

Innovative Management Practices and Employee Motivation in Public Administration: A Generational Perspective

Peter Gallo ^{1,*}, Jan Dobrovic ², Anna Cepelova ¹, Bohuslava Mihalcova ³

¹ Pavol Jozef Safarik University in Kosice, Slovakia

² University of International Business ISM Slovakia in Presov, Slovakia

³ University of Economics in Bratislava, Slovakia

* Corresponding author: Peter Gallo, peter.gallo@upjs.sk

Type of manuscript: Research paper

Cite as: Gallo, P., Dobrovic, J., Cepelova, A. & Mihalcova, B. (2026). Innovative Management Practices and Employee Motivation in Public Administration: A Generational Perspective. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 17(1), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2026.1-02>

Received: 10 May 2025

Revised: 19 February 2026

Accepted: 14 March 2026

Publisher & Founder: Sumy State University



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. For open-access publication within the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract: This study examines motivational and demotivational factors among employees in public administration. At present, public services face increasing pressure to increase their efficiency. These services must adapt to modern management trends and respond to the changing needs of society. These developments create new challenges in the area of employee motivation. The public sector workforce consists of multiple generations with different values, expectations, and work habits. These factors affect not only employees' job satisfaction but also the overall effectiveness of organizations. The study is based on a sample of 242 public administration employees. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire designed to examine generational differences in the perceptions of motivational and demotivational factors. Statistical testing of data related to individual motivational and demotivational factors revealed that some factors demonstrated statistically significant differences. For Generation X, the results indicate the importance of factors such as job stability and regular salary with associated benefits. Political pressures and top-down interventions also emerged as highly significant factors. For Generation Y, statistically significant factors included the meaningfulness of work and work-life balance. Key demotivational factors include the unequal distribution of workload. For the youngest Generation Z, meaningful work and work-life balance were also identified as key motivating factors. Among the demotivational factors, insufficient recognition and feedback, as well as a lack of modern technologies, predominated. The examination of motivational and demotivational factors among employees in public administration therefore represents an important step toward understanding how to increase their engagement, satisfaction, and performance. The results support the development of targeted motivational strategies and a working environment that fosters loyalty, professional development, and high-quality public service delivery. The study contributes to the more effective functioning of public services and to strengthening public trust.

Keywords: motivation; public administration; organizations; generations of employees; managerial innovations.

Funding: There is no funding for this research.

1. Introduction. The contemporary environment is characterized by rapid social, technological, and organizational changes that profoundly affect how institutions operate and how employees perceive their work. Within this dynamic framework, the motivation of human resources represents a key element of organizational adaptability and long-term sustainability (Bilan et al., 2025; Dzunova et al., 2024; Kiselakova et al., 2020; Skypalova et al., 2025). Effective motivation enables employees to respond flexibly to environmental shifts, enhances work efficiency, and strengthens the alignment between individual and

organizational goals (Inkabova et al., 2021; Michalec et al., 2024; Raza et al., 2025; Stehnei et al., 2025; Suhanyiova et al., 2024; Szabo et al., 2018). In the public administration sector, motivation is even more important, as the purpose of this domain is not profiting maximization but the provision of public goods and services that generate social value (Bao et al., 2024; Cantarelli et al., 2023; Demircioglu, 2020; George & van der Wal, 2023). Both the motivation and demotivation of employees constitute central determinants of organizational performance and service quality. These mechanisms are closely related to the efficiency of administrative processes, the quality of decision-making, and the level of public trust in both public services and state institutions. High levels of motivation among civil servants are associated with greater professionalism, accountability, and responsiveness, which ultimately strengthen the legitimacy of public administration. Conversely, low motivation can lead to reduced performance, employee turnover, and citizen satisfaction with public services. However, work in public administration is specific. It is characterized by formalized decision-making processes, extensive legal regulation, and limited managerial autonomy in personnel policies (Huang, 2021; Klatt & Fairholm, 2023; Lee et al., 2022; Urotadze et al., 2025). Employees in this sector often face structural challenges such as rigid pay systems, constrained career progression, and a lack of innovation-oriented encouragement. Despite these systemic constraints, public servants must act ethically, transparently, and in the public interest. This tension between internal (intrinsic) motivation and external working conditions creates a complex motivational dynamic that requires targeted managerial attention (Jankiewicz & Trojanek, 2024; Kiyak & Karkin, 2022; Lameck, 2024; Jensen et al., 2019). Motivation in public administration is determined not only by financial rewards but also by psychological and organizational factors. Elements such as perceived fairness, recognition by supervisors, identification with the organization's mission, and opportunities for professional growth are decisive in shaping employee engagement. Thus, modern management practices increasingly emphasize participatory leadership, performance-based remuneration, and competency-based evaluation systems as tools for enhancing motivation and reducing demotivation among public employees (Bencsik & Belas, 2024; Ghebregiorgis & Negusse, 2022; Gorgievski et al., 2023;).

The aim of this paper is to analyse the factors that influence employee motivation and demotivation within the public administration sector, with particular attention given to the impact of organizational conditions, leadership approaches, and individual employee characteristics. We structure the paper into several interrelated sections. The first section presents a comprehensive review of the relevant theoretical and empirical knowledge on motivation in public administration. The second section outlines the research methodology and methods applied in the empirical part of the study. The third section contains the main findings proven by statistical verification. The final section summarizes key findings, identifies managerial implications, and proposes paths for further research.

2. Literature Review.

Employee motivation is a key prerequisite for the effective functioning of any organization, acquiring particular significance within the public sector. Public servants often engage in tasks that are not directly motivated by financial rewards but are associated with values such as public value, altruism, and orientation toward the common good. The motivation of public servants has been the subject of extensive scholarly research, with particular attention given to the concept of public service motivation (PSM), defined as the motivation to provide public services for societal benefit (Ahn, 2022; Giacomelli et al., 2020; Hill & Plimmer, 2024; Kim et al., 2021). Significant studies have demonstrated that motivation in governmental organizations is not solely driven by financial incentives but that attributes such as altruism and a commitment to public welfare play a significant role (Bartuseviciene & Butkus, 2024; Bright, 2020; Park & Lee, 2023). More recent studies confirm that PSM is closely related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For instance, meta-analyses indicate that employees with higher levels of PSM exhibit greater levels of satisfaction and engagement, which can enhance organizational performance (Breugh et al., 2022; Homberg & Vogel, 2016). Similarly, Ritz et al. (2023) reported that higher PSM reduces turnover intention among public servants.

From a PSM perspective, many public servants are guided by altruistic motives and a commitment to social benefit, distinguishing their value orientation from that of private-sector workers. Research also highlights the relationship between PSM and organizational behaviour. Mussagulova et al. (2021) demonstrated that PSM increases employees' willingness to engage in organizational citizenship behaviour, which has a significant effect on public sector efficiency. Lim & Moon (2025) reported that PSM affects the quality of interpersonal relationships and collaboration within public organizations. However, some authors point to potential risks associated with PSM. Georgellis et al. (2011) argue that improperly structured external rewards can "crowd out" intrinsic motivation, whereas Bozeman and Su (2015) critique the conceptual clarity and consistency of

the PSM measurement. Other research focuses on the determinants of PSM. Romanelli (2024) emphasizes the role of institutional environments in shaping PSM, whereas Van Loon et al. (2018) report that the effect of PSM on performance is stronger when employees perceive their work as having high social impact. Recent studies have also explored cultural and contextual differences; Ding and Wang (2023) reported that the positive effect of PSM on work engagement is consistent across cultures, whereas Tang et al. (2024) reported that the dimensions of PSM and their consequences may vary depending on the social and cultural context. Overall, PSM constitutes a significant factor explaining employee behaviour in public administration, with evidence of positive effects on engagement, satisfaction, and performance, while highlighting the need for carefully designed reward systems and critical evaluation of measurement tools. Employee motivation in the public sector is influenced by a combination of both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic motivators include the meaningfulness of work, identification with the organization's mission, and opportunities for personal and professional development. Value-oriented motives such as public service, social justice, and contributing to societal well-being often serve as stronger motivators than financial compensation does. Extrinsic motivators include salary, reward systems, job security, and career advancement opportunities. Compared with the private sector, financial remuneration in public administration is often lower, which may reduce motivation, particularly among younger and highly skilled employees (Anh, Vu et al., 2022; Fuenzalida et al., 2024; Houston & Freeman, 2024; Jung & Moon, 2024;). Demotivation in the public sector typically arises from prolonged discrepancies between employee expectations and actual working conditions. Common causes include insufficient recognition of performance, limited participation in decision-making, bureaucratic obstacles, inefficient management, and a lack of career growth opportunities. Another significant demotivating factor is rigid compensation systems, which often do not reflect individual performance but are tied to pay scale and seniority. This can lead to perceptions of unfairness and decreased interest in improving personal effectiveness (Fareed & Su, 2021; Ford, 2017; Sułkowski et al., 2025).

In their empirical study, Czerwinska-Lubszczyk and Jankowiak (2025) examine differences in work motivation among generations X, Y, and Z in the post-COVID-19 pandemic period. They identified different perceptions of material and nonmaterial motivational factors across generations and offered practical recommendations for managers regarding motivation in a multigenerational environment. Tadic and Zaja (2025) conducted quantitative research that analysed motivational factors across generations Baby Boomers, X, Y, and Z. The authors emphasize the need to combine universal and generation-specific motivation strategies to increase engagement and performance.

The current state of knowledge in the field of public sector employee motivation is characterized by fragmentation of research. Previous studies focused either on identifying individual motivational factors or on generational differences in work values. Notably, these approaches were analysed separately. The literature lacks a systematic connection between generational diversity, the concept of managerial innovation, and organizational adaptability. Research on motivation in public administration often relies on traditional theoretical frameworks without a deeper integration of the innovation management perspective. The study empirically test how motivation systems can be understood as tools for organizational innovation. Ambiguities also arise in the question of the extent to which generational differences are a determinant of performance and how they can be strategically used in the context of public sector development.

3. Methodology and research methods.

The study is based on the assumption that the issue of motivational and demotivational factors that affect employees working in public administration. The study used a questionnaire allowing to select information from respondents to implement suitable methods, which provided a versatile means of collecting details.

In the context of examining employee motivation in the public sector, the questionnaire was divided into two logically connected sections. The first section addressed demographic questions, including the respondents' gender, age, education, and job position. The age question was particularly important, as it allowed respondents to be considered into particular generational groups. The second section focuses on the research problem itself, exploring both motivational and demotivational factors. We asked the respondents to evaluate motivational factors such as job stability, meaningfulness of work, a regular salary, work-life balance, career development, and training opportunities. Demotivational factors included bureaucracy, weak feedback, unequal workload distribution, lack of modern technologies, and the impact of political pressure on work performance in the public sector.

The questionnaire includes a combination of open-ended questions, multiple-choice questions, and Likert-scale items. A five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" through "neutral" to "strongly disagree" was used. A total of 242 public sector employees participated in the study. Respondents were employed in

central government and local government institutions. The respondents' geographical and institutional framework is a territory of the Slovak Republic. The institutions fit the SK NACE division methodology under code 84, Public administration and defence, essential to social security. Employees of various organizational levels (administrative positions, specialist officers, and managers) were included in the research. This ensured the variability of the studied sample. The selection of respondents was nonprobability in nature, which represents one of the limiting criteria of the research.

The research focused on motivational and demotivational factors in public administration. Data collection took place in a precisely defined period from January to April 2025 through online distribution of the questionnaire via the Google Forms platform. The respondents' participation was voluntary and anonymous. The boundaries of data collection were determined by the willingness of organizations to participate in the research and the availability of respondents. If not, there might be a limit in the degree of generalization of the results to the entire public administration sector.

Two hypotheses were formulated for this study:

H1: There is a statistically significant difference between generations of public sector employees in their perception of the impact of motivational factors on work performance.

H2: There is a statistically significant difference between generations of public sector employees in their perception of the impact of demotivational factors on work performance.

We decided to use statistical tests based on the nature of the data obtained and the structure of the research design. Since the data were obtained using a five-point Likert scale, they are ordinal variables for which a normal distribution cannot be assumed. For this reason, nonparametric statistical methods were used to test differences between generational groups. The Mann–Whitney U test was chosen as an appropriate tool for comparing differences between two independent groups, allowing the identification of statistically significant differences in the assessment of individual factors without requiring normality of the data. Spearman's correlation coefficient was used to assess the strength and direction of monotonic relationships between variables, as it is a nonparametric equivalent of Pearson's correlation suitable for ordinal data. Statistical significance was evaluated at a predetermined significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ (Brajercik & Krupka, 2025).

The reliability of the measurement instruments was verified using the internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's alpha). The Cronbach's alpha values for the constructs of motivational factors and demotivational factors reached a level higher than 0.70, which can be considered an acceptable to fair measure of the internal consistency of the scales. These results confirm that the individual items of the Likert scale consistently measured the same construct. Before the actual data collection, a pilot test of the questionnaire was carried out on a smaller sample of respondents ($n = 51$). The aim of such a test was to verify the comprehensibility of the items, the time required to complete it, and the content validity of the instrument. On the basis of the feedback, some of the wording of the questions was linguistically distinguished.

4. Results.

The study focused on examining motivational and demotivational factors among public sector employees. These factors were analysed in terms of perceptions across Generations X, Y, and Z. Generation X includes employees currently over 45, representing those with the longest tenure in the labour market. Generation Y comprises employees in their thirties and forties, while the youngest, Generation Z, consists of employees in their twenties and thirties.

A total of 75 public sector employees from Generation X participated in the study. The responses indicate that the most important motivational factors for this group are regular salary, benefits, and job stability. These factors also had the lowest standard deviation, reflecting a high degree of consensus among the respondents. Among the demotivational factors, political pressure and nonprofessional interventions from higher authorities were most prominent. In this case, the standard deviation for these demotivational factors was the lowest, indicating consistent perceptions across the group. Table 1 presents the motivational and demotivational factors for Generation X.

Table 1. Importance of the aspect for Generation X.

Motivation and demotivation factor	N	Average	Median	Standard deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Range	Min	Max
Job stability	75	1.45	3.00	1.286	0.947	0.224	4	1	5
Meaningfulness of work	75	1.32	2.00	1.433	-0.432	0.366	4	1	5
Regular salary and benefits	75	2.31	4.00	1.265	0.322	-1.653	3	2	5
Work-life balance	75	1.53	3.00	1.336	0.649	-.771	3	1	4

Motivation and demotivation factor	N	Average	Median	Standard deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Range	Min	Max
Career and professional development	75	2.05	2.00	1.304	0.566	-0.651	3	1	5
Bureaucracy and slow processes	75	2.41	3.00	1.233	0.391	-0.936	4	1	5
Weak recognition and feedback	75	3.02	3.00	1.321	-0.414	1.032	4	1	4
Unequal workload distribution	75	2.29	3.00	1.265	0.189	-1.423	4	1	5
Lack of modern technologies	75	1.19	2.00	1.227	-0.340	1.058	4	1	3
Political pressure and nonprofessional interventions from higher authorities	75	2.58	4.00	1.138	1.021	-0.963	3	1	5

Sources: created by the authors.

A total of 98 public sector employees from Generation Y participated in the study. The most important motivational factors for this generation are the meaningfulness of work and work–life balance. This is confirmed by the low standard deviation observed for these factors, indicating a high level of consensus among respondents. In contrast, the most significant demotivational factors include bureaucracy and slow processes within public administration institutions, as well as unequal workload distribution. Table 2 presents the perceived importance of these factors for Generation Y.

Table 2. Importance of the aspect for Generation Y.

Motivation and demotivation factor	N	Average	Median	Standard deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Range	Min	Max
Job stability	98	1.15	2.00	1.413	0.837	0.334	4	1	5
Meaningfulness of work	98	2.95	4.00	1.201	1.352	0.476	4	1	5
Regular salary and benefits	98	1.12	3.00	1.312	0.652	1.213	3	2	5
Work-life balance	98	2.13	3.00	1.237	0.399	-0.851	3	1	4
Career and professional development	98	1.25	3.00	1.409	-0.663	-0.678	3	1	5
Bureaucracy and slow processes	98	1.81	3.00	1.336	0.365	-0.626	4	1	5
Weak recognition and feedback	98	1.22	3.00	1.297	0.854	0.045	4	1	4
Unequal workload distribution	98	1.42	3.00	1.326	-0.219	1.023	4	1	5
Lack of modern technologies	98	2.79	4.00	1.103	-0.490	-0.305	4	1	3
Political pressure and nonprofessional interventions from higher authorities	98	1.27	3.00	1.144	-0.936	-0.833	3	1	5

Sources: created by the authors.

The youngest generation, Generation Z, participated in the study, with a total of 69 public sector employees. Like Generation Y, this group identifies the meaningfulness of work and work-life balance as the most important motivational factor. However, the demotivational factors differ from those of older generations, with weak recognition and feedback, as well as a lack of modern technologies, being the most significant. The low standard deviation for these factors confirms a high level of consensus among respondents. Table 3 presents the perceived importance of these factors for Generation Z.

To judge the importance of the examined factors, we formulated two main hypotheses, which assumed significant differences in the perception of motivational and demotivational factors across generations. On the basis of hypothesis testing and the statistical analysis of individual motivational and demotivational factors, we may assume that statistically significant differences exist among certain factors. For Generation X, the calculated values confirm the significance for job stability ($p = 0.024$) and regular salary and benefits ($p = 0.003$). Additionally, political pressure and top-down interventions were significant, with a p value of 0.032. The other factors did not significantly differ.

Table 3. Importance of the aspect for Generation Y.

Motivation and demotivation factor	N	Average	Median	Standard deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Range	Min	Max
Job stability	69	1.25	2.00	1.586	0.894	0.644	3	1	5
Meaningfulness of work	69	1.63	4.00	1.093	1.359	1.386	4	2	5
Regular salary and benefits	69	1.71	3.00	1.391	-0.562	-0.785	3	2	5
Work-life balance	69	1.83	3.00	1.357	0.419	-0.452	3	1	4
Career and professional development	69	1.45	2.00	1.258	0.852	-0.662	3	1	5
Bureaucracy and slow processes	69	1.36	3.00	1.284	-0.367	-0.316	3	1	5
Weak recognition and feedback	69	2.62	3.00	1.279	-0.414	-0.832	3	1	4
Unequal workload distribution	69	1.49	3.00	1.349	0.189	-0.223	4	1	5
Lack of modern technologies	69	3.89	4.00	1,102	-0.340	1.178	4	2	5
Political pressure and nonprofessional interventions from higher authorities	69	1.78	3.00	1.269	1.021	-0.523	3	1	5

Sources: created by the authors.

For Generation Y, meaningfulness of work ($p = 0.034$), work-life balance ($p = 0.028$), and unequal workload distribution ($p = 0.030$) were statistically significant, confirming the relevance of these factors for this group. In the youngest Generation Z, significant factors included meaningfulness of work ($p = 0.013$), work-life balance ($p = 0.006$), weak recognition and feedback ($p = 0.026$), and lack of modern technologies ($p = 0.019$). Table 4 presents the statistically validated motivational and demotivational factors across the three generations.

Table 4. Statistical data processing for individual generations.

	Generation X		Generation Y		Generation Z	
	Mann–Whitney U	p value	Mann–Whitney U	p value	Mann–Whitney U	p value
Job stability	3467.500	0.024	4237.500	1.124	3265.500	0.095
Meaningfulness of work	4965.500	0.074	3032.500	0.034	3968.500	0.013
Regular salary and benefits	3258.000	0.003	4057.000	0.001	2014.000	0.532
Work-life balance	3431.500	0.302	3185.500	0.028	3695.500	0.006
Career and professional development	2312.000	0.217	1609.000	0.547	1951.000	0.367
Bureaucracy and slow processes	3826.500	0.952	5302.500	0.042	4203.500	0.442
Weak recognition and feedback	3594.500	0.466	3935.500	0.741	3914.500	0.026
Unequal workload distribution	2914.000	0.650	5774.000	0.030	2684.000	1.020
Lack of modern technologies	3134.000	0.103	3085.000	0.213	4063.000	0.019
Political pressure and nonprofessional interventions from higher authorities	3112.000	0.032	3993.000	0.142	2891.000	0.741

Sources: created by the authors.

The skewness and kurtosis values show the distribution of responses in individual generational groups. For Generation X, factors such as job stability and political pressure showed positive skewness, which indicates a concentration of responses toward higher values of the scale and a relatively high degree of agreement among respondents. Low to moderate kurtosis also indicates a relatively homogeneous distribution of responses without extreme fluctuations. From a managerial perspective, this means that the issue of job security and the elimination of political interference represent a stable and consistent priority for this generation, to which managers should respond systematically.

For Generation Y, the meaningfulness of the work factor showed more pronounced positive skewness, which indicates a strong orientation of this group toward the value dimension of work. Relatively low values of the standard deviation for work-life balance indicate a high degree of consensus. For management practice, this implies the need to strengthen flexible work models, support work-life balance and communicate the social benefits of the work performed.

For demotivating factors such as the lack of modern technologies (especially in Generation Y), negative skewness indicates a more frequent assignment of higher significance values. In practice, this means that technological modernization of the work environment is not only a question of efficiency but also an important motivational tool affecting job satisfaction. The range of responses and standard deviations also indicate the degree of diversity of opinion in individual generations. Lower variability values signal stable preferences that can be the basis for standardized motivational measures, whereas higher variability indicates the need for a differentiated and individualized approach.

In Generation X, the factors of job stability and political pressure showed positive skewness and relatively low variability, which indicates a concentration of responses toward higher significance values and a high degree of agreement among respondents. Generation Y shows more pronounced skewness in terms of meaningful work and, at the same time, low variability in the balance between work and private life, which signals a strong value orientation and the need for flexible working conditions. The negative skewness in the factor of lack of modern technologies indicates that the technological equipment of the workplace represents a significant element of job satisfaction for this group. In Generation Z, pronounced positive skewness and higher kurtosis were shown for the factor of meaningful work, which indicates a strong concentration of responses at higher values of the scale. The most pronounced values in the factor of lack of modern technologies (high median, low standard deviation) indicate its dominant position among demotivating factors. In practice, this means that technological modernization of the work environment and high-quality feedback are key tools for maintaining the engagement of the youngest generation.

5. Discussion.

Employee motivation represents a dynamic process influenced by multiple individual, organizational, and societal factors. One aspect that has received increasing attention in recent years is the generational differentiation of work motivation. Generations X, Y, and Z, which together constitute the core of the workforce, exhibit distinct value orientations, expectations from the work environment, and responses to motivational stimuli. These differences are also evident in the public sector, where traditional forms of motivation based on job stability and security often conflict with the need for more flexible, development-oriented, and value-driven approaches. According to Mahmoud et al. (2021), generational differences in the public sector are reflected more in the preference for intrinsic versus extrinsic motivators than in the overall level of motivation. We found that employees across generations tend to emphasize the significance and meaningfulness of their work, which is characteristic of public interest-oriented professions. Similarly, Akwuole (2017), in a study conducted among civil servants, confirmed that generational differences in the perception of motivation are not statistically significant; however, younger generations (particularly Generation Y) exhibit greater sensitivity to fairness and performance recognition. In contrast, research by Bielińska-Dusza et al. (2022) indicates that Generation Z perceives not only financial rewards but also opportunities for skills development, feedback, and meaningful teamwork as key motivational factors. From the perspective of the public sector, these findings underscore the need to modernize human resource strategies toward greater individualization and the creation of a work environment that supports autonomy, participation, and professional growth. Consistent with this, Heyns and Kerr (2018) report that younger generations prefer approaches to work that allow for self-realization, innovation, and open communication, whereas older generations remain more focused on stability and job security. These insights suggest that effective motivational policies in public administration must account for generational diversity and provide a combination of traditional and modern motivational tools that reflect the needs of different age groups. Bińczycki et al. (2023) compare the preferences for motivational instruments across generations X, Y, and Z. Their findings indicate that while all generations value motivation in general, generations Z and Y are more satisfied with existing incentive systems than generation X is. Financial incentives are important across all generations, but generation Z places considerable emphasis on nonfinancial elements such as teamwork, recognition, and opportunities for development.

The results of the empirical analysis point to the need to differentiate motivational systems in public organizations depending on the generational affiliation of employees. These statistically significant differences confirm that universally set motivational tools may not be sufficiently effective in conditions of generational diversity. In the case of Generation X, the determining factors were employment stability, regular salary and elimination of political interference, which implies the need to strengthen transparency, professionalize management and secure working conditions. Generation Y prefers meaningful work and a balance between work and private life, while workload optimization also plays a significant role, which indicates the need for flexible forms of work and effective organization of processes. For Generation Z,

meaningful work, feedback and technological equipment were identified as key, which highlights the importance of digitalization, support for internal communication and systematic recognition of work performance. Empirical findings thus indicate that innovation in motivational systems in public administration should be based on a segmented and flexible approach that reflects the specific expectations of individual generational groups.

6. Conclusions.

The results indicate that compared with other generations, Generation X is oriented primarily toward financial factors and job stability. Younger Generation Y identifies the meaningfulness of work and work-life balance as key motivational factors, whereas bureaucracy, slow processes, and unequal workload distribution serve as primary demotivating factors. Similarly, Generation Z values meaningful work and work-life balance as motivational factors; however, as a generation that grew up with modern technologies, the lack of technological resources emerges as a notable demotivating factor. Motivation and demotivation among public sector employees are complex phenomena that significantly influence the quality and efficiency of public services. While traditional approaches often emphasize financial aspects of motivation, current trends highlight the increasing importance of nonmaterial forms of recognition and professional development. Successful public sector institutions are those that effectively integrate these approaches and create an environment where employees feel valued, heard, and motivated to contribute to the public good.

Empirical findings highlight the need to differentiate motivational systems in public organizations depending on the generational affiliation of employees. Statistically significant differences confirm that universally set motivational tools are not sufficiently effective in conditions of generational diversity. In the case of Generation X, employment stability, regular salary and elimination of political interference were shown to be key factors, which implies the need to strengthen transparency and professionalize management. Generation Y is associated with meaningful work and work-life balance, while workload optimization also plays a significant role, indicating the need for flexible organizational arrangements. For Generation Z, meaningful work, systematic feedback and technological support of work processes were identified as determinants, which highlights the importance of digitalization and innovative forms of management.

The contribution of the study goes beyond the framework of human resource management and is also relevant for the field of strategic management and innovation studies. The findings empirically support the argument that generational diversity is a significant determinant of organizational adaptability, innovative capacity, and the ability of public organizations to respond to dynamic societal change. Differentiated motivational mechanisms can be understood as tools for organizational innovation that contribute to increasing performance, supporting internal cooperation, and effectively implementing change. The study thus expands the knowledge base in the field of public management by linking the issue of motivation with the concepts of organizational innovation, public sector modernization, and the long-term sustainability of institutional development.

This study has several limitations. One limitation relates to the temporal scope of the research. Motivation and perceptions may evolve over time, and generational groups shift into different age categories, potentially altering their views on the examined issues. Political changes may also affect public sector functioning and the relative importance of motivational and demotivational factors. Another limitation potentially represents the research sample, which could be expanded by including additional public sector organizations, thereby potentially providing broader insights.

Future research will therefore adopt a longer period approach with a larger and more comprehensive sample, encompassing as many public sector employees as possible to capture generational and contextual dynamics in wider complexity.

Author Contributions: conceptualization, P.G. and B.M.; methodology, P.G.; software, A.C.; validation, P.G., B.M. and A.C.; formal analysis, J.D.; investigation, P.G.; resources, P.G., B.M. and A.C.; data curation, B.M. and A.C.; writing–original draft preparation, P.G.; writing–review and editing, P.G., B.M. and A.C.; visualization, J.D.; supervision, P.G.; project administration, J.D.; funding acquisition, P.G., B.M. and A.C.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Data availability statement: Not applicable.

Ethical Approval: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all the subjects involved in the study.

Declaration on non-using the AI for content generation: During the preparation of this paper, the author(s) used ChatGPT for stylistic editing of the text. Following its use, the author(s) carefully reviewed and edited all generated content and assume full responsibility for the final version of the publication.

References

1. Ahn, Y. (2022). Mission Match and Organizational Satisfaction: Testing the Mediating Role of Perceived Reputation. *Public Personnel Management*, 51(3), 355–379. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
2. Akwuole, P. C. (2017). *Generational age differences and employee motivation in the public sector (Doctoral dissertation)*. Walden University. [[Link](#)]
3. Anh, Vu T., Plimmer, G., Beraman, E., & Ha, P. N. (2022). Performance management in the Vietnam public sector: The role of institution, traditional culture and leadership. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 45, 49–63. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
4. Bao, Y., Liu, Y., & Zhang, Z. (2024). Understanding the Correlates of Fear among Public Employees Working in Extreme Conditions: Evidence from Chinese Frontline Customs Officers. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 47(1), 232–261. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Bartuseviciene, I., & Butkus, M. (2024). The effect of digital governance to stimulate the antifragile capabilities of public sector organizations. *Economics and Sociology*, 17(3), 41–61. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
6. Bencsik, A., & Belas, J. (2024). Characteristics of sustainable leadership in international comparison. *Economics and Sociology*, 17(4), 272–294. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
7. Bielińska-Dusza, E., Woszczyzna, A., & Gojny, M. (2022). The motivation of generations: What drives Generation X, Y, Z? *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, Article number 637177. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
8. Bilan, Y., Tovmasyan, G., & Ghazeyan, K. (2025). Evaluating the Motivation of University Staff and Their Satisfaction Level with Their Job. In: Kot, S., Khalid, B., ul Haque, A. (eds) *New Challenges of the Global Economy for Business Management. EEEU 2024. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics*. Springer, Singapore. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
9. Bińczycki, B., Łukasiński, W., & Dorocki, S. (2023). Determinants of motivation to work in terms of Industry 4.0 — The Gen Z perspective. *Sustainability*, 15(15), Article number 12069. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
10. Bozeman, B., & Su, X. (2015). Public service motivation concepts and theory: A critique. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 700–710. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
11. Brajercik, J., & Krupka, D. (2025). SO(3): The Principal Bundle Structure. *Mathematics*, 13(7), Article number 1184. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
12. Breaugh, J., Alfes, K., & Ritz, A. (2022). Strength in numbers? Understanding the effect of team-level PSM on team effectiveness. *International Public Management Journal*, 25(1), 65–85. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
13. Bright, L. (2020). Does Perceptions of Organizational Prestige Mediate the Relationship Between Public Service Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and the Turnover Intentions of Federal Employees? *Public Personnel Management*, 50(3), 408–429. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
14. Cantarelli, P., Vainieri, M., & Seghieri, C. (2023). The management of healthcare employees' job satisfaction: optimization analyses from a series of large-scale surveys. *BMC Health Services Research*, 23(1), Article number 428. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
15. Czerwinska-Lubszczyk, A., & Jankowiak, N. (2025). Motivation in The Workplace – A Generational Perspective. *Management Systems in Production Engineering*, 33, 100–114. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
16. Demircioglu, M. A. (2020). The Effects of Organizational and Demographic Context for Innovation Implementation in Public Organizations. *Public Management Review*, 22(12), 1852–1875. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Ding, M., & Wang, C. (2023). Can public service motivation increase work engagement? A meta-analysis across cultures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article number 1060941. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Dzunova, J., Dousa, M., & Korenova, D. (2024). The Role of Local Government in the Process of the Brownfield Regeneration – Case Study of Košice, Slovakia. *Review of European and Comparative Law*, 58(3), 241–259. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Fareed, M. Z., & Su, Q. (2021). Transformational Leadership and Project Success: A Mediating Role of Public Service Motivation. *Administration & Society*, 54(4), 690–713. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Ford, R. C. (2017). Combining performance, learning, and behavioral goals to match job with person: Three steps to enhance employee performance with goal setting. *Business Horizons*, 60(3), 345–352. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Fuenzalida, J., Gutiérrez, L. L., Fernández-Vergara, A., & González, P. A. (2024). Red Tape and Burnout Risks in the Public Service: Evidence from a Survey Experiment of School Principals. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 46(1), 53–84. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
22. George, B., & van der Wal, Z. (2023). Does Performance-Related-Pay work? Recommendations for practice based on a meta-analysis. *Policy Design and Practice*, 6(3), 299–312. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
23. Georgellis, Y., Iossa, E., & Tabvuma, V. (2011). Crowding out intrinsic motivation in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(3), 473–493. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

-
-
24. Giacomelli, G., Vainieri, M., Garzi, R., & Zamaro, N. (2020). Organizational commitment across different institutional settings: how perceived procedural constraints frustrate self-sacrifice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 88(3), 702–720. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 25. Ghebrejorgis, F., & Negusse, H. (2022). Factors Affecting Public Servants' Performance in Developing Countries: Evidence from Eritrea. *International Journal of Public Policy and Administration Research*, 9(1), 1–10. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 26. Gorgievski, M. J., Bakker, A. B., Petrou, P., & Gawke, J. C. L. (2023). Antecedents of employee intrapreneurship in the public sector: a proactive motivation approach. *International Public Management Journal*, 26(6), 852–873. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 27. Heyns, M. M., & Kerr, M. D. (2018). Generational differences in workplace motivation. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(1), 1–10. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 28. Hill, K., & Plimmer, G. (2024). Employee Performance Management: The Impact of Competing Goals, Red Tape, and PSM. *Public Personnel Management*, 53(3), 458–485. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 29. Homberg, F., & Vogel, R. (2016). Human resource management (HRM) and public service motivation (PSM): Where are we, and where do we go from here? *International Journal of Manpower*, 37(5), 746–763. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 30. Houston, D. J., & Freeman, P. K. (2024). Religiosity and work motives among public sector employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 47(3), 263–285. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 31. Huang, W. L. (2021). Changes in public service motivation: Can public administration education help cultivate it? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 88(4), 1176–1191. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 32. Inkabova, M., Andrejovska, A., & Glova, J. (2021). The Impact of Environmental Taxes on Agriculture – the Case of Slovakia. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies*, 30(4), 3085–3097. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 33. Jankiewicz, J., & Trojanek, R. (2024). Formation of household opinions and the situation in the labour market in Poland. *Journal of International Studies*, 17(4), 29–43. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 34. Jensen, U. T., Andersen, L. B., & Jacobsen, C. B. (2019). Only when we agree! How value congruence moderates the impact of goal-oriented leadership on public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 79(1), 12–24. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 35. Jung, G., & Moon, K. K. (2024). Examining Public Service Motivation's Impact on Organizational Commitment: Focusing on Moderating Roles of Hygiene and Motivation Factors. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(6), 476. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 36. Kim, J., Kang, H., & Lee, K. (2021). Transformational-transactional leadership and unethical pro-organizational behavior in the public sector: does public service motivation make a difference? *Public Management Review*, 25(2), 429–458. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 37. Kiyak, B., & Karkin, N. (2022). Job characteristics and public service motivation among highly qualified public employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 45(3), 316–333. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 38. Klatt, T., & Fairholm, M. (2023). Promote or deter: How organizations influence public service motivation. *Public Personnel Management*, 52, 48–69. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 39. Kiselakova, D., Gallo, P., Cabinova, V., Onuferova, E., & Hairul, H. (2020). Total quality management as managerial tool of competitiveness in enterprises worldwide. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 21(2), 195–209. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 40. Lameck, W. U. (2024). Uncovering the potentials for public service motivation in Tanzania. *SN Social Sciences*, 4, Article number 158. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 41. Lee, H. J., Min, K. R., Kim, M. Y., & Park, S. M. (2022). The Impact of Entrepreneurial Leadership and Ethical Climate on Public Service Motivation in Korea and China: Moderating Role of Confucian Values. *Sustainability*, 14(21), Article number 14162. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 42. Lim, J.-Y., & Moon, K.-K. (2025). The Public Service Motivation's Impact on Turnover Intention in Korean Public Organizations: Do Perceived Organizational Politics Matter? *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(4), Article number 474. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 43. Mahmoud, A. B., Reisel, W. D., Hack-Polay, D., Fuxman, L., & Mohr, I. (2021). "We aren't your reincarnation!" Workplace motivation across X, Y and Z generations. *International Journal of Manpower*, 42(1), 193–209. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 44. Michalec, G., Hargitai, D. M., & Bencsik, A. (2024). Organizational trust as a success factor. *Journal of Business Sectors*, 2(1), 61–67. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 45. Mussagulova, A., Chen, C. A., & Dennis Dong, H. K. (2021). Confronting Pension Reform: Public Employees' Psychological Contract Breach, Negative Perception, Regret, and the Moderating Role of PSM. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 42(4), 641–668. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
 46. Park, M., & Lee, B. H. (2023). Do public service motivation and organizational processes influence job satisfaction and organizational commitment? A comparative study in public and private organizations. *Chinese Public Administration Review*, 14(4), 224–237. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
-
-

47. Raza, H., Kovacs, S., & Khan, M. H. (2025). Profitability and SDG 13-Climate Action: The Moderating Role of Environmental Management Training: A Machine Learning Approach. *Journal of Business Sectors*, 3(1), 1–12. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
48. Romanelli, M. (2024). Motivating the Employees to Ethics Within Public Organizations. In: Chivu, L., Ioan-Franc, V., Georgescu, G., De Los Ríos Carmenado, I., Andrei, J.V. (eds) Europe in the New World Economy: Opportunities and Challenges. ESPERA 2023. *Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics*. Springer, Cham, 319–327. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
49. Ritz, A., Weißmüller, K. S., & Meynhardt, T. (2023). Public Value at Cross Points: A Comparative Study on Employer Attractiveness of Public, Private, and Nonprofit Organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 43(3), 528–556. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
50. Skypalova, R., Betakova, J., Heinz, V., & Klement, A. (2025). Evaluation of the Human Resources Management in the Czech Business Environment: Gender Approach. *Journal of Business Sectors*, 3(2), 26–34. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
51. Stehnei, M., Irtysheva, I., Kramarenko, I., Ishchenko, O., & Irtyshev, O. (2025). Innovation-Oriented HR Strategy Transformation and Business Model Reengineering: Empirical Insights from Ukrainian Agribusiness. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 16(2), 32–46. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Suhanyiova, A., Suhányi, L., & Kocisova, M. (2024). Business Confidence in the Sustainable Manufacturing Sector in the Context of Production, Production Prices, and Interest Rates. *Sustainability*, 16(1), Article number 173. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
53. Sułkowski, Ł., Wójcik-Chodorowska, J., Jarosz, K., & Jung-Konstanty, S. (2025). Public value management, deinstitutionalization, and personalized social services in local communities. *Journal of International Studies*, 18(2), 50–74. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Szabo, S., Mihalcova, B., Gallo, P., & Ivanickova, M. (2018). Evaluating efficiency in specialized hospital facilities - developing the model by way of the discriminant analysis. *E+M Ekonomie a Management*, 21(3), 88–106. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
55. Van Loon, N., Kjeldsen, A. M., Andersen, L. B., Vandenabeele, W., & Leisink, P. (2018). Only when the societal impact potential is high? A panel study of the relationship between public service motivation and perceived performance. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 38(2), 139–166. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
56. Tadic, I., & Zaja, A. (2025). Work Motivation Across Employee Generations in Croatia. *Poslovna izvrsnost - Business Excellence*, 19(2), 1–19. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
57. Tang, H., An, S., Zhang, L., Xiao, Y., & Li, X. (2024). The Antecedents and Outcomes of Public Service Motivation: A Meta-Analysis Using the Job Demands–Resources Model. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(10), Article number 861. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Urotadze, J., Strielkowski, W., Durglishvili, N., & Kechakmadze, I. (2025). Public Perception and Adoption of Pension System Innovations in Georgia: Behavioural Factors and Managerial Implications. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 16(1), 15–30. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Петер Галло, Університет імені Павла Йозефа Шафарика в Кошицях, Словаччина

Ян Добровіч, Університет міжнародного бізнесу ISM у Пряшеві, Словаччина

Анна Цепелова, Університет імені Павла Йозефа Шафарика в Кошицях, Словаччина

Богуслава Міхалцова, Економічний університет у Братиславі, Словаччина

Інноваційні управлінські практики та мотивація працівників державного сектору: у розрізі поколінь

У дослідженні проаналізовано мотиваційні та демотиваційні чинники діяльності працівників органів державного сектору. У сучасних умовах державні служби зазнають зростаючого тиску щодо підвищення ефективності своєї діяльності, що зумовлює необхідність адаптації до сучасних управлінських тенденцій та реагування на змінні потреби суспільства. Такі трансформації формують нові виклики у сфері мотивації персоналу. Водночас кадровий склад державного сектору представлений різними віковими групами, які відрізняються за цінностями, очікуваннями та трудовими установками, що впливає як на рівень задоволеності працівників роботою, так і на загальну результативність діяльності організацій. Емпіричною базою дослідження стали результати опитування 242 працівників органів державного сектору. Збір даних здійснено за допомогою структурованої анкети, спрямованої на виявлення відмінностей між поколіннями у сприйнятті мотиваційних і демотиваційних чинників. Результати статистичного аналізу засвідчили наявність статистично значущих відмінностей за окремими групами чинників. Для представників покоління X визначальними мотиваційними чинниками є стабільність зайнятості та регулярна заробітна плата із відповідними соціальними гарантіями. Водночас суттєвими демотиваційними чинниками виступають політичний тиск і адміністративне втручання керівництва. Для покоління Y статистично значущими мотиваційними чинниками визначено змістовність роботи та баланс між професійним і особистим життям, тоді як ключовим демотиваційним чинником є нерівномірний розподіл робочого навантаження. Для покоління Z основними мотиваційними чинниками також виступають змістовність роботи та баланс між професійним і особистим життям, тоді як серед демотиваційних чинників переважають недостатній рівень визнання результатів праці та зворотного зв'язку, а також обмежене використання сучасних

технологій. Отримані результати дозволяють поглибити розуміння особливостей мотивації працівників державного сектору різних поколінь та можуть бути використані для розроблення цільових мотиваційних стратегій і формування сприятливого робочого середовища, що сприятиме підвищенню залученості персоналу, його професійному розвитку та якості надання державних послуг, а також зміцненню довіри громадськості до діяльності державних інституцій.

Ключові слова: мотивація; державний сектор; працівники; відмінності між віковими групами; управлінські інновації.