.
2. Attempts to increase remuneration for one's work.
3. Overestimation of one's capabilities (decreased self-confidence).
4. Attempts to influence the organization's management to change the remuneration or workload of other employees.
5. Selecting another object for comparison.
6. Attempts to move to another department or another organization.

The advantages of S. Adams's theory of justice are important conclusions for the practice of managing people in organizations:

1. Organization managers and HR managers must take into account the psychology of the organization's employees, particularly, their ideas about justice.
2. To effectively motivate employees, it is very important to provide a clear remuneration system.
3. The organization's management should periodically study the issue of how fair the organization's employees consider their remuneration to be.

Porter and Lawler developed a comprehensive theory of motivation based on the two previous concepts.

Research methods

To study the theory of motivation from the point of view of determining destructiveness, we applied scientific methodological approaches of the historical method, comparison, and analysis. Taking into account the fact, that the problem of motivation of labor of a person in modern society is inextricably linked with his needs and social expectations, it was necessary to apply an interdisciplinary approach in this study. Thus, with the help of an interdisciplinary scientific apparatus, the connections between the causes of the appearance of destructiveness in human behavior and the expression of his motivational sphere of activity were investigated and analyzed. The results of this study can become a methodological basis for further empirical socio-psychological and anthropological studies to identify certain relationships and interdependencies between the motivational activity of a person and his destructive behavior. In the future, the development of scientific thought in the field of comparison of motivational frustration

and destructiveness will allow us to discover methodological ways to reduce destructiveness in human labor activity, as well as to develop skills to overcome motivational frustration.

Results

According to the theory of stigmatization (branding) by G. Becker, destructiveness is a consequence of the fact that society itself (more precisely, a social group) hangs appropriate labels on an individual, correlating the actions of a specific person with abstract rules (primary deviation). Gradually, a reputation is formed, which forces the individual to adhere to a destructive role (secondary deviation). Secondary deviation develops after branding and as a reaction to it. In full accordance with the ideas of G. Becker, a deviant becomes such only when society has recognized his destructive behavior.

The famous German sociologist and criminologist of the 20th century F. Sack [6] noted that the overwhelming majority of the adult population of modern society commits a crime at least once in their life (from the point of view of the current criminal law). But only official admission of committing a crime makes a person a criminal. Once branded as a criminal, a person continues to behave accordingly. In general, the theory of stigmatization reveals a significant layer of the relationship between man and society. Despite a certain one-sidedness, this theory makes one wonder whether official sanctions for a first or minor offense are always justified. Finally, a subjective cause of destructive behavior can be the attitude of an individual (group) to social norms [23]. For example, to free oneself from moral demands and justify oneself, a person can “neutralize” the effect of norms in the following ways: refer to higher concepts (friendship, loyalty to the group); deny the existence of the victim; justify one’s behavior by the destructiveness of the victim or by provocation on his part; deny one’s responsibility; deny the harm caused by one’s behavior. In addition, according to D. Matsa, a young person from the lower strata of society has the opportunity to maneuver, “drift” (hence the concept of “drift”) between various social norms that condemn/permit certain forms of behavior. Most offenders, having become adults, stop “drifting”, moving on to completely conformist behavior [23].

It should be noted that some of the provisions we are considering form the core of socio-psychological concepts of destructive behavior. Thus, the “cognitive model of aggression” [8], as well as the theory of stigmatization, originating in symbolic interactionism, are based on the ability of people to qualify (interpret, treat) the actions, deeds, and behavior of others. When analyzing destructive behavior, emotional and cognitive processes should be taken into account, since the nature of an individual’s understanding (interpretation) of any events, as well as the feelings experienced subsequently, largely determine the degree of aggressive reaction. The likelihood of an aggressive reaction depends on individual characteristics of cognitive processing of sociocultural information preceding destructive behavior, which is reflected in the formation of various motivational structures, cognitive schemes, and scenarios (the theory of “cultural schemes” by

E. Wallace) [7], which control the manifestation of aggression. [3]. All scenarios are characterized by the normative conviction of an individual in the acceptability of his reaction in a specific situation. The only way to control and eliminate aggression is to develop constructive or non-aggressive cognitive schemes and scenarios in provoking circumstances. In turn, the criminological concepts of G. Tarde, E. Sutherland, and D. Cressey are often considered in the social psychology of aggression as the “learning theory” of A. Bandura [11], in which aggression is considered a social phenomenon, namely, as a form of behavior learned in the process of social learning. In other words, according to social-psychological concepts, human aggression is an acquired, complex behavioral reaction learned throughout life and conditioned by many factors of the external environment, which, like any other social behavior, is subject to control and correction.

Since the mid-19th century, with the development of sociology and psychology, various manifestations of human destructiveness have been studied within the framework of deviant behavior in the context of social processes and norms established within a given society. In this context, some procedural theories of motivation have become more relevant. It is fundamentally important that such forms of deviant behavior as crime, suicide, drug addiction, and alcoholism, have a common property, which is a criterion for belonging to a group of deviations. Such an essential feature is destructiveness. After all, deviant behavior in general leads to the destruction of something (health, relationships, personality, public order) and even to the interruption of life itself [2].

According to J. Tarde, the basis for the development of society is the socio-communicative activity of individuals in the form of imitation. In essence, he interpreted crime as a process of imitation, understanding it as an elementary copying and repetition by some people of the behavior of others. His compatriot, criminologist A. Lacassagne, compared criminals to microbes that are always present in any healthy organism, and if the organism is strong, it does not allow them to manifest themselves negatively – therefore, the origins of crime should be sought in a sick social organism. Speaking in 1885 at the First International Congress of Anthropologists in Rome, A. Lacassagne uttered the famous phrase that became a formula: “Every society has the criminals it deserves.” Later, having reproduced it, G. Mannheim added: “Every society has such a type of crime and criminals⁵ that correspond to its cultural, moral, social, religious and economic conditions” [33].

Thus, in modern society, wealth is a generally recognized universal symbol of success, and, therefore, people strive for it. But part of the population lives in slums, with limited social opportunities. At the same time, the rigidity of the class structure increases, and the possibility of legally changing social status in the direction of its improvement is reduced. However, it is the class structure that determines the inequality of opportunities, and differences in access to the values of society. Therefore, destructive behavior can be assessed as a symptom of the discrepancy between the motivations determined by culture (for success, wealth) and the socially organized means of satisfying them [1, 5]. “Deception,

corruption, immorality, crime, in short, the whole spectrum of prohibited means becomes increasingly widespread when the importance attached to the goal of achieving success, stimulated by a given culture, diverges from the coordinated institutional significance of the means” [24]. The demands of culture on a specific person turn out to be incompatible. On the one hand, he is required to orient his behavior towards the accumulation of wealth, on the other hand, he is practically not allowed to do this institutionally. The result of such structural inconsistency is the following paths of adaptation: either conformism and ritualism, or “rebellion” – the formation of a psychopathic personality, antisocial behavior, and destructive activity. Thus, the conflict between goals and the means to achieve them can lead to motivational frustration and the search for illegal ways of adaptation. T. Parsons [27] expanded the typology of destructive adaptations and destructive behavior by R. Merton. According to T. Parsons, the main social causes of destructiveness are motivational differences between participants in social interaction and discrepancy with expectations.

Other socio-cultural factors of destructive behavior can be the influence of norms of a deviant subculture and training. The theory of subcultures [20] arose as a result of studies of juvenile delinquency and gangsterism (banditry). To a large extent, this concept emphasized the significance of the conflict between the values and goals of the “big society”, or more precisely, the middle class, and the ability of adolescents from the lower classes to achieve these goals. Adolescents react to the inaccessibility of the values of society’s culture by creating a subculture with its values, goals, and norms. According to A. Cohen, the delinquent subculture as a protest against the culture of society is characterized by a destructive, malicious, and negativistic nature. “There is an element of malice here, pleasure from causing trouble to others, enjoyment of the very fact of rejecting various taboos” [20]. This standpoint also proceeds from the fact that “individuals occupying different positions in the social structure do not have equal chances of success” [19].

The motivation to be included in a social group can be expressed through personal and group needs – to be included in the group, to follow its norms, to imitate its members, and to oppose oneself to other groups [4]. A wide variety of subcultures grow on this soil – the aristocratic elite, hippies, metalheads, rockers, etc. People tend to identify themselves with the leaders of the group and their ideals (including destructive ones), which largely explains the existence of such mass deviations as genocide, racism, and fascism. Thus, certain forms of behavior – both law-abiding and deviant – are learned when interacting with other people in the process of communication [21]. This usually occurs in groups between people connected by some personal relationships. The main reason for the formation of destructive behavior is a conflict of cultures or subcultures, expressed in the frustration of human needs and destructive motivation. “When people become criminals, this happens because they come into contact with a criminal mode of behavior, and also because they find themselves isolated from the influence of an anti-criminal mode of behavior. They become criminals because of an excess of such connections” [21]. The theory of differentiated

connections was one of the most fruitful of its time. It made it possible to explain destructive behavior, but could not answer the main question – why do people need destructive connections? Along with the objective socio-cultural factors considered, the so-called subjective causes of destructive behavior are also at work. In his book, G. Becker uttered a phrase that became famous: “A deviant is someone to whom the labor market, as a social institution in modern society, has assigned a corresponding label; deviant behavior is behavior that people have labeled in this way” [9].

In human professional activity, the issues of destructiveness and motivation were studied by Porter and Lawler. According to the developed model, the achieved results of an employee's work depend on the efforts made, abilities, and also on his/her awareness of social role. The level of effort applied to the work is determined by the value of the reward and the degree of confidence that the level of effort applied will lead to a certain level of reward. Achieving the required level of work performance can entail external rewards, such as a bonus, praise from a manager, or promotion, and internal rewards, such as a sense of satisfaction from a job well done, a sense of competence, and self-esteem. The Porter-Lawler motivation theory must establish a connection between reward and the achieved results of an employee's work: the employee satisfies his/her needs through rewards for the achieved results of his/her work. The Porter-Lawler motivation model has some advantages. Firstly, this model shows that motivation is a complex systemic process, consisting of many factors. Secondly, the Porter-Lawler model reveals the importance of the joint action of such motivation factors as efforts, abilities, results, external and internal rewards, satisfaction, assessments, and expectations of the organization's employees within the framework of a single system of human resource motivation. Thirdly, Porter and Lawler proved that effective work leads to employee satisfaction, and not vice versa – to destructiveness [28].

Conclusions

Exploring various theories of motivation we can make a general conclusion, that theories of motivation are divided into two main groups: classical and modern. The most famous is the theory of A. Maslow. The most systemic and effective model of human resource motivation is the model developed by Porter and Lawler. Most of the modern methods of material and non-material motivation of human resources follow from the main theories of motivation considered. Modern scientific trends in the study of personal motivation lead us to understand this complex psychological phenomenon in the context of studying destructive behavior. Therefore, for a systematic understanding of motivation as one of the most important management functions, for the formation of professional competencies, modern managers and leaders must not only know well and be able to apply classical and contemporary theories of motivation, but also compare them with forms of destructive behavior.

References

1. Հակոբյան Ն., Խաչատրյան Ա., Ավանդույթի գործառնությունը անձի արժեհամակարգի ձևավորման համատեքստում, Գիտական հոդվածների ժողովածու, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Գիտակրթական միջազգային կենտրոն, Երևան, 2016 թվական, էջ 149-156.
2. Հակոբյան Ն., Ֆիրյան Ա., Խաչատրյան Ա., Սոցիալական անոմիա և հոգեբանական պաշտպանություն. Ուսումնամեթոդական ձեռնարկ, 2022.
3. Eron L., Theories of Aggression: From Drives to Cognitions. New York: Plenum Press, 1994.
4. Hakobyan N., Khachatryan A., Career Management Problems and Development Trends // Գիտական հոդվածների ժողովածու, 2015, 1, 196-203.
5. Hakobyan N., Khachatryan A., Theoretical-Methodological Review of Social-Psychological Problems in Career Management // Российско-Армянский университет, XII Годичная научная конференция. Сборник научных статей, 4-8 декабря, 1, 305-313.
6. Sack F., Neue Perspektiven in der Kriminologie // Kriminal-soziologie. Wisbaden, 1968.
7. Wallace A., Culture and Personality. New York: Random House, 1960.
8. Zillmann D., Cognitive-Excitation Interdependencies in Aggressive Behavior // Aggressive Behavior. 1988. № 14.
9. Беккер Г., Девиантность как следствие «наклеивания ярлыков». Казань: Изд-во Каз. ун-та, 2001.
10. Бонгер В., Бродяжничество и нищенство // Уголовное право и социализм. М., 1908.
11. Бандура А., Теория социального научения. СПб.: Евразия, 2000.
12. Ветлужских Е. Н., Мотивация и оплата труда. Инструменты, методика, практика. М.: Альпина, 2016. С. 34.
13. Волков Ю. Г., Поликарпов В. С., Человек как космопланетарный феномен. Ростов н/Д: Изд-во РГУ, 1993.
14. Гилинский Я. И., Девиантология: социология преступности, наркотизма, проституции, самоубийств и других «отклонений». СПб.: Изд-во «Юридический центр Пресс», 2004.
15. Дюркгейм Э., Социология. Ее предмет, метод, предназначение. М.: Канон, 1995.
16. Зарубина Е. В., Социальные и культурные функции морали // Вестник научных конференций. 2016. № 1-5 (5). С. 75-76.
17. Змановская Е. В. Девиантология: (Психология отклоняющегося поведения). М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2004. Рынок труда как социальный институт в современном российском обществе 319
18. Кетле А., Человек, развитие его способностей или опыт социальной физики. Киев, 1965.
19. Клаурд Р., Оулин Л., Дифференциация субкультуры // Социология преступности. М.: Прогресс, 1966.
20. Козн А., Содержание делинквентной субкультуры // Социология преступности. М.: Прогресс, 1966.
21. Кресси Д., Развитие теории. Теория дифференцированной связи // Социология преступности. М.: Прогресс, 1966.
22. Локк Дж., Соч.: В 3 т. М.: Мысль, 1985. Т. 1.
23. Матза Д., Сайкс Г., Метод нейтрализации. Теория делинквентности // Социология преступности. Современные буржуазные теории: Сборник статей. М.: Прогресс, 1966.
24. Мертон Р., Социальная структура и аномия // Социология преступности (Современные буржуазные теории). М.: Издательство «Прогресс», 1966.

25. Мескон М., Альберт М., Хедоури Ф., Основы менеджмента, М.: изд.-во «Дело», 2000. С.360, 362.
26. Огурцов А. П., Философия науки эпохи Просвещения. М.: Наука, 1993.
27. Парсонс Т., О структуре социального действия. М.: Академический проект, 2002.
28. Серебренникова М. С., Фатеева Н. Б. Актуальные проблемы мотивации и стимулирования труда // Аграрное образование и наука. 2015. № 1. С. 29.
29. Тард Г., Преступник и преступление. Сравнительная преступность. Преступления толпы. М.: ИНФРА-М, 2004.
30. Фокс В., Введение в криминологию. М.: Изд-во «Прогресс», 1985.
31. Фромм Э., Анатомия человеческой деструктивности. М.: АСТ\$ Хранитель, 2007.
32. Чаликова В., Утопия и утопическое мышление: Антология зарубежной литературы. М.: Прогресс, 1991.
33. Яковлев А. М., Преступность и социальная психология. М.: Юриздат, 1971.

The article has been submitted for publication: 17.06.2024
Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է րւշագրւոթյաւն. 17.06.2024
Статья представлена к публикации: 17.06.2024

The article is sent for review: 31.07.2024
Հոդվածն ուղարկվել է գրախոսությաւն. 31.07.2024
Статья отправлена на рецензию: 31.07.2024

The article is accepted for publication: 29.08.2024
Հոդվածն ընդննսվել է րւշագրւոթյաւն. 29.08.2024
Статья принята к печати: 29.08.2024