

MOTIVATION AS A KEY FACTOR OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: PSYCHOLOGICAL AND BEHAVIORAL APPROACHES

Marsel Sadykov

Self-Employed Organizational Development, USA

A B S T R A C T	K E Y W O R D S
<p>This article examines motivation as a central determinant of organizational effectiveness, synthesizing classical and contemporary psychological and behavioral approaches. It describes key motivation theories (self-determination theory, expectancy theory, goal-setting theory, and two-factor theory), the relationship between motivation and job resources and demands (JD-R), the impact of motivation on performance and the risk of burnout, as well as empirical data and practical interventions aimed at enhancing autonomous motivation and organizational performance. Recommendations for designing motivational systems and evaluating their effectiveness are presented.</p>	<p>Employee motivation, organizational effectiveness, self-determination theory, Job Demands – Resources , goal setting, psychological safety.</p>

Introduction

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the integration of psychological and behavioral theories of motivation into a single analytical context of organizational effectiveness, with an emphasis on the difference between autonomous and controlled motivation and their different impact on the sustainability of performance results.

In a context of intense competition, digitalization , and growing uncertainty, organizational effectiveness is increasingly determined not only by technological and structural factors but also by the quality of human capital utilization. In this context, employee motivation is viewed as one of the key psychological mechanisms mediating the relationship between management practices and organizational performance. Contemporary research shows that the level and nature of motivation are directly linked to labor productivity, engagement , innovative behavior, turnover, and the psychological well-being of employees [1,2].

Classical and modern theories of motivation emphasize that performance is determined not only by the intensity of effort, but also by its quality, sustainability, and internal regulation. In particular, self - determination theory Theory distinguishes between autonomous and controlled motivation, showing that autonomous motivation is associated with higher-quality task performance, sustained engagement

, and a lower risk of emotional burnout. Empirical research in various organizational contexts confirms that support for employees' autonomy, competence, and social connectedness is a significant predictor of organizational effectiveness and staff well-being [1].

Process models of motivation, such as Vroom's expectancy theory, complement psychological analysis by focusing on cognitive assessments of the probability of achieving a result and the value of rewards. According to this model, motivation is determined by the extent to which an employee believes their efforts will lead to desired outcomes and meaningful rewards. Research shows that a mismatch between effort, results, and the reward system reduces motivation even with formally high incentives [3].

At the same time, research in organizational psychology emphasizes that motivation cannot be considered in isolation from working conditions. The Job Model The Job Demands – Resources (JD-R) model demonstrates that motivational processes are closely linked to the balance between job demands and available resources. Job resources (such as support, autonomy, and development opportunities) activate the motivational process and increase engagement, whereas excessive demands without compensation for resources lead to decreased motivation and increased burnout [2].

Empirical meta-analytic studies confirm that motivation is a significant mediator between organizational practices and performance outcomes. Autonomous motivation is associated with higher productivity, creativity, and proactive behavior, whereas the prevalence of external control may produce short-term effects at the cost of reduced employee resilience and well-being [4].

Thus, the relevance of motivation research in the context of organizational effectiveness stems from the need to integrate psychological and behavioral approaches to not only stimulate employee efforts but also ensure their long-term performance and adaptability. This article examines motivation as a multi-level phenomenon, encompassing individual psychological mechanisms and organizational conditions, enabling a shift from fragmented incentives to systemic performance management.

The study of motivation as a factor in organizational effectiveness draws on a combination of psychological and behavioral theories explaining the sources, direction, and sustainability of work activity. A modern scientific approach integrates content, process, and resource models of motivation, allowing for consideration of both individual psychological mechanisms and the influence of the organizational context.

Self-determination theory, developed by R. Ryan and E. Deci, is one of the most empirically supported modern theories of motivation. It is based on the assumption that there are three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness, the satisfaction of which contributes to the development of autonomous (intrinsic) motivation. Autonomous motivation, unlike controlled motivation (based on external pressure and rewards), is associated with higher task performance, sustained engagement, and psychological well-being among employees.

Numerous studies in organizational contexts show that autonomy support from management, professional development opportunities, and social support are positively associated with performance and reduced burnout [1].

The expectancy process theory proposed by V. Vroom explains motivation through the employee's cognitive assessments of three components:

- expectation that efforts will lead to results (expectancy);
- instrumentality of the result for obtaining a reward (instrumentality);
- subjective value of reward (valence).

According to this model, motivation declines if even one of these links is disrupted. In organizational practice, this means that even significant incentives may not lead to increased performance in the absence of transparent evaluation criteria and a fair reward system [3].

The goal-setting theory of E. Locke and G. Latham posits that specific, challenging, and accepted goals systematically enhance employee performance. Goal setting is linked to focused attention, mobilization of effort, persistence, and the development of task strategies. Goal effectiveness is significantly enhanced by regular feedback and a sense of autonomy in choosing how to achieve them. Long-term studies and meta-analyses confirm a strong link between high-quality goal formulation and work performance [5].

Herzberg's two-factor model distinguishes between hygiene factors (working conditions, salary, safety), which eliminate dissatisfaction, and motivational factors (achievement, recognition, growth), which foster positive motivation. The theory emphasizes that improving external conditions alone does not guarantee high performance if the work is not perceived as meaningful and developmental.

Despite criticism, this model retains heuristic value in designing non-material motivation systems [6]. JD - R model integrates motivation and stress, viewing them as the result of the interaction of job demands and resources. Job resources (support, autonomy, and development) activate the motivational process, leading to engagement and high performance, while excessive demands without adequate resources initiate burnout.

JD - R is one of the most widely used models in organizational effectiveness research and helps explain why motivation declines even with the formal presence of incentives [2].

Table 1 - Key theoretical approaches to motivation and their contribution to explaining organizational effectiveness

Theory	Key focus	The main mechanism of motivation	Contribution to understanding effectiveness
Self-determination theory (SDT)	Type of motivation (autonomous/controlled)	Satisfaction of basic psychological needs	Sustainable performance, engagement, well-being
Expectancy theory	Cognitive expectations and values	Linking effort, results, and rewards	Rational distribution of efforts
Goal setting theory	Goals and self-regulation	Focus and Mobilization of Efforts	Increased productivity
Two-factor theory	Satisfaction and motivation	Differences in conditions and sources of growth	Designing non-material motivation
Job Demands – Resources	Context of labor	Balancing demands and resources	Integrating Motivation and Burnout

The theoretical frameworks discussed demonstrate that motivation is a multilevel phenomenon formed through the interaction of individual psychological processes and organizational conditions. Integrating these approaches allows for a more accurate explanation of differences in organizational effectiveness and serves as a theoretical basis for developing comprehensive motivational interventions.

Modern research shows that motivation as a factor in organizational effectiveness can be targeted through systemic psychological and behavioral interventions. The most effective approaches are those that simultaneously consider individual motivational mechanisms and the organizational context in which work occurs.

1. Supporting autonomy and intrinsic motivation. Interventions aimed at supporting employee autonomy include increasing participation in decision-making, flexibility in choosing how to complete tasks, and developing management practices that focus on support rather than control. According to self-determination theory, such measures contribute to the development of autonomous motivation, which is associated with higher quality work and sustainable productivity. Empirical research confirms that an autonomy-supportive leadership style is associated with higher engagement , job satisfaction, and reduced burnout [1].
2. Designing work and job crafting . Designing a job design) and job practices Crafting allows you to tailor the content of work to the individual strengths and interests of employees . Crafting involves proactively modifying tasks, social interactions, and cognitive perceptions of work, which enhances the experience of meaning and responsibility for results. Longitudinal and meta-analytic studies show a consistent positive relationship between job crafting with motivation, engagement and productivity [7].
3. Goal and Feedback System. Setting specific, challenging, and achievable goals, reinforced by regular feedback, is one of the most empirically proven tools for improving performance. Goals promote focus and self-regulation. behavior, and feedback ensures adjustment and maintenance of motivation. Research shows that the effect of goal setting is enhanced when combined with autonomy and competence development [5].
4. Requirements and Resource Management (JD-R approach). Within the Job model Demands – Resources interventions are aimed at reducing excessive work demands and enhancing resources (management support, training, recovery opportunities). This approach simultaneously enhances motivation and reduces the risk of burnout. Research confirms that programs that increase work resources indirectly improve organizational effectiveness through increased engagement [2].
5. Developing psychological safety. Psychological safety is an important contextual condition for the realization of motivation. Interventions in this area include developing inclusive leadership, encouraging the expression of ideas, and normalizing the discussion of mistakes. These practices promote team learning and innovative behavior, which mediates the influence of motivation on effectiveness. The empirical significance of psychological safety has been confirmed in studies of team effectiveness [8].

Table 2 - Practical motivational interventions

Intervention	The main psychological mechanism	Empirically proven effects
Support for autonomy	Satisfaction of basic needs (SDT)	Increased engagement , quality of work, and well-being
Job crafting	Increasing the meaning and relevance of work	Increased motivation and initiative
Goal setting and feedback	Self-regulation and focus of attention	Increased productivity
Strengthening of Work Resources (JD-R)	Activation of the motivational process	Reduced burnout, increased efficiency
Psychological safety	Openness and team learning	Innovation, sustainable team results

Practical interventions aimed at motivation demonstrate the greatest effectiveness when applied systematically and considered within the organizational context. Empirical evidence suggests that sustainable improvements in organizational effectiveness are achieved through a combination of autonomy support, effective job design, balancing demands and resources, and fostering a psychologically safe environment.

Evaluating the effectiveness of motivational interventions is essential for their scientific validity and practical reproducibility. Current research recommends using a combined methodological approach, including subjective and objective measures, as well as longitudinal measurement designs.

Validated psychometric scales of motivation, engagement, and burnout are used as subjective indicators, while objective measures include productivity, turnover, absenteeism, and job performance indicators. Designs with repeated measures (before and after the intervention) and, if possible, control or quasi-experimental groups are considered the most informative.

Longitudinal studies show that short-term changes in motivation do not always translate into sustainable organizational outcomes, highlighting the importance of delayed assessment of effects. Furthermore, motivation often acts as a mediator between interventions and performance, requiring the use of multivariate statistical analysis when interpreting the data.

Thus, a systematic and methodologically correct assessment of effectiveness allows not only to determine the effectiveness of specific interventions, but also to increase the reliability of conclusions about the role of motivation in ensuring organizational effectiveness.

Thus, motivation is a key factor in organizational effectiveness, but its impact depends on the nature of motivation (intrinsic/extrinsic), organizational resources, and the design of work environments. Practically significant interventions include those that support autonomy, align goals and rewards with employee expectations, and balance demands and resources. A comprehensive, context-sensitive approach offers the greatest likelihood of sustainably improving both motivation and organizational performance.

References

1. Ryan RM, Deci EL Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions // Contemporary Educational Psychology. 2000. Vol. 25, No. 1. P. 54–67. URL: https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/2000_RyanDeci_SDT.pdf
2. Bakker AB, Demerouti E. The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art // Journal of Managerial Psychology. 2007. Vol. 22, No. 3. P. 309–328. URL: <https://peopleful.io/Job-Demands-Resource-Model-research.pdf>
3. Vroom VH Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964. 331 p. URL: <https://www.potentialunearthed.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Vrooms-Expectancy-of-Needs-theory.pdf>
4. Deressa AT, Zeru G. Work motivation and its effects on organizational performance: the case of nurses in Hawassa public and private hospitals // BMC Research Notes. 2019. Vol. 12, Article number: 213. URL: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6454626/>
5. Locke EA, Latham GP Building a Practically Useful Theory of Goal Setting and Task Motivation // American Psychologist. 2002. Vol. 57, No. 9. P. 705–717. URL: https://med.stanford.edu/content/dam/sm/s-spire/documents/PD.locke-and-latham-retrospective_Paper.pdf

6. Herzberg F. Motivation–Hygiene Theory // [Electronic resource].

URL: <https://davidpublisher.com/Public/uploads/Contribute/63c64fc3c4cb5.pdf>

7. Wrzesniewski A., Dutton JE Crafting a Job: Revisioning Employees as Active Crafters of Their Work // Academy of Management Review. 2001. Vol. 26, No. 2. P. 179–201. URL: https://positiveorgs.bus.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/Crafting-a-Job_Revisioning-Employees.pdf

8. Edmondson A. Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams // Administrative Science Quarterly. 1999. Vol. 44, No. 2. P. 350–383. URL: https://web.mit.edu/curhan/www/docs/Articles/15341_Readings/Group_Performance/Edmondson%20Psychological%20safety.pdf