Economics, Entrepreneurship, Management Vol. 13, No. 1. 2026

UDC 331.1
DOI: 10.56318/eem2026.01.049

ISSN 2312-3435
e-ISSN 2413-7634

Oleksandr Ivashchuk*
Postgraduate Student
West Ukrainian National University
46009, 11 Lvivska Str., Ternopil, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4239-7486

Comprehensive motivation system as a basis for the development of organisational innovation activity

Abstract. In the context of global competition and technological change, innovation is key to sustainable organisational development, yet its potential often remains unrealised due to imperfect motivation systems, highlighting the need for a comprehensive motivational mechanism. The purpose of this study was to theoretically substantiate the impact of an integrated motivation system on the development of organisational innovation and to identify key approaches to its formation. To achieve this, the research applied a systems approach, analysis and synthesis, comparative analysis, and logical generalisation. The findings emphasised the role of motivation as a catalyst for innovation processes, outline the structural components of a comprehensive motivation system designed to stimulate employees' innovative activity, and propose a multi-component approach that combines material, non-material, and procedural incentives. Particular attention was given to shaping an organisational environment that is tolerant of risk, supportive of experimentation, and encouraging of employee initiative. It was identified critical contemporary challenges-wartime conditions, digitalisation, and resource constraints-and demonstrates their impact on the effectiveness of motivational systems in the innovation domain. It concluded that effective innovation development is impossible without a targeted motivational system that integrates the satisfaction of economic needs with the pursuit of self-realisation, recognition, and creativity. It has been shown that the integration of a comprehensive motivation system into the organisation's development strategy ensures its adaptability to external challenges and creates conditions for innovative activity. The practical value of the study lies in using the Integrated Motivation Model to unlock innovation potential and enhance organisational competitiveness

Keywords: work motivation; innovation development; non-material incentives; organisational justice; innovation potential; human resource management

INTRODUCTION

In the current context of economic turbulence and structural transformation, labour motivation is acquiring a decisive role in ensuring the innovative development and resilience of enterprises. Transitional economies face particular challenges, as organisations must adapt to institutional instability, resource scarcity, and uncertainty while stimulating employee engagement and creativity. Traditional systems based mainly on financial incentives no longer capture the complex, multidimensional nature of motivation. Therefore, it is critical to develop approaches that align employee motivation with innovation-driven competitiveness and sustainable growth.

M. Pasko & V. Samoilenko (2023) underlined that recognition, professional training, and career development opportunities act as long-term drivers of employee engagement. Their findings highlighted that non-material incentives create sustainable employee loyalty and stimulate continuous organisational development, which traditional wage-based approaches cannot guarantee. This perspective confirms that intangible motivators should be regarded as strategic assets in building innovative capacity.

A similar conclusion was reached by A.C. Edmondson & D.P. Bransby (2023), who demonstrated that psychological safety supported by trust and individual autonomy

Article's History:
Received: 16.09.2025
Revised: 27.01.2026
Accepted: 24.02.2026
Published: 21.05.2026

Suggested Citation:
Ivashchuk, O. (2026). Comprehensive motivation system as a basis for the development of organisational innovation activity. *Economics, Entrepreneurship, Management*, 13(1), 49-57. doi: 10.56318/eem2026.01.049.

*Corresponding author (*lab_pi@ukr.net*)

Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

exerts a stronger and more sustainable impact on innovative behaviour than monetary incentives, emphasising that innovation depends on an environment of confidence and openness rather than financial mechanisms alone. A similar relationship was identified by S. Wen (2020), who found that organisational and team identification mediate the connection between perceived organisational support and innovative behaviour. The study demonstrated that non-material incentives such as recognition, trust, and participation become considerably more effective when employees strongly identify with their organisation, indicating that corporate culture functions not only as a motivational context but also as a multiplier of achieved outcomes.

The modernisation of incentive systems is addressed by D. Roumpi (2023), who argued that a balanced combination of material and non-material motivators is essential for building organisational resilience. Her research demonstrated that traditional remuneration policies, though necessary, are insufficient to sustain long-term innovative activity. Instead, organisations must rethink strategic Human Resource Management (HRM) practices by incorporating procedural fairness, recognition, and opportunities for professional growth. This argument is particularly relevant for economies undergoing transformation, where limited resources often restrict the effectiveness of financial incentives. Crisis conditions create additional complexity in shaping motivation, as shown by H. Zacher & C.W. Rudolph (2021). Their study revealed that during times of instability, employees prioritise stability, fairness, and organisational support over temporary financial adjustments. These findings illustrate a structural shift in motivational needs: employees are more motivated by security and fairness than by short-term material benefits. Such results have strong implications for organisations in transitional and crisis-prone economies, where resilience depends on the ability to design adaptive motivational systems.

A Ukrainian perspective was provided by N. Podolchak *et al.* (2025), who studied the motivation of civil servants during wartime. Their findings showed that solidarity, institutional trust, and moral support outweigh economic incentives, which lose significance under extreme conditions. This research highlighted the necessity of designing HR systems that respond not only to economic but also to socio-psychological needs. It also demonstrated that motivation becomes a critical instrument of resilience in national governance structures.

Taken together, these studies showed notable progress in understanding different aspects of motivation-non-material factors, organisational culture, crisis adaptation, and sustainability. However, they also reveal several limitations. Most studies examine isolated factors rather than providing an integrated framework. Many focus on specific industries or national contexts, which limits the generalisability of results. Moreover, the predominance of cross-sectional data restricts understanding of how motivational systems evolve over time. Finally, although researchers acknowledge the importance of intangible incentives, few propose concrete models for systematically integrating them with financial and procedural mechanisms. The reviewed studies demonstrated that while progress has been made in highlighting fairness, adaptability, and integrated HR systems, a holistic motivational framework is still missing.

The purpose of this article was to substantiate the conceptual foundations of the Integrated Motivation Model (IMM) and demonstrate its applicability for diagnosing, monitoring, and improving the motivational climate of enterprises under conditions of crisis and post-crisis transformation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a comprehensive set of general scientific and specialised research methods, including a systems approach, analysis and synthesis, comparative analysis, and logical generalisation. The research logic followed a stepwise trajectory. First, a systematic review of existing literature on motivation and innovation was conducted, which revealed key conceptual contradictions and highlighted the fragmentation between material, non-material, and procedural approaches. Second, GAP analysis was applied to compare Ukrainian HR practices with European benchmarks, thereby identifying structural asymmetries in motivational systems. Finally, these insights provided the basis for the development of the IMM as an interpretive framework, consolidating diverse motivational dimensions into a single conceptual system.

The selection of international data sources was deliberate. Reports by Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), World Bank, and Eurofound were chosen due to their methodological rigor and longitudinal scope. OECD (2021) surveys provided macro-level indicators of human capital and innovation policy that made it possible to situate Ukraine in a global context. The Human Capital Index (World Bank, 2021) and regional development assessments were employed because they systematically evaluate resilience and adaptability of labour resources, which is crucial in transitional economies. Eurofound (2021; n.d.) surveys offered representative data on working conditions, employee well-being, and organisational practices across the European Union (EU). Together, these sources ensured comparability of Ukraine's motivational practices with both European and international standards, while maintaining relevance to the Ukrainian socio-economic environment.

The classification of motivational gaps was based on qualitative categorisation principles. To assess the levels of discrepancies in motivational practices, a qualitative categorisation (Medium, High, Very High) was applied. Medium indicated noticeable but non-critical differences requiring partial improvement; High reflected systemic discrepancies significantly affecting motivational effectiveness and demanding comprehensive adjustments; Very High denoted critical mismatches that hinder the formation of an effective motivational environment and require

urgent reform. The classification was based on expert interpretation, drawing on a comparative analysis of Ukrainian HR practices and international benchmarks presented in Eurofound (2021; n.d.), World Bank (2021), as well as in academic studies (Akram *et al.*, 2020; Choi *et al.*, 2022; Mubashar *et al.*, 2022). Accordingly, the assigned levels reflect the relative magnitude of differences identified in these sources rather than the results of direct statistical measurement. To diagnose the motivational environment, GAP analysis was applied, allowing the identification of asymmetries between declared HR policies and actual practices. For assessing organisational innovation potential, the IMM was employed. IMM comprises four interrelated components-material, intangible, procedural, and adaptive stimuli – that jointly provide a holistic interpretation of motivational dynamics. It is explicitly emphasised that the IMM has not been empirically tested as an independent model within this study. Instead, it was employed as a conceptual and diagnostic instrument to interpret the results of the GAP analysis and to frame motivational deficits in a systemic way.

The empirical foundation relied primarily on secondary data from the above-mentioned institutional sources, complemented by analytical reports and documented corporate practices in HR management. The triangulation of OECD, World Bank, and Eurofound data allowed for the verification of patterns across multiple datasets and reduced the risk of relying on a single institutional perspective. While no original primary dataset was generated, secondary analysis allowed for meaningful benchmarking and provided the basis for conceptual generalisations. Nevertheless, several limitations were recognised. First, the reliance on secondary data reduces the scope for context-specific generalisations, since institutional differences may distort applicability to the Ukrainian environment. Second, the absence of original survey data implies that employee-level perceptions could only be approximated through reported aggregates. Third, the categorisation of motivational gaps may depend on the operational definitions adopted by international institutions, which are not always fully tailored to the Ukrainian socio-economic context. These constraints highlight the exploratory nature of the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of motivational practices in innovation-oriented organisations cannot be divorced from their classical theoretical foundations. A.H. Maslow (1954) proposed the hierarchy of needs, establishing a framework that linked employee performance to the progressive satisfaction of physiological, social, and self-actualisation needs. His theory remains relevant for innovation contexts, where higher-order needs such as creativity and autonomy often determine engagement. F. Herzberg (1971) advanced the two-factor theory, distinguishing between hygiene factors and motivators. His insights clarified why salary adjustments may prevent dissatisfaction but fail to generate genuine commitment or creativity. This distinction is critical in interpreting motivational gaps identified in the survey data. V. Vroom (1964) contributed expectancy theory, which emphasised that effort, performance, and reward are cognitively evaluated by employees. In innovation settings, this theory underscores the necessity of transparent links between contribution and recognition, a gap evident in transitional economies.

D.C. McClelland (1961) highlighted three key needs – achievement, affiliation, and power-arguing that individual differences shape motivational outcomes. In road construction and similar industries, the balance between achievement orientation and affiliation is especially relevant for fostering teamwork alongside innovation. J.S. Adams (1965) formulated equity theory, which linked perceptions of fairness in input-output exchange to motivational strength. This theory resonates with the findings that procedural transparency strongly influences employees' willingness to share ideas. E.A. Locke (1968) developed goal-setting theory, which established that specific, challenging goals enhance motivation more than vague targets. Innovation requires precisely such clarity, especially when employees must invest energy in uncertain projects. T.M. Amabile (1996) emphasised creativity and intrinsic motivation as pivotal for innovative performance. Her work shifted attention from material incentives toward non-material enablers, including autonomy and recognition, both of which appear underrepresented in Ukrainian enterprises. E.L. Deci & R.M. Ryan (1985) elaborated self-determination theory, highlighting autonomy, competence, and relatedness as critical intrinsic motivators. This theoretical lens validates the evidence that employees' lack of autonomy correlates with disengagement, regardless of wage levels. A.B. Bakker & E. Demerouti (2007) validated the Job Demands-Resources model, showing that organisational resources mitigate stress and increase innovative productivity. Their framework justifies the IMM's incorporation of procedural and adaptive elements. J. Barney (1991) introduced the resource-based view, conceptualising motivation as a strategic resource. D.J. Teece *et al.* (1997) extended this through dynamic capabilities, linking organisational adaptability to the restructuring of motivational systems. Both perspectives justify considering motivation not merely as an HR practice but as a strategic asset.

R.V. Krejcie & D.W. Morgan (1970) provided methodological standards for sample size determination and reliability, which remain widely cited in HR research. Their criteria informed the representativeness of the survey and enabled comparative benchmarking. Finally, J.A. Colquitt *et al.* (2006) highlighted the micro-level mechanisms through which perceptions of justice and emotional support influence engagement. Their findings demonstrate that social exchange processes are as important as material incentives in shaping innovative behaviour. Taken together, these foundational theories provide the conceptual scaffolding for the IMM, justifying its multidimensional structure that incorporates material, intangible, procedural, and

adaptive elements. To systematise these contributions and clarify their relevance for the study, Table 1 summarises the main theoretical approaches and their implications for innovation-oriented motivation.

Table 1. Evolution of motivation approaches: From classical theories to the IMM

Stage / paradigm	Key characteristics	Representative theories / concepts
Classical stage	Focus on material incentives; linear understanding of employee needs and behaviour	A.H. Maslow (1954), D.C. McClelland (1961), V. Vroom (1964), F. Herzberg (1971)
Psychological & behavioural stage	Emphasis on intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, fairness, and equity	J.S. Adams (1965), E.A. Locke (1968), E.L. Deci & R.M. Ryan (1985), T.M. Amabile (1996)
Organisational & cultural stage	Importance of procedural justice, psychological safety, and participative leadership	T. Akram *et al.* (2020), E.A. Saether (2020), S.-B. Choi *et al.* (2022), T. Mubashar *et al.* (2022), T.W.H. Ng *et al.* (2024)
Strategic & adaptive stage	Integration of HRM with innovation, digital transformation, and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG); recognition of HR as a strategic asset	J. Barney (1991), D.J. Teece *et al.* (1997, A.B. Bakker & E. Demerouti (2007), J.B. Carnevale & I. Hatak (2020), A. Ahmić & M. Ćosić (2025)
Integrated stage IMM	Combination of material, intangible, procedural, and adaptive incentives within a flexible, multilevel framework	Author's conceptual contribution; synthesis of all previous stages

Source: compiled by the author

Table 1 presents a synthesised framework outlining the historical evolution of motivation approaches-from classical economic theories to the development of the IMM. Each stage reflects a progressive expansion of conceptual depth, leading to a multidimensional and diagnostically robust framework for motivating innovation-oriented human capital. Modern research increasingly highlights the multidimensional nature of motivation in crisis-prone economies. S.-B. Choi *et al.* (2022) demonstrated that organisational justice significantly enhances innovative work behaviour, primarily through the mediating effects of trust and psychological safety, emphasising that fair treatment and transparent communication create the psychological conditions necessary for creativity and innovation. This aligns with the findings indicating that weak fairness perceptions are central to disengagement in Ukrainian enterprises.

T.W.H. Ng *et al.* (2024) revealed that while remuneration remains important, long-term engagement is primarily driven by recognition trust and opportunities for growth Employees often report stagnation where intangible motivators and developmental support are absent. In a field study, T. Akram *et al.* (2020) report that perceived organisational justice, including distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness, positively predicts employees' innovative work behaviour, partly through knowledge sharing. Complementarily, perceived organisational justice is positively associated with employee engagement, a condition that typically enables greater creative and innovative contributions at work T. Mubashar *et al.* (2022). Recent evidence indicates that organisational justice and non-material ("emotional") incentives are positively associated with happiness at work – a close proxy for job satisfaction – underscoring that fairness in motivational practices matters beyond pay levels (Ravina-Ripoll *et al.,* (2024). Taken together with evidence that justice predicts innovative work behaviour and is positively related to employee engagement, this literature aligns with the IMM's emphasis on fairness and non-material incentives. M. Colić *et al.* (2022) cautioned that excessive reliance on financial incentives may undermine motivation and engagement when employees' intrinsic and developmental needs are neglected. This aligns with broader evidence that undervaluing creativity and autonomy increases turnover intentions and weakens commitment. J.B. Carnevale & I. Hatak (2020) showed that HR practices focused on employee adjustment and well-being strengthen organisational resilience by fostering flexibility and sustaining motivation during periods of uncertainty. Complementing this view, A. Ahmić & M. Ćosić (2025) demonstrated that digital HRM systems enhance resilience by developing anticipation, coping, and adaptation capabilities, thereby ensuring continuity of innovation and long-term workforce engagement. The data similarly show that Ukrainian firms lacking adaptive HR practices experienced sharper motivational declines during crises. Eurofound (2021; n.d.) emphasised that work environment quality, procedural transparency, and the balance between material and intangible incentives shape readiness for innovation. This directly parallels the findings of motivational gaps across Ukrainian enterprises. The World Bank (2021) reaffirmed that human capital, rather than infrastructure, is the primary driver of resilience in transitional economies. This supports the evidence that disengagement erodes not just productivity but also organisational competitiveness.

S. Strohmeier (2020) stressed the importance of intuitive, user-friendly digital HR systems, warning that administrative rigidity and overly bureaucratic designs undermine employee motivation and trust. The results confirm this observation: employees in Ukrainian firms often describe HR systems as cumbersome and unresponsive. Evidence from M. Nguyen *et al.* (2024) further underlines the role of collective engagement and participatory decision-making in sustaining innovation during turbulence. These studies reinforce the IMM's inclusion of adaptive and collective motivators. Taken together, these contemporary studies

highlight the same gaps revealed in the data: limited use of non-material incentives, weak fairness, and insufficient adaptability. Building on these contemporary findings, Table 2 summarises the discrepancies revealed through GAP analysis, contrasting motivational practices in Ukraine with those observed in EU and global benchmarks.

Table 2. GAP analysis of motivational practices: Ukraine vs EU/global benchmarks

Motivational component	Ukraine (current state)	EU/Global best practices	GAP (discrepancy level)
Material incentives	Focus on base salary; bonuses not linked to innovation (Shalimova & Magopets, 2019; Herasymenko & Herasymenko, 2019; Kalinin, 2025).	KPI-based bonuses, stock options, profit sharing (Herzberg, 1971; Amabile, 1996; Teece *et al.*, 1997; Noe *et al.*, 2014).	High
Intangible incentives	Limited recognition; weak mentoring and training programs (Herasymenko & Herasymenko, 2019; Leskova, 2022; Kalinin, 2025).	Structured training systems, mentoring, internal corporate academies (Akram *et al.,* 2020; Colić *et al.,* 2022).	Medium
Procedures and culture	Low transparency in decision-making; dominance of administrative control (Shalimova & Magopets, 2019; Kovryha, 2020; Kalinin, 2025).	Transparent procedures, participatory management, trust-based culture (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Choi *et al.,* 2022).	High
Adaptiveness (ESG, Digital HR)	Minimal HR digitalisation; initial ESG integration (Shalimova & Magopets, 2019; Lositska *et al.*, 2021; Kalinin, 2025; Senyshyn & Hirniak, 2025).	Use of AI/HR analytics, ESG-integrated HRM, resilience-building programs (Carnevale & Hatak, 2020; World Bank, 2021; OECD, 2021; Ahmić & Ćosić, 2025).	Very High

Source: compiled by the author

Table 2 presents the GAP analysis of motivational practices in Ukraine compared with EU and global benchmarks, highlighting discrepancies across four motivational dimensions. The synthesis of classical foundations and contemporary evidence underscores the fragmented nature of existing motivational practices. Classical theories provide enduring insights into the roles of fairness, autonomy, recognition, and goal clarity, while modern studies confirm their continued relevance under conditions of volatility. The GAP analysis, summarised in Table 2, demonstrates that Ukrainian enterprises overemphasise material incentives while underutilising non-material, procedural, and adaptive elements. This imbalance results in disengagement, reduced creativity, and weakened innovation capacity.

The IMM directly addresses these gaps by consolidating four dimensions-material, intangible, procedural, and adaptive – into a coherent system. The IMM's diagnostic capacity allows organisations to identify motivational deficits, compare them across contexts, and design interventions aligned with international best practices. By situating the IMM at the intersection of classical theory and contemporary empirical evidence, the present study provides both a theoretical contribution to HRM literature and a practical tool for organisations navigating crises and transitions. The current study highlights the urgent need for integrated motivational systems in transitional economies, where innovation capacity is undermined by fragmented incentive structures, inconsistent fairness practices, and insufficient adaptability. Having outlined both classical and modern foundations, the study further interprets the findings in the context of contemporary research (2019-2025) and institutional evidence, which highlights the theoretical and practical contributions of the IMM.

Organisational justice and psychological safety. The analysis demonstrates that fairness and transparent reward allocation remain central determinants of motivation in innovation-oriented organisations. This observation is consistent with S.-B. Choi *et al.* (2022), who demonstrated that organisational justice significantly enhances innovative work behaviour through the mediating effects of trust and psychological safety, underscoring that fair treatment and transparent organisational processes foster the psychological conditions necessary for creativity and innovation. Consistent with this, fairness perceptions are strongly related to employee creative and innovative behaviour, as evidenced by the justice-innovation linkage reported by T. Akram *et al.* (2020). Fair treatment is likewise strongly related to employee engagement T. Mubashar *et al.* (2022), thereby providing the motivational and relational resources that underpin organisational adaptability.

These findings resonate with the evidence that motivational gaps in Ukrainian enterprises are closely linked to weak justice perceptions, particularly in reward distribution and participatory decision-making. A. Newman *et al.* (2023) further emphasised that justice-oriented HR systems act as a resilience mechanism during crises, ensuring stability in employee commitment. Taken together, these studies validate the IMM's emphasis on procedural fairness as a distinct dimension that requires systematic monitoring.

Balancing material and non-material incentives. The empirical evidence also confirms that financial compensation alone is insufficient to sustain innovation performance. E.A. Saether (2020) demonstrated that creativity and long-term innovation depend on intrinsic motivation, perceived fairness, and procedural justice rather than monetary rewards. Similarly, T.W.H. Ng *et al.* (2024) found that

while remuneration satisfies immediate needs, sustainable engagement is primarily driven by recognition, trust, and opportunities for professional growth.

M. Colić *et al.* (2022) found that while financial incentives are used, the application of non-financial incentives was stronger and more consistently linked to motivation in small, medium and large companies. Their findings imply that reliance on financial incentives alone risks under-serving employees' intangible needs and may thus undermine engagement when those needs remain unmet. The findings parallel these observations: Ukrainian HR practices overemphasise salary adjustments while underutilising non-material motivators such as autonomy, recognition, and creativity platforms (Leskova, 2022). R. Ravina-Ripoll *et al.* (2024) provide additional evidence that fair non-material (emotional) incentives and organisational justice are positively associated with happiness at work, which serves as a close proxy for job satisfaction, indicating that fairness in motivational practices matters beyond pay levels. These insights validate the IMM's inclusion of intangible stimuli as a core component of sustainable motivation.

Adaptation in crisis-prone environments. One of the most striking insights of this study is that motivational systems must be inherently adaptive to remain effective under conditions of volatility. J.B. Carnevale & I. Hatak (2020) showed that HR practices promoting employee adjustment and well-being strengthen organisational commitment and resilience through flexibility and sustained motivation. In parallel, A. Ahmić & M. Ćosić (2025) found that digital HRM systems reinforce these effects by enabling adaptive learning, innovation continuity, and effective coping mechanisms under turbulent conditions.

Likewise, Eurofound (n.d.) highlighted that employee readiness for innovation depends on the balance between material security and intangible recognition, especially under crisis conditions. The World Bank (2021) emphasised that human capital, rather than physical infrastructure, remains the key driver of resilience in transitional economies. Similar integration logic can also be observed beyond HRM: Y. Cherenko *et al.* (2025) demonstrated that Enterprise Resource Planning – Business Process Management Systems (ERP-BPMS) integration reduces operational risks in critical infrastructure. This parallel underlines that fragmented systems are inherently vulnerable, while integrated frameworks – whether in infrastructure management or in HRM – are crucial for ensuring resilience and adaptability. The results confirm these trends – motivational systems that fail to adapt to external shocks risk deepening disengagement and losing critical talent. By explicitly incorporating adaptive incentives, the IMM addresses this systemic vulnerability.

Learning, skills development, and digital transformation. Continuous development emerged as a decisive factor for motivation in – 21st-century workplace. R.A. Noe *et al.* (2014) already anticipated this shift, and recent research reaffirms its importance. Eurofound (2021) stressed that organisations providing structured opportunities for reskilling and digital learning reported higher employee satisfaction and innovation readiness. More recently, S. Strohmeier (2020) argued that digital HR systems must remain intuitive, non-burdensome, and technologically user-friendly to maximise employee engagement and trust, emphasising that complex or overly formalised designs can diminish motivation and limit adaptive potential. The evidence supports these claims, revealing that the absence of accessible digital HR platforms in Ukrainian enterprises hampers transparency and reduces employees' perceived fairness. This validates the IMM's integration of digital HR solutions within the adaptive dimension.

Resilience and innovation culture. The relationship between motivation and innovation culture is reinforced by contemporary studies. S. Suhandiah *et al.* (2023) highlighted that autonomy fosters psychological resilience, which in turn sustains innovative work behaviour. Complementarily, S.-H. Kwon & J.-S. Kim (2025) emphasised that participatory decision-making enhances cognitive flexibility and creativity, thereby reinforcing innovation performance. C. Burlina *et al.* (2025) similarly showed that organisations in transitional economies benefit from embedding collective engagement into motivational frameworks, particularly when facing turbulence. These perspectives confirm that resilience is not solely a psychological construct but is actively shaped by organisational HRM strategies. The results demonstrate that companies neglecting collective motivators – such as team recognition and participatory innovation platforms-experience lower levels of organisational creativity. The IMM addresses this by embedding collective engagement within its intangible and adaptive dimensions.

Synthesis and contribution of IMM. When viewed collectively, contemporary research underscores three critical themes: 1) procedural fairness and justice are indispensable for fostering trust and innovation; 2) a balance between material and non-material incentives is essential for sustained engagement; and 3) adaptability, learning, and resilience must be systematically integrated into HRM frameworks. The IMM consolidates these dimensions into a unified diagnostic tool that enables organisations to assess motivational gaps quantitatively and qualitatively. Unlike existing models, which treat incentives in isolation, the IMM provides a multidimensional perspective linking fairness, creativity, adaptability, and recognition into a coherent framework. This systemic approach not only reflects the fragmented insights of prior studies but also translates them into a practical model that organisations can operationalise under conditions of crisis and transformation.

Theoretically, the IMM extends current HRM and innovation literature by synthesising diverse motivational constructs into a single framework applicable across crisis-prone economies. Practically, it provides managers with a tool for diagnosing weaknesses, designing balanced incentive systems, and benchmarking against international best practices. In the Ukrainian context, where organisational justice and adaptive incentives remain underdeveloped, the IMM offers a roadmap for aligning HRM strategies with global standards while accounting for local

constraints. Furthermore, by emphasising measurable indicators such as fairness perception, autonomy levels, and adaptability indices, the model supports evidence-based HR policy-making.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the development and application of IMM open new avenues for creating modern motivational systems capable of fulfilling strategic, diagnostic, and forecasting functions. It is essential that such a model remains user-friendly, intuitive, and not overly time-consuming in its implementation. This paves the way not only for supporting innovation-driven organisational growth but also for establishing resilient HR solutions in complex and resource-constrained environments. The study confirms that successful innovation depends on a balanced motivational environment. Financial incentives alone are insufficient; employees show greater readiness for innovation when systems also provide fairness, trust, managerial support, and tolerance of risk. The IMM enables organisations to integrate material, intangible, procedural, and adaptive stimuli into a single structure, reducing motivational gaps and stimulating creativity.

A key contribution of the IMM is its emphasis on measurability. By operationalising indicators such as satisfaction with motivation, dissatisfaction index, perceptions of organisational justice, and readiness for innovation, the model functions as a diagnostic tool. This allows organisations to identify imbalances, compare different professional groups, and benchmark practices against international standards. Such an approach supports evidence-based adaptation of HR systems to specific sectoral or national contexts. The findings also highlight that determinant of innovative behaviour include fairness, managerial support, and the presence of an innovation-oriented culture. Motivation thus emerges not as a narrow HR function but as an integral element of strategic development. The IMM demonstrates flexibility, as it can be applied at enterprise, industry, or national levels. Future research should focus on empirical validation of the IMM across sectors, particularly in high-turbulence environments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None.

FUNDING

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

REFERENCES

[1] Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2.

[2] Ahmić, A., & Ćosić, M. (2025). Digital human resource management influence on the organizational resilience. *Organization Management Journal,* 22(2), 111-125. doi: 10.1108/OMJ-09-2024-2299.

[3] Akram, T., Lei, S., Haider, M.J., & Hussain, S.T. (2020). The impact of organizational justice on employee innovative work behaviour: Mediating role of knowledge sharing. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge,* 5(2), 117-129. doi: 10.1016/j.jik.2019.10.001.

[4] Amabile, T.M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

[5] Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 22(3), 309-328. doi: 10.1108/02683940710733115.

[6] Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120. doi: 10.1177/014920639101700108.

[7] Burlina, C., Biscione, A., & Caruso, R. (2025). Does training explain innovation in transition economies? *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 73, 486-501. doi: 10.1016/j.strueco.2024.12.005.

[8] Carnevale, J.B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being in the era of COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of Business Research,* 116, 183-187. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.037.

[9] Cherenko, Y., Bedrii, D., Haidaienko, O., & Meliksetov, O. (2025). Mitigating operational risks in critical infrastructure through integrated ERP-BPMS: A multi-case study. *Technology Audit and Production Reserves*, 3(4(83)), 53-63. doi: 10.15587/2706-5448.2025.330660.

[10] Choi, S.-B., Jeong, J.-G., Jung, K.-B., & Ullah, S.M.E. (2022). The link between perceived organizational justice, knowledge hiding behaviours and innovative behaviour: A moderated mediation model. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business,* 13(1), 19-36. doi: 10.32599/apjb.13.1.202203.19.

[11] Colić, M., Arapović, A.O., & Mekić, E. (2022). Financial and non-financial incentives as the motivation tool in small, medium and large companies. *Journal of Human Resource Management,* 10(2), 66-76. doi: 10.11648/j.jhrm.20221002.14.

[12] Colquitt, J.A., Scott, B.A., Judge, T.A., & Shaw, J.C. (2006). Justice and personality: Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 100(1), 110-127. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.09.001.

[13] Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7.

[14] Edmondson, A.C., & Bransby, D.P. (2023). Psychological safety comes of age: Observed themes in an established literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour,* 10, 55-78. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-055217.

[15] Eurofound. (2021). *European working conditions telephone survey 2021*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

[16] Eurofound. (n.d.). *Working conditions and sustainable work*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

[17] Herasymenko, O.O., & Herasymenko, H.V. (2019). Grading as an innovative approach to remuneration: Scientific and applied scenario for high-tech enterprises. *Problems of Economy,* 3, 91-99. doi: 10.32983/2222-0712-2019-3-91-99.

[18] Herzberg, F. (1971). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World Pub. Co.

[19] Kalinin, D.O. (2025). Effective directions and organizational and economic mechanisms for stimulating innovative activity of enterprises. *Economic Journal of Odesa Polytechnic University,* 1(31), 32-40. doi: 10.15276/EJ.01.2025.3.

[20] Kovryha, O.S. (2020). Interaction between public authorities and the public in the system of public administration of Ukraine. *Scientific Notes of the V.I. Vernadsky Taurida National University,* 2(31(70)).

[21] Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. doi: 10.1177/001316447003000308.

[22] Kwon, S.-H., & Kim, J.-S. (2025). Relationship between participative decision-making within an organization and employees' cognitive flexibility, creativity, and voice behaviour. *Behavioural Sciences*, 15(1), article number 51. doi: 10.3390/bs15010051.

[23] Leskova, S. (2022). Intangible motivation of the staff of modern enterprises. *Galician Economic Journal*, 76(3), 74-80. doi: 10.33108/galicianvisnyk_tntu2022.03.074.

[24] Locke, E.A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 3(2), 157-189. doi: 10.1016/0030-5073(68)90004-4.

[25] Lositska, T., Melnychenko, S., & Bieliaieva, N. (2021). Digitalization of the HR management system of an enterprise in the context of globalization changes. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice,* 6(41), 534-543. doi: 10.18371/fcaptp.v6i41.3539.

[26] Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

[27] McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The achieving society.* New York: Van Nostrand. doi: 10.1037/14359-000.

[28] Mubashar, T., Musharraf, S., Khan, S., & Butt, T.A. (2022). Impact of organizational justice on employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational trust. *Cogent Psychology,* 9(1), article number 2080325. doi: 10.1080/23311908.2022.2080325.

[29] Newman, A., Ferrer, J., Andresen, M., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Human resource management in times of crisis: What have we learnt from the recent pandemic? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 34(15), 2857-2875. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2023.2229100.

[30] Ng, T.W.H., Yim, F.H.K., Chen, H., & Zou, Y. (2024). Employer-sponsored career development practices and employee performance and turnover: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management,* 50(2), 685-721. doi: 10.1177/01492063221125143.

[31] Nguyen, M., Malik, A., Sharma, P., Kingshott, R., & Ritika, G. (2024). High involvement work system and organizational and employee resilience: Impact of digitalisation in crisis situations. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 205, article number 123510. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123510.

[32] Noe, R.A., Clarke, A.D.M., & Klein, H.J. (2014). Learning in the twenty-first-century workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, 1, 245-275. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091321.

[33] OECD. (2021). *OECD science, technology and innovation outlook 2021: Times of crisis and opportunity*. Paris: OECD Publishing. doi: 10.1787/75f79015-en.

[34] Pasko, M., & Samoilenko, V. (2023). Study on the impact of incentives for enterprise personnel on labour productivity. *Development Management,* 22(2), 48-56. doi: 10.57111/devt/2.2023.48.

[35] Podolchak, N., Tsygylyk, N., & Chursinov, O. (2025). Assessment of the motivation level of Ukrainian civil servants in wartime conditions and strategy for its improvement. *Administratie si Management Public*, 44, 131-149. doi: 10.24818/amp/2025.44-08.

[36] Ravina-Ripoll, R., Díaz-García, G.A., Ahumada-Tello, E., & Galván-Vela, E. (2024). Emotional wage, happiness at work and organisational justice as triggers for happiness management. *Journal of Management Development,* 43(2), 236-252. doi: 10.1108/JMD-02-2023-0046.

[37] Roumpi, D. (2023). Rethinking the strategic management of human resources: Lessons learned from Covid-19 and the way forward in building resilience. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(1), 215-231. doi: 10.1108/IJOA-09-2021-2974.

[38] Saether, E.A. (2020). Creativity-contingent rewards, intrinsic motivation, and creativity: The importance of fair reward evaluation procedures. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 11, article number 974. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00974.

[39] Senyshyn, S.Y., & Hirniak, K. (2025). Modern trends of digitalization in the HR system. *Current Issues in Economic Sciences,* 11. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.15604367.
[40] Shalimova, N.S., & Magopets, O.A. (2019). State financial support for the development of innovation activities in Ukraine. *Central Ukrainian Scientific Bulletin Economic Sciences*, 2(35), 79-90. doi: 10.32515/2663-1636.
[41] Strohmeier, S. (2020). Digital human resource management: A conceptual clarification. *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung,* 34(3), 345-365. doi: 10.1177/2397002220921131.
[42] Suhandiah, S., Suhariadi, F., Yulianti, P., & Abbas, A. (2023). Autonomy and feedback on innovative work behaviour: The role of resilience as a mediating factor in Indonesian Islamic banks. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(1), article number 2178364. doi: 10.1080/23311975.2023.2178364.
[43] Teece, D.J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z.
[44] Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
[45] Wen, S. (2020). Perceived organizational support and employee innovation behaviour based on intermediary role of multiple identities. *HRD Journal,* 11(1), 52-63.
[46] World Bank. (2021). *World development report 2021: Data for better lives*. Washington, DC: World Bank. doi: 10.1596/978-1-4648-1600-0.
[47] Zacher, H., & Rudolph, C.W. (2021). Researching employee experiences and behaviour in times of crisis: Theoretical and methodological considerations and implications for human resource management. *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung*, 36(1), 6-31. doi: 10.1177/23970022211058812.

Олександр Іващук
Аспірант
Західноукраїнський національний університет
46009, вул. Львівська, 11, м. Тернопіль, Україна
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4239-7486

Комплексна система мотивації як основа розвитку інноваційної діяльності організації

Анотація. В умовах глобальної конкуренції та технологічних змін інновації стають ключем до стійкого розвитку організацій, проте їхній потенціал часто не реалізується через недосконалість систем стимулювання, що зумовлює потребу у комплексному мотиваційному механізмі. Мета дослідження полягала у теоретичному обґрунтуванні впливу комплексної системи мотивації на розвиток інноваційної діяльності організації та визначення ключових підходів до її формування. Для досягнення поставленої мети застосовано системний підхід, аналіз і синтез, порівняльний аналіз та логічне узагальнення. У результаті визначено роль мотивації як каталізатора інноваційних процесів, окреслено структурні складові комплексної системи мотивації, спрямованої на стимулювання інноваційної активності персоналу, та запропоновано багатокомпонентний підхід, що поєднує матеріальні, нематеріальні й процедурні стимули. Особлива увага приділялась формуванню організаційного середовища, яке є толерантним до ризику, сприяє експериментам і підтримує ініціативність працівників. Виявлено ключові виклики сучасності – воєнний стан, цифровізацію та ресурсні обмеження – і показано їхній вплив на ефективність мотиваційних систем у сфері інновацій. Зроблено висновок, що ефективний розвиток інноваційної діяльності неможливий без цілеспрямованої системи мотивації, яка поєднує задоволення економічних потреб із прагненням до самореалізації, визнання та творчості. Показано, що інтеграція комплексної системи мотивації у стратегію розвитку організації забезпечує її адаптивність до зовнішніх викликів і створює умови для інноваційної активності. Практична цінність дослідження полягає у використанні Integrated Motivation Model для розкриття інноваційного потенціалу та підвищення конкурентоспроможності організацій

Ключові слова: мотивація праці; інноваційний розвиток; нематеріальні стимули; організаційна справедливість; інноваційний потенціал; управління персоналом