

СЕКЦІЯ 2
ПСИХОЛОГІЯ ПРАЦІTHE PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIAL, INSTITUTIONAL,
AND INDIVIDUAL PRODUCTIVITY FACTORSПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ АСПЕКТИ СОЦІАЛЬНИХ, ІНСТИТУЦІЙНИХ
ТА ІНДИВІДУАЛЬНИХ ФАКТОРІВ ПРОДУКТИВНОСТІ

In the contemporary era, the progression of technology, particularly the pervasive implementation of artificial intelligence and automation, is continuously reshaping the labor market. This evolution necessitates the recalibration of individual motivational structures and fosters an increased interest in diverse professional domains. Within this context, self-awareness and the alignment of career trajectories with personal inclinations become increasingly significant. The motivational attributes of individuals constitute fundamental determinants of job satisfaction and performance within professional environments. Empirical studies demonstrate that individuals with elevated levels of intrinsic motivation derive greater satisfaction from their professional endeavors and exhibit enhanced commitment to their occupational roles. This dynamic is particularly critical in optimizing productivity and ensuring the emotional well-being of employees in modern organizational settings. The outlined issue emerges as a salient focus within the framework of contemporary psychological inquiry. The core of this research area lies in the examination of how personality traits influence vocational decisions and motivational drivers. Professional motivation plays a pivotal role not only in personal development but also in achieving economic and societal progress. In this context, the challenges, as viewed from the perspective of researchers, pertain to the following areas: the sources of professional motivation, including the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors; the effect of psychological characteristics of personality on motivation, such as the connection between personality types and motivational tendencies (e.g., differences between introverts and extroverts); the influence of social and cultural factors, including the role of family, educational institutions, and societal norms in shaping individual motivation and career preferences; and the outcomes of motivation on both individual and organizational levels, particularly its role in job performance, job satisfaction, and professional development.

The implications of motivation on productivity can be examined from various perspectives. Among these, the employer-employee framework provides a basis for elevating this thesis beyond the scope of prior research in the field, through deliberate efforts to achieve a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding.

Key words: efficiency, productivity and motivation, organization, factors.

У сучасну епоху розвиток технологій, зокрема повсюдне впровадження штучного інтелекту та автоматизації, постійно змінює ринок праці. Ця еволюція вимагає перекалібрування індивідуальних мотиваційних структур і сприяє зростанню інтересу до різноманітних професійних сфер. У цьому контексті самосвідомість і узгодження кар'єрних траєкторій з особистими схильностями стають усе більш важливими. Мотиваційні властивості індивідів становлять фундаментальні детермінанти задоволеності роботою та продуктивності в професійному середовищі.

Емпіричні дослідження демонструють, що люди з підвищеним рівнем внутрішньої мотивації отримують більше задоволення від своїх професійних зусиль і виявляють підвищену відданість своїй професійній ролі. Ця динаміка особливо важлива для оптимізації продуктивності та забезпечення емоційного благополуччя працівників у сучасних організаційних умовах. Окреслена проблема постає в центрі уваги в межах сучасного психологічного дослідження. Суть цієї галузі досліджень полягає у вивченні того, як риси особистості впливають на професійні рішення та мотиваційні чинники. Професійна мотивація відіграє ключову роль не лише в особистому розвитку, але й у досягненні економічного та суспільного прогресу. У цьому контексті виклики, з погляду дослідників, стосуються таких сфер: джерел професійної мотивації, включаючи вплив внутрішніх і зовнішніх мотиваційних факторів; вплив психологічних характеристик особистості на мотивацію, зокрема зв'язок між типами особистості та мотиваційними тенденціями (наприклад, відмінності між інтровертами та екстравертами); вплив соціальних і культурних факторів, включаючи роль сім'ї, навчальних закладів і суспільних норм у формуванні індивідуальної мотивації та кар'єрних переваг; і результати мотивації як на індивідуальному, так і на організаційному рівнях, зокрема її роль у виконанні роботи, задоволенні роботою та професійному розвитку.

Вплив мотивації на продуктивність можна розглядати з різних точок зору. Серед них система роботодавця – працівник забезпечує основу для виведення цієї тези за межі попередніх досліджень у цій галузі шляхом цілеспрямованих зусиль для досягнення більш повного та тонкого розуміння.

Ключові слова: ефективність, продуктивність і мотивація, організація, фактори.

UDC 159.9

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2663-5208.2025.69.2.13>

Babayeva L.

Doctoral Candidate
at the Department of Psychology
Baku State University

The relevance of the problem and the degree of exploration. The study of professional motivation has been extensively explored in both local and international research. Various theoretical frameworks and approaches have been developed in this field.

For instance, the **Theory of Self-Determination** (SDT), advanced by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan, elucidates how motivational processes are shaped by intrinsic and extrinsic determinants. This theoretical framework underscores the pivotal role of intrinsic motivation in fostering personal development and enhancing occupational satisfaction [4].

The motivational frameworks developed by scholars such as Abraham Maslow and Frederick Herzberg propose classical paradigms that investigate the interplay between motivational determinants, job satisfaction, and productivity. Maslow's **hierarchy of needs** and Herzberg's **two-factor theory** constitute foundational models for examining motivation within professional environments [21; 22].

Researchers across Western Europe and the United States have provided extensive insights into this issue, analyzing numerous socio-psychological dimensions. These include studies addressing psychological growth and vulnerability: the fulfillment and frustration of fundamental psychological needs [5], attitudes towards work, motivational constructs, and self-determination theory [9], the historical evolution, theoretical advancements, and empirical findings on work motivation [12], the latent logic shaping human motivations [7], workplace well-being: the interplay of job demands and resources [3; 14], and motivation as influenced by cognitive frameworks [6]. These findings collectively underscore the critical importance of psychological dimensions in understanding the productivity dynamics inherent in professional activities.

The primary objective of this study is to delineate the psychological dimensions of social, institutional, and individual productivity factors.

The research methodology involves the analytical examination and synthesis of scholarly literature, coupled with the derivation of structured conclusions. This methodological approach integrates multiple techniques to achieve the research objectives and offers an in-depth exploration of the factors influencing professional motivation among individuals.

Main Section. Productivity as an Individual, Organizational, or Societal Construct
When conceptualized as an individual, organizational, or societal objective, productivity assumes varying interpretations contingent on the interests and perspectives of individuals. For instance, an economist approaching productivity within a societal framework, an entrepreneur evaluating the operational efficiency and profitability of their enterprise, or an engineer focused on the quantitative assessment of work outputs, each ascribe unique meanings to the term, reflecting their disciplinary viewpoints. Likewise, the conceptualization of efficiency varies across distinct phases of industrial development and across cultural

contexts. Nonetheless, definitions of productivity formulated by diverse international organizations exhibit substantial conceptual alignment.

According to sources from the **International Labour Organization** (ILO), productivity represents a multi-faceted, universally applicable, and dynamic construct that necessitates continuous reinterpretation to align with contextual exigencies. It must be enhanced in a manner that generates value for stakeholders, including customers, organizations, and society at large. Productivity should not merely react to external circumstances but should be approached through proactive and strategic planning.

All planning must be intricately embedded into the corporate system and practices of the business.

On an international scale, productivity is typically conceptualized as total factor productivity. Comparative analyses are conducted based on production models, using efficiency and pricing criteria. The Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) index is utilized in projects conducted by the OECD and the United Nations (UN) [2], and productivity indices are constructed following similar methodologies.

The most general definition of productivity, traditionally understood as a production-oriented concept, is the ratio of outputs (goods and services) to inputs provided to achieve those outputs [8; 9]. While productivity inherently consists of efficiency and effectiveness components, it also encompasses performance metrics such as efficiency, quality, innovation, and quality of work life.

In contexts where the issue of productivity, centered around the human factor, is assessed without being directly indexed to production – and where employees in other organizational functions, as well as those at the production level, are comprehensively addressed – productivity increasingly becomes synonymous with the concept of performance.

Considering that productivity represents the ratio between outputs and inputs, it can be improved by either increasing output while keeping inputs constant or reducing inputs while maintaining the same level of output. In such cases, efficiency implies achieving organizational objectives through either of two equally effective solutions, with the additional determination to select the most cost-effective option.

Given that the resources used to produce goods and services include raw materials, human labor, capital, equipment, technology, and energy, the broadest definition of productivity emerges as a measure of the efficiency of these resources, which are inherently limited, in meeting human needs through the creation of goods or services.

Various definitions of productivity in normative economics, such as total and partial productivity, monetary or physical productivity, and average or marginal productivity, are further elaborated below.

Total Factor Productivity (TFP) and **Partial Productivity** arise from the relationship between output and either total inputs or individual inputs. TFP is defined as the ratio of outputs to the

combined total of inputs, including labor, capital, raw materials, energy, and machinery: **Total Factor Productivity = Outputs / (Labor + Capital + Raw Materials + Machinery + Energy)**

Partial Productivity, by contrast, focuses on the ratio of outputs to specific inputs considered individually:

- *Raw Material Efficiency = Goods and Services Produced / Quantity of Raw Materials Utilized*
- *Labor Productivity = Value of Goods and Services Produced / Hours of Labor Utilized*
- *Overall Machinery Efficiency = Goods and Services Produced in the Production Department / Hours of Machinery Utilized*

The formulas for physical productivity and monetary productivity emerge depending on whether the inputs and outputs subject to productivity evaluation are expressed in physical or monetary terms:

- *Monetary Efficiency = Monetary Value of Inputs / Monetary Value of Outputs*
- *Physical Productivity = Total Physical Output (e.g., tons, meters, units) / Total Physical Input*

Average productivity is the representative rate of productivity calculated for a specific period. It is obtained by dividing the total output of the period by the total input used during the same period:

Average Productivity = Total Outputs of the Period / Total Inputs Used in the Period

Marginal productivity is derived by dividing the incremental production volume during a period by the increase in input over the same period: *Marginal Productivity = Incremental Output for the Period / Incremental Input for the Period*

The Essence of Efficiency and Effectiveness

Due to its close association with concepts such as efficiency, effectiveness, profitability, rationality, performance, quality, and optimization – and its role as an indicator of organizational and managerial success – efficiency drives numerous strategic transformations and advancements across all business sectors. In the effective management of enterprises, the utilization of various resources is indispensable.

The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance

The hypothesis of a positive correlation between job satisfaction and employee performance levels remains inconclusive. However, three principal approaches exist regarding the connection between job satisfaction and performance:

1. Job satisfaction increases performance.
2. Performance enhances job satisfaction.
3. Rewards improve both job satisfaction and performance.

Studies indicate that there is no simple or direct correlation between job satisfaction at a given time and subsequent performance [1]. While job satisfaction does not inherently boost performance, some research suggests that the degree of the satisfaction-performance link may vary under certain conditions. For example, this relationship is more likely

to occur among skilled, high-level, and professional employees than among unskilled, semi-skilled, or lower-level workers.

The idea that performance influences job satisfaction was advanced by Edward Lawler and Lyman Porter, with some studies demonstrating that the “performance-to-job satisfaction” connection is stronger than the “job satisfaction-to-performance” link. If an employee delivers high performance and receives rewards that they deem important, satisfaction will likely follow. These rewards can be intrinsic or extrinsic. Moreover, the employee will evaluate whether the rewards are equitable when compared to what other employees receive.

As depicted below, inequitable rewards diminish satisfaction levels, subsequently reducing performance:

Performance → Intrinsic Rewards → Extrinsic Rewards → Job Satisfaction → Perception of Equity in Rewards [4; 17].

The notion that rewards influence performance and job satisfaction is rooted in the optimal distribution of incentives. Research indicates that employees who receive substantial rewards also exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction. Similarly, while withholding rewards from underperforming employees may initially lead to dissatisfaction, it often fosters higher performance levels in the future. This suggests that the ambiguity surrounding the relationship between performance and job satisfaction partially arises from the role of rewards as an intervening variable. Nevertheless, this relationship constitutes a continuous and dynamic system, making it challenging to evaluate the precise impact of job satisfaction on performance.

For years, efforts have been made to establish a positive correlation between job satisfaction and productivity. The initial *Hawthorne Studies* suggested the existence of such a relationship. Subsequent research by several scholars also concluded that job satisfaction and productivity are positively correlated, but they found only a weak correlation of about 15%. Group-based studies have observed that the most productive employees often belong to groups with the lowest levels of job satisfaction. Additional investigations suggest that a positive correlation between job satisfaction and productivity is more likely among highly skilled and professionally engaged workers dealing with complex and challenging tasks, rather than among unskilled or semi-skilled workers performing monotonous duties [10; 20].

According to Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, the mere presence of relative job satisfaction cannot guarantee high productivity. Factors such as job design and organizational hierarchy, which influence employee productivity, must also be considered. Moreover, the absence of job satisfaction poses significant obstacles to achieving long-term productivity goals.

Studies that account for individual differences classify workers as follows:

- Those who work harder when satisfied with their jobs;
- Those who are content as long as they are undisturbed;
- Those who work excessively to forget their problems.

In this classification, employees who work harder when satisfied are described as standard or normative workers. If the other groups exhibited traits typical of these normative workers, the correlation between job satisfaction and productivity would likely be much stronger. However, the presence of the other two groups considerably weakens the correlation.

Although some argue that happier individuals work more effectively, later research has shown no significant relationship between job satisfaction and productivity, as stated by numerous scholars. An employee may feel satisfied without necessarily being highly productive, while a highly productive worker may experience low satisfaction levels. On the other hand, high levels of job satisfaction can influence an employee's intrinsic motivation, potentially enhancing their efficiency and directing them toward more productive activities.

While productivity is fundamentally related to human economic activity, its evaluation in measurement and comparative research often appears as a static determination of the current state. In this context, productivity should not be viewed as a static condition but rather as a dynamic phenomenon. Additionally, productivity must be assessed relative to past productivity metrics or compared with the performance metrics of other enterprises within the same sector. This dynamic perspective ensures that productivity remains a reliable measure, beginning with the initial phase of production and extending through the resource utilization process.

The concept of productivity is frequently regarded as a phenomenon that organizations endeavor to attain expeditiously. Presently, productivity continues to be recognized as a fundamental metric of organizational success, and it appears that in the forthcoming years, it will retain its status as a critical benchmark for management and organizational achievement within the domain of business administration.

Enhancing Business Efficiency within Enterprises

The responsibility for enhancing business efficiency within enterprises lies directly with managerial personnel. Consequently, efficiency is regarded as an indicator of the success of managers who direct and oversee business functions. In fact, managers shoulder considerable accountability in optimizing the use of personnel, time, and material resources to meet production objectives, while also fostering a culture of productivity awareness.

On the other hand, at first glance, efficiency gives the impression of emerging within institutional dimensions. The recent historical context of a challenging institutional environment forms the basis of this perspective. In reality, productivity is

primarily a consequence of attitudes and behaviors. This observation suggests that efforts to augment productivity should be predicated upon the individual.

Although productivity is correlated with social advancement and the optimal utilization of resources in the industrial and service sectors, the enhancement of productivity primarily occurs within the context of the enterprise or corporation itself. The available resources are amalgamated in their diverse forms to produce goods and services, and the efficacy of their combined efforts is reflected in productivity. Therefore, it is essential not only to measure but also to manage productivity effectively. When efficiency is explicitly defined as a strategic objective by organizational leadership, this concept becomes even more pertinent.

When business leaders establish objectives and strategies rooted in efficiency, domains such as marketing, profitability, production costs, investment returns, sales, and product manufacturing can be integrated and balanced. Enhancing productivity within an organization can be achieved at multiple levels. As in production, irrespective of their position within the organizational hierarchy, every individual performing based on output, aside from those directly engaged in production, can contribute to productivity. The contribution of an unskilled worker holds equal value to that of a senior manager.

Productivity factors can be classified into two primary categories:

- External (uncontrollable) productivity factors
- Internal (controllable) efficiency factors

External factors lie beyond the control of the respective business, while internal factors are subject to organizational control. For any given organization, external and uncontrollable factors may, in some instances, be internal to other entities. For example, external factors that affect a business, such as governmental bodies, national or regional institutions, associations, and interest groups, may be considered internal for those organizations. Governments may enhance tax policies, improve labor legislation, facilitate greater access to natural resources, upgrade social infrastructure, and refine pricing policies, among other initiatives; however, individual organizations lack the capacity to implement such changes.

Conclusion. External factors for business are inherently linked to the business itself. This is because understanding these factors may activate certain actions that could alter the business's behavior and efficiency in the long term. It is evident that the rapidly evolving and advancing technology influences not only the working conditions of employees but also the ways in which organizations can enhance their operational efficiency. The increased workload placed on employees and the enrichment of tasks indicate that the significance of individual development within the labor economy may be emphasized with greater intensity in the future.

There are also positive advancements within the work environment. In an era where regulatory

bodies overseeing labor law – regulating business relations between employees and organizations – are becoming increasingly flexible and irregular, one of the key drivers of these changes is the management of processes, which is highlighted as a sensitive issue. Considering that economics is a social research field, the discipline of labor economics automatically emerges as a highly significant area of study. The competitive pressures and development-driven openness of the key actors within labor economics, namely employees and organizations, in the business environment are recurring themes emphasized in various academic studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Bakker A.B., Demerouti E. The Job Demands-Resources Model: State of the Art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 2007. № 22(3). P. 309–328.
2. Bakker A.B., Demerouti E. Job Demands-Resources Theory. Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide. 2014. P. 1–28.
3. Bakker A.B., Albrecht S.L. Workplace Wellbeing: The Role of Job Demands and Resources. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2018. № 15(6). P. 2792.
4. Deci E.L., Ryan R.M. Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness. Guilford Press. 2017. 756 p.
5. Vansteenkiste M., Ryan R.M. On Psychological Growth and Vulnerability: Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction and Need Frustration as a Unifying Principle. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*. 2013. № 23(3). P. 263–280.
6. Dweck C.S. Mindset: Changing the Way You Think to Fulfill Your Potential. Robinson. 2017. 306 s.
7. Ariely D. Payoff: The Hidden Logic that Shapes Our Motivations. TED Books. 2016. 103 p.
8. Gagné M., Deci E.L. Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2005. № 26(4). P. 331–362.
9. Gagné M. (Ed.). The Oxford Handbook of Work Engagement, Motivation, and Self-Determination Theory. Oxford University Press. 2014. 444 p.
10. Ilies R., Judge T.A. On the Heritability of Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2003. № 88(4). P. 750–759.
11. Ilies R., Judge T.A. Goal Regulation across Time: The Effects of Feedback and Affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2005. № 90(3). P. 453–467.
12. Latham G.P. Work Motivation: History, Theory, Research, and Practice (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. 2012.
13. Latham G.P., Locke E.A. Enhancing the Benefits and Overcoming the Pitfalls of Goal Setting. *Organizational Dynamics*. 2006. № 35(4). P. 332–340.
14. Tims M., Bakker A.B., Derks D. The Impact of Job Crafting on Job Demands, Job Resources, and Well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 2013. № 18(2). P. 230–240.
15. Oldham G.R., Hackman J.R. Not What It Was and Not What It Will Be: The Future of Job Design Research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2010. № 31(2-3). P. 463–479.
16. Pink D.H. Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us. Riverhead Books. 2009. 288 p.
17. Pinder C.C. Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior (2nd ed.). Psychology Press. 2014. 600 p.
18. Ryan R.M., Deci E.L. Brick by Brick: The Origins, Development, and Future of Self-Determination Theory. *Advances in Motivation Science*. 2019. № 6. P. 111–156.
19. Ryan R.M., Deci E.L. On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2001. № 52(1). P. 141–166.
20. Staw B.M., Ross J. Stability in the Midst of Change: A Dispositional Approach to Job Attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1985. № 70(3). P. 469–480.
21. Maslow A.H. A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*. 1943. № 50(4). P. 370–396.
22. Herzberg F. One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees? *Harvard Business Review*. 1968. № 46(1). P. 53–62.