

УДК 330.161

DOI:10.32680/2409-9260-2021-11-12-288-289-116-125

МОТИВАЦІЙНІ МЕХАНІЗМИ У ПОВЕДІНКОВІЙ ЕКОНОМІЦІ

Керекеша О. В. кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри іноземних мов, Одеський національний економічний університет, Одеса, Україна
e-mail: olik_k@ukr.net
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4530-2961

Поліщук В.О., аспірант кафедри загальної економічної теорії та економічної політики, Одеський національний економічний університет, Одеса, Україна
e-mail: st_vlad0901@ukr.net
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6492-2923

***Анотація.** У XXI ст. широко розвивається та домінує у сучасній економічній науці неокласична концепція економіки. У центрі цієї наукової теорії стоїть «економічна людина», яка, спираючись на свої знання, досвід та переваги, намагається отримати максимальну вигоду, а її поведінка є раціональною. Але не завжди створюється така ідеальна картина і бувають ситуації, коли над економічною людиною беруть верх емоції, його поведінка відхиляється від раціональної та нерідко стає нерациональною. Вивченням різноманітних аномалій і феноменів у поведінці людини економічної займається особлива область економічної науки – «поведінкова економіка». Матеріали та методи. Методологічною основою послужив теоретичний аналіз аспектів розвитку поведінкової економіки. При дослідженні застосовувалися аналіз історичного становлення та ретроспективний аналіз даної галузі економіки. Методологічним інструментарієм послужили загальнонаукові методи, такі як дедукція, індукція, синтез та логічний аналіз. Результати. Яскраво представлена роль поведінкової економіки загалом у економічній науці. Докладно описаний генезис даної галузі економіки та виявлено властиві їй сучасні проблеми. На основі зібраного матеріалу про поведінкову економіку наведено інформацію практично за всіма досягненнями та відкриттями прихильників даного напрямку. Висновки. Зроблено висновок про те, що, незважаючи на всі проблеми, з якими стикається поведінкова економіка, проведені дослідження та експерименти привносять нові знання економістам, допомагають у вивченні аномалій у поведінці економічної людини і дають відповіді на питання про відхилення поведінки від раціональної при ухваленні економічних рішень.*

***Ключові слова:** поведінкова економіка, мотивація, механізми мотивації, економічна людина.*

MOTIVATIONAL MECHANISMS IN BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS

Kereksha Olga, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Foreign Languages, Odessa National Economic University, Odessa, Ukraine
e-mail: olik_k@ukr.net
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4530-2961

Polishchuk Volodimir graduate student of the Department of General Economic Theory and economic policy, Odessa National Economic University, Odessa, Ukraine
e-mail: st_vlad0901@ukr.net
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6492-2923

***Abstract.** Modern scientists, studying economic science and studying various economic processes and phenomena, are increasingly trying to enrich economic science and identify the main prospects and trends in the development of economics itself as a science. To this end, scientists turn to other sciences for help and use their methodology and tools. In the XXI century the neoclassical concept of economics is widely developed and dominates in modern economics. At the heart of this scientific theory is the «economic man» who, based on his knowledge, experience and strengths, tries to get the maximum benefit, and his behavior is rational. But such an ideal picture is not always created and there are situations when an economic person is dominated by emotions, his behavior deviates from the rational and often becomes irrational. The study of various anomalies and phenomena in economic human behavior is a special field of economics - "behavioral economics". This overview of the main aspects of new directions in the framework of experimental economics - behavioral economics. The historical formation, ideas of supporters and specific methodological problems of these two areas of economics are considered. Materials and methods. The methodological basis was a theoretical analysis of aspects of the development of behavioral economics. The study used the analysis of historical formation and retrospective analysis of this sector of the economy. General scientific methods such as deduction, induction, synthesis and logical analysis served as methodological tools. Results. The role of behavioral economics in general in economics is clearly presented. The genesis of this branch of economy is described in detail and its current problems are revealed. On the basis of the collected material on behavioral economics, information is given on almost all the achievements and discoveries of supporters of this area. Conclusions. It is concluded that, despite all the problems faced by behavioral economics, research and experiments bring new knowledge to economists, help study anomalies in economic behavior and answer questions about the deviation from rational behavior in economic decision-making.*

JEL Classification: A140, D210, O150, Z130.

Formulation of the problem. The essential characteristics of the motivation process are not limited to a consistent relationship: needs - interests - goals - decisions. Motivation is a complex and continuous process of psychological choice by the subject of a type of upcoming behavior, the mechanisms of its «launch» and evaluation of results. Indeed, any business entity is constantly in a state of motivational choice, weighing the value (usefulness, benefit) of future actions, the expected result and the cost of achieving them.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The analysis of human models in economic theory differs depending on the dominant economic theory and, consequently, adherents of these theories. Among the mercantilists, W. Stafford was involved in this problem. (England), De Santis (Italy), T. Man (England), A. Montchretien (France), etc. Separately it is necessary to note A. Smith, without the analysis of the main work of which not a single economic article. Among the marginalists. I would like to highlight G. Gossen (Germany), W. Jevons (England), L. Walras (France), I. Bentham (England). Further, among the supporters behavioral economics (which is considered in this paper a little more emphasized) this issue was dealt with in particular detail by G. Simon (USA) and D. Arieli (USA).

Separation of previously unresolved parts of the overall problem. Behavioral is an area of economics that studies the influence of social, cognitive and emotional factors on economic decision-making by individuals and institutions, as well as the consequences of this influence on market components (prices, profits, resource allocation). From the beginning of its development, economic science has been closely related to psychology. Even then, some economists, such as Adam Smith, assumed that human behavior and decision-making may directly depend on psychological factors such as «honesty», «fairness», «self-confidence». But neoclassical economics offered a very different concept to explain human behavior. The concept of «economic man» considered our behavior to be completely rational. In the twentieth century, thanks to the emergence and development of economic psychology, scientists began to put forward hypotheses about the human decision-making process under conditions of uncertainty. In the 1960s, a revolution took place in psychological science: behaviorism (a direction in psychology, the subject of which is behavior, and not human consciousness) was replaced by cognitive psychology (a branch of psychology that studies cognitive, that is, cognitive, processes of the human psyche).

Purpose of the study. The purpose of the article is to determine the place of motivation in behavioral economics and the paradigm structure of modern economic theory and its role in the development of modern economic knowledge. The weak attention of classical economic theory to the motivation of the behavioral aspect of decision-making by economic entities in the face of growing instability and uncertainty of economic development has led to the actualization and popularization of research in the field of behavioral economics.

Basic material. Traditional economic theory convinces us that man is a rational being, so he always makes the most profitable and best decision for himself. This seems logically correct, but is not entirely true in practice - smoking, eating junk food, making spontaneous purchases of unnecessary things, and giving up on professional development are not the best decisions, but billions of people do so.

In turn, behavioral economists have shown that humans are highly irrational. They are convinced that most of the calculations in the brain go automatically without our involvement, and we are simply slaves to these calculations - this is the reason for our irrational behavior.

So what is behavioral economics? Although economics, like any other science, is evolving towards more and more systematization and structuring, there is one element that defies all order and discipline, and that element is man. It is the individual who determines the basic patterns of economic functioning, who determines whether the economy is on the upswing or downswing, whether it is in equilibrium or only striving for it. And all this is done by the individual by making decisions based on his preferences, expectations, knowledge, calculations, etc., that is, it all depends on how the human model is arranged in a particular economic era or system. One of the latest trends in the development of economic thought is the development of an interdisciplinary concept - behavioral economics.

Behavioral economics gathered all the accumulated research on the decision-making process of the individual, brought the human model as close to reality as possible, showed its irrationality. In this case, the question arises, but how does the economy function if man is not as absolutely rational as the neoclassical model assumed? The answer is simple - the state intervenes in the

decision-making process and levels out this irrationality [4]. The following problem arises: doesn't it happen that proponents of behavioral economics remove little relevant assumptions of the neoclassical model of man, make him more "real", closer to life, talk about his irrationality, but fall at the other extreme - give excessive rationality to the state, which actively interferes in the decision-making process? It is the analysis of the problem posed that is at the heart of this paper.

Further development can be described as the approximation of the human model in economics to a real person (similar to Smith's human model), but only at a more advanced level and using more sophisticated analytical tools. During this period, the problems of choice under uncertainty, motivation, accounting for limited human capabilities (a limitation being understood as a person's informational and intellectual abilities) are actively studied. This stage in the development of the human model in economics is characterized by the fact that knowledge and experience of such special areas of economics as behavioral and experimental economics began to be included in the analysis [3]. This is essentially an interdisciplinary field of research, formed by the efforts of economists (D. Ariely, G. Simon, W. Smith) and psychologists (J. Lowenstein, D. Kahneman, P. Slovik, A. Tversky, W. Edwards). Since the concept of behavioral economics has been mentioned, let us briefly characterize this branch of economics. Behavioral economics began to take shape in the 1950s. It was during this period that G. Simon proposed the idea of bounded rationality, which is opposed to the human model in the neoclassical concept. Indeed, do people really behave so rationally? Can human cognitive abilities be so well developed that all the prerequisites of the neoclassical model are met? Can the decision-making process not be influenced by psychological, ethical factors, the surrounding situation, even, banally, a person's laziness? The answer to all these questions is absolutely negative [2].

Simon's idea differs primarily in that it takes into account the limited rationality of man, including his NOT absolute memory, NOT infinite mental and cognitive abilities, NOT a correct assessment of the probability of desirable events, etc. All these factors lead to errors in the operation of the neoclassical model. Moreover, these errors begin to become systematic, so they can be studied and accounted for in new economic models. It is at this point that behavioral economics - an interdisciplinary science on the verge of economics, psychology, sociology, ethics, philosophy - begins to emerge. Many vivid examples can be given to illustrate the systematic nature of errors arising in the neoclassical model and to confirm the fact that the basic assumptions of the neoclassics are not fulfilled.

For example, let us consider, say, the premise that the decisions made at different points in time are consistent. The fact is that, more often than not, individuals' decisions at different points in time are inconsistent with each other rather than vice versa. This is due to the presence of the discounting factor (a person values the future a little less than the present).

Intertemporal choice distorts the premise of decision coherence. Simply put, the idea of bounded rationality means that a person is guided by common sense, reasonableness, rather than abstract theoretical models, when making these or those decisions. It can be said that this was the moment when the concept of "behavioral economics" was born. After that began its active phase. Works on behavioral economics were also recognized by the Nobel Committee. In 2002, psychologist Daniel Kahneman (Princeton University, USA) and economist Vernon Smith (University of Jerusalem, Israel) became laureates. Both of these scientists showed that people in reality do not act as intelligently and rationally as classical economic theories describe them. In fact, the Nobel Prize was awarded for the recognition that psychological, behavioral errors, which are inherent in human nature, have a significant impact on human economic and business decisions [9].

It can be said that it was a formal recognition of the fact that such new scientific disciplines as economic psychology and behavioral economics with their own, absolutely different, model of a person in economics were formed. Today, no economist writing about individual behavior and the human model can avoid the psychological characteristics of the decision-making process.

Behavioral economics is a complex and heterogeneous phenomenon. The human model it proposes (including in the context of normative analysis) is based on rather unorthodox assumptions. On the one hand, they seem very realistic compared to the doctrine of absolute rationality. Nevertheless, there are some criticisms of behavioral economics in general and of the human model in this concept in particular.

We would like to start with the fact that despite more than half a century of history, behavioral economics has not become a single coherent and structured science, the studies describe only one or another recurrent behavioral response, i.e. the studies break up into many small «precedents» (as in foreign legal systems) and are almost completely unconnected with each other. Moreover, representatives of behavioral economics say that people are not rational and systematically make

mistakes, but there is no unified approach or analysis about the frequency of various cognitive and behavioral errors and how the number of rational and irrational people correlates [7].

Researchers only say that these errors are distributed extremely unevenly among economic agents, but at the same time the results of normative analysis (paternalism) apply to the whole society without restrictions. Further, supporters of the new paternalism talk about the need for government intervention, since it corrects the behavior of irrational economic agents [2]. The conclusion suggests itself: do politicians know better about the real preferences of people than themselves? Of course, people in reality cannot be absolutely rational, but sometimes better results are achieved if people make decisions for themselves than if those decisions are made by others (including the state). They may not be sufficiently aware of their personal preferences, but still know more about them than anyone else (for example, friends, relatives, etc.). At the same time, even if this "someone else" is aware of preferences, he is most likely much more aware of them than the state.

That is why it can be assumed that the decisions that are made instead of individuals by the paternalist state will not be as successful as the decisions that individuals make on their own. Further, for a paternalistic policy to be successful, one cannot simply state that people are susceptible to certain behavioral errors. The state must have a huge amount of information: what are the real preferences of individuals, what mistakes and in what special situations they make, etc. State interference in the economy and in the decision-making process by each individual must be «calibrated» taking into account the huge list of all the factors listed above (and this is not the final list) [9]. Is this really possible? In addition, individuals do not remain indifferent to the behavioral errors to which they are prone: very often they are aware of them and make conscious efforts to eliminate them. If the state does not take this into account, then its intervention, instead of improving the situation of people, is highly likely to worsen it. Under these conditions, determining the optimal level of intervention becomes extremely difficult [1].

The issues of motivation and goal-setting have been thoroughly studied in the world of psychological science. However, according to modern researchers, "with all the achievements in the development of this topic, there are some gaps, white spots, the illumination of which is still ahead.

Economic behavior as a particular type of human behavior has long been of interest to economists, psychologists, and sociologists. There are fundamental differences in the approaches of economists and psychologists to study it. Economic behavior from the point of view of the economy is considered as economically feasible, rational, aimed at maximizing benefits and minimizing costs [5]. A person, including his psychological characteristics, is of interest to the economist primarily as factors of economic behavior and economic relations that affect economic behavior, which, from the point of view of psychology, is considered as a private element of human life, is far from the only and not always the most important one. The psychologist is primarily interested in the reasons why sometimes a person behaves economically expediently and rationally, and not in accordance with his human nature, how the individual psychological characteristics of people manifest themselves in their real economic behavior, how economic conditions affect the psychological characteristics of people, the relationship between them.

Economic behavior - behavior associated with the consideration of economic alternatives for the purpose of rational choice, i.e. a choice that minimizes costs and maximizes net benefit. Based on the balance of rationality and emotionality of their thinking, people take only those actions that will bring them the greatest net benefit (namely, benefit minus the possible costs associated with these actions).

In the definition adopted by the International Association of Researchers in the Field of Economic Psychology, economic behavior refers to the behavior of people in which economic decision-making takes place, as well as the determinants and consequences of economic decisions.

The economic literature describes various models of economic behavior. Its essence is considered mainly within the framework of two directions of world economic thought: classical and neoclassical theories, on the one hand, and institutional and neoinstitutional concepts, on the other.

From the standpoint of classical and neoclassical economic theory, economic behavior is considered as completely rational, carried out in conditions of completeness of information and aimed at maximizing profits.

The classics of economic thought, starting with Adam Smith - the Scottish economist, scientist, philosopher and without resorting to using the term itself, actually substantiated and developed historically the first model of economic behavior in the concept of "economic man"

("Homo Economicus"). The essence of this concept was that, acting in the economic sphere, a person maximizes his own benefit and minimizes costs, while his actions are rational, reasonable and rational. The creation of such a model was due to the need to study the problem of choice and motivation in the economic activity of individuals and is based on the recognition of the compensatory role of wages as the basis of the economic behavior of the subject. The functioning of the model is determined by five main conditions that compensate for small money earnings in some activities and counterbalance large earnings in others:

- the pleasantness or the unpleasantness of the activities themselves;
- ease and low cost or difficulty and high cost of teaching them;
- constancy or inconstancy of occupation;
- more or less confidence in those people who deal with them;
- the likelihood or improbability of success in them.

These conditions determine the balance of actual or imagined benefits and costs on which a person's rational choice is based. The economic behavior of a person is determined by alternative options chosen in each of the five conditions for making money, based on his inclinations and preferences.

Thus, self-interest becomes the main force of economic behavior. Smith called this the desire to "improve their position" and argued that such a calculation, as a rule, accompanies us throughout our life, and the simplest path that most people take to improve their situation is "increasing wealth."

In the national economy, in the process of establishing market relations, two basic types of economic behavior dominate in the context of Smith's methodology: pre-market and market.

The pre-market type of behavior is characterized by the formula "guaranteed income at the price of minimum labor costs" or "minimum income with minimum labor costs". People with a pre-market type of economic behavior are characterized by rejection of the market or a wary attitude towards it, a low assessment of their own ideas about a market economy, a high level of social and psychological tension of the individual, which is strongly influenced by social stereotypes developed during the years of the Soviet economy.

The market type of behavior is characterized by the formula "maximum income at the price of maximum labor costs." It presupposes a high degree of economic activity of people, their understanding that the market provides opportunities for increasing welfare in accordance with the invested efforts, knowledge, and skills. Actually, the market type of behavior is just beginning to take shape and to a large extent depends on the course of economic reforms and their compliance with the social expectations of the economically active population.

The costs of forming the labor market have led to the emergence of another type of economic behavior - pseudo-market, which is characterized by the formula "maximum income at the price of minimum labor costs." The presence of a pseudo-market type of behavior in any social system indicates a low level of its development, the absence of a clearly expressed concept of this development, which is characteristic to one degree or another for developing countries.

Within the framework of the neoclassical school, the model of the economic man as an individual who maximizes utility was finally formed.

From the point of view of institutional and neoinstitutional concepts, economic behavior is viewed as boundedly rational, significantly dependent on external socio-economic norms and institutions that restrict a person's desire to maximize profits [8].

The essential characteristic of the motivation process is not limited to a consistent relationship: needs - interests - goals - decisions. Motivation is a complex and continuous process of the subject's psychological choice of one or another type of forthcoming behavior, the mechanisms of its "launch" and evaluation of the results. Indeed, any business entity is constantly in a state of motivational choice, weighing the value (utility, benefit) of the forthcoming actions, the expected result and the costs of achieving them. From an economic and managerial point of view, such a choice in national (and not only) conditions means that the subject is constantly weighing whether it is worth investing his savings in rubles, euros or dollars, on a bank deposit, in shares or in a "stocking", in his own business or in real estate; continue your studies at the university or interrupt it in connection with the need to earn a living; pay taxes or avoid them; increase or decrease the interest rate; choose a liberal market or another model of system-wide development, etc [2]. These and thousands of other small and large alternative choices appear in front of each subject continuously, forming, in fact, the motivation for his economic behavior. The result (culmination) of such a choice, as already noted, is the adoption of a motivated decision to act, one way or another. This decision is correlated with the actual results of the actions performed, and if the expected

and actual results differ significantly, the subject makes the necessary motivated adjustments in his practical actions, corresponding to the reinforced (come true) or unsupported (deceived) expectations [5]. For example, an employee of the management apparatus, conscientiously and creatively doing his job and expecting career advancement, but not receiving it for a long time, will make a choice in the direction of creating the “appearance” of work or leaving the organization. A novice (and not only) entrepreneur, under the influence of an excessive burden of taxes or levies of officials, will go into the shadows. A large businessman will seek to circumvent the costs of the institutional environment by latent methods of economic behavior - the acquisition and use of insider information, agreements with affiliated persons, stock market speculation, etc.

The problem of a motivated choice of the type of forthcoming behavior, including economic, not only at the level of the individual, but also at the level of large socio-economic systems, has been difficult and relevant for economic and behavioral science and practice for many years. The needs and problems of behavioral economics, which could not be explained only from the standpoint of economic determinism, led to the emergence in the middle of the XX century. a new large-scale doctrine, called the theory of rational choice, whose roots go back to philosophy and psychology [6]. The general meaning of the theory of rational choice, including in modern conditions, is associated with the fundamental property of human behavior - the necessity and ability of a person (social system) to choose the type, method, space of actions in the universal process of exchanging goods, services, information, knowledge. The absence of such a choice restricts the freedom of action of economic agents, makes micro- and macrosystems rigidly determined, inflexible, and non-adaptive to changes, especially in their most acute crisis form.

The doctrine of rational choice formed the basis of the theory of social choice, the ideas of which were developed independently by the already mentioned American scientists, Nobel Prize winners K. Arrow and J. M. Buchanan. In the most general form, the meaning of their ideas consists in assessing the role of politics as a type of economic activity, the practice of making political decisions and their influence on the behavior of economic agents and on the development of the economy as a whole. K. Arrow focused on the problem of criteria for the balance of interests of the legislative and executive authorities in order to optimize economic growth, which is also important for intra-firm management. At the same time, he argued that "the essence of the economic behavior of any economic agent is actions aimed at choosing the most profitable alternatives." D. Buchanan proposed extending market categories to the analysis of political processes, and came up with the concept of a political market [2].

Apparently, it was this phenomenon that formed the basis of marginalist economic theories (first of all, the theory of marginal utility), theories of rational expectations and public choice, as well as institutional and neoinstitutional theories.

The problems of economic choice and the prerequisites that determine the behavior of agents have occupied a very significant place in the discussions of economists who tend to different economic theories and share different approaches to the question of the rationality of the behavior of economic agents. Proponents of the marginalist theory ultimately determine the value of any theory by how reliably it helps to explain and predict the results of mass behavior. In particular, F. Machlup notes that since “we are not able to obtain all the necessary information, it is useless to burden the model with variables that we are not able to use».

For modern science, it is of fundamental importance to identify the features and mechanisms that determine the choice of the behavior of economic agents in the dynamically changing conditions of the development of social production. The traditional neoclassical theory was based mainly on the agent's full awareness, his developed interpretive and calculating abilities and the absence of transaction costs, which does not fully correspond to the realities of the modern economy.

The limitation of the applicability of the neoclassical approach to describing the behavior of economic agents lies in the fact that the model of rational behavior dictated primarily by personal interest, formed within this approach, ignores the complex of individual impulses that govern the behavior of people, for example, habits, stereotypes, emotions, heuristics, etc., as well as the inability of a person in a complex and ambiguous situation to make an unambiguous choice (decision) and determine the way to achieve the desired result. In conditions of uncertainty in economics, the Neumann-Morgenstern expected utility function is often used to assess the choice of behavioral alternatives, which takes into account the probabilities of a particular state [2]. However, it should be borne in mind that decisions made under conditions of uncertainty in accordance with the theory of expected utility are deliberately subjective and therefore often deviate from this theory.

A social subject who is focused on achieving a positive result in his activity has in mind a certain motivation for this very activity. He rarely turns to universal human values, to a greater extent he

is interested in the factors of people's behavior in specific motivational situations, which, taking into account the variability of social reality, have a multifaceted nature and, unfortunately, are not always clearly explainable. A social subject, relying on rationality with his activities, presupposes a certain goal, realized and presupposing the achievement of a positive result. He deliberately bases his activities in relation to other social subjects on a sufficiently thought-out interaction strategy, which allows him to solve very specific tasks. At the same time, the effectiveness of such activities presupposes the fact that the social subject is responsible for the positive results of his activities and the subjects interacting with him, not only in a certain present time, but also, at least in the near future.

This moment belongs to the sphere of rational activity of the social subject. In this regard, it should be noted that one of the tasks of a social subject, within the framework of rational activity, is such a development of the level of interaction with the subjects around him, which would help them to cope not only with specific tasks, but also at certain points to be included in tactical and in the strategic activity of a specific social subject. On the other hand, this cannot but apply to the very subjects of rational activity. That is, a social subject that does not take into account the factor of rationality, does not have a clearly expressed motivation, can hardly make a significant contribution not only to the implementation of a specific task, but also to activities to achieve a specific goal within a specific society.

Problems associated with the motivation of rational activity can be roughly divided into two large groups [12]:

1. Theories of content;
2. Process theory.

Within the framework of the first theory, emphasis is placed on the study and explanation of what is actually motivated and what are the motives for certain rational behavior. The second explains the process that directly reflects the internal psychological and motivational aspects of social activity itself. As a result, in order to really be able to understand motivation as a phenomenon, both concepts are needed, as well as a certain individual approach to this issue [12].

Based on some fundamental approaches to these issues, which have been formulated in modern domestic and foreign literature, let us highlight our own reconstructive position in relation to these approaches. Within the framework of foreign literature, the two-factor theory of motivation by Herzberg is highlighted, in which a very contradictory concept was presented, associated with various mismatched situations in relation to various social groups within the framework of rational activity. That is, we are talking about the fact that contradictory situations actually formed the basis of this theory, and in such a way that different sides of contradictory situations actually assumed different directions within the framework of the functioning of society. Herzberg came to the conclusion that the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of various social groups with the results of rational activity are caused by various factors [11]. A. Maslow approaches the problem from the standpoint of the hierarchy of needs within the framework of rational behavior. In this case, the behavior of the social subject is usually directed by the strongest need at a particular moment. It forces people to act in ways that satisfy a need. Moreover, the needs themselves can, of course, be grouped in different ways. Let us note in this connection that A. Maslow created a five-stage hierarchical model of such needs within the framework of rational activity, and Alderfer created a three-stage model [1]. From the standpoint of Maslow's classification, the following needs can be distinguished, although it seems to us that they can hardly be considered as universal - this is a need for security; social needs; the need for respect; the need for self-expression. At the same time, Maslow argues that the strongest need determines rational behavior until it is satisfied. A satisfied need no longer determines behavior, that is, it does not act as a motivator. It turns out that the needs are satisfied in a certain order, that is, the physiological needs and the need for security are primary needs that must be satisfied before the needs of a higher level, which, in principle, to a greater extent determine the behavior itself.

So, according to Maslow, if there are two equally strong needs within the framework of rational behavior, then the need of a lower level will dominate. Thus, the conditions and the situation, for their part, determine which needs will dominate. The needs associated with the landmarks of the social subject and in this sense are individual, naturally, will have their own specificity in that in the same situation different people may have different needs, and a change in the situation entails a change in the needs of a particular person. Rational activity itself, as such, of course, can provide an opportunity to satisfy this spectrum of needs. But in this case, often we are talking about the needs of a higher level, associated, for example, with such moments as self-expression or respect, that is, the problem can move into the rank of even ethical and aesthetic aspects [10].

On the other hand, such rational activity can be a way of finding opportunities to satisfy such needs outside of such activity, which will determine the needs of a higher order and, naturally, will go to those problems that are associated with conditions and safety factors within the framework of the most rational activity. which is very relevant not only from the point of view of its effectiveness, but from the point of view of its tactical and strategic planning. Rational social activity associated with motivated behavior and, accordingly, motivated activity, of course, is largely associated with the classic version of the rational theory of expectation.

At the same time, social motivational activity is purposeful, which implies the necessary appeal to the non-classical theory of rationality. Note that the very goal of rational activity will be associated with the direct or indirect satisfaction of any need arising in the framework of the implementation of a particular social program. The very strength of the direction of activity, taking into account the achievement of a specific goal, will depend in part on the extent to which the social subject himself as a person feels rewarded for achieving the goal, which will allow him to more effectively implement the innovative aspects of his own rational activity.

The social subject, within the framework of his activity, is guided by the programmed achievement of a certain result, which will become the implementation of the proposed project, and which, ultimately, allows us to talk about the implementation of the goal of the activity, which, in principle, determines the very activity of the social subject. On the other hand, any subject as a person, to a certain extent, experiences psychological comfort or discomfort from achieving this or that result, while the strength of the desire to obtain the same comfort or another positive goal, as they say in the literature - performing motivation, depends on [11]:

- the values of what this subject receives;
- the attainability or maximum reality in obtaining a positive result (which can be associated with the theory of expectations).

In this regard, it should be said that the rationally acting subject values what depends on his needs, which, in fact, is connected with his needs. In order for him to be motivated for a certain activity, it is necessary to encourage his achievements in this very activity in such a way that he appreciates his own result.

Nevertheless, in principle, everyone knows that even serious efforts do not always guarantee the achievement of the goal. In this regard, on the basis of early experience gained in the framework of rational activity, an expectation will be formed about how real the opportunities that serve the achievement of the goal will be. In such a case, all the possibilities and obstacles arising from the peculiarities of the situation at a given moment are also considered. Moreover, if expectations are high, then the strength of the motive, the strength of behavior, the strength of motivation increases.

On the other hand, early experience also reinforces expectations that an appropriate outcome might be obtained. That is, in fact, social success will enhance social motivation. However, if expectations are not fulfilled, then obstacles to the achievement of the goal set in the social program give rise to a feeling of a certain futility of the efforts expended [10]. Let us pay attention to the fact that the greater the value of an inaccessible goal for a person, the greater the disappointment or the feeling of failure in resolving the problem under consideration. Attention should be paid to situational, personal and psychological factors that affect the motivational activity of a social subject. Both the management method itself and the organizational structure are the factors that directly affect motivation within a particular group of society. In principle, this can be called «intermediary variables» that is, their influence either generates social motivation or hinders it.

Theoretically, this can be called excluding factors, that is, the way of solving such issues either caused dissatisfaction in social motivation, or made the social situation within the framework of behavior neutral, but did not create the motivation itself. Within the framework of the expectation theory, such factors of the external environment are those variables that, in fact, create an assessment of the effective desirability in achieving a goal, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the possibility of achieving this goal, for example, this or that used in the framework of rational activity the method of obtaining a positive result already limits the maintenance of the satisfaction of the need for self-expression as a goal in the framework of this social program [10]. But, meanwhile, the behavior of a social subject and the method of management itself largely determine motivation and the achievement of this motivation not only by the subject himself, but also by the individuals around him within the framework of a certain goal rationality.

On the basis of the rational activity of the social subject, the subjects interacting with him draw conclusions about which results within the framework of this rational activity lead to success and which do not; and what specific conclusions are drawn within the mode of operation. Note that situational factors often impede the subject within the framework of society in fulfilling a certain

goal in the way that is most acceptable for him, but which may not be included in the framework of the general strategy for achieving social rationality.

It should be noted that from the content of the methods of interaction of a social subject within the framework of his social group, it is sometimes concluded that the achievement of a goal, in general, will not entail the desired result. That is, the obstacles visible on the way to achieving the goal create a feeling of hopelessness in achieving the goal and, accordingly, reduce the overall level of motivation for rational activity. One of these obstacles may also be the lack of personal, individual abilities of the social subject itself in relation to the achievement of a certain goal. A similar reason causes problems associated with the fact that motivation in the following similar cases may or may not come; the point is that from the point of view of strategic and tactical tasks, not every subject sees what should be achieved within the framework of rational behavior if purely tactical goals are set within the framework of motivational behavior and within the framework of achieving very specific decisions. And then any failure in the framework of rational behavior from the point of view of the motives of this behavior can lead not only to a general negative strategy for achieving a result, but also lead to the fact that the subject may no longer be able to implement a general strategic problem at some particular stage.

On the one hand, this general strategic problem was initially possible for them and did not pose. However, within the framework of an effective rational decision, such a strategic goal must necessarily be indicated.

Another thing is that a number of tactical sets, the development of a scenario for achieving a rational decision can be, as indicated in full, since it depends on the very specific conditions for their implementation. If the subject is not ready to adjust his goals and objectives depending on real conditions, then indeed at a certain stage the problem of motivation can be lost from the point of view of the general problem of achieving a result; and from the point of view of changing specific tasks, such motivation will not manifest itself at all, since in such cases the social subject will most likely consider some other project of his activity, depending on other motives, entailing, in accordance with this, other behavior, other goals, decisions, etc. results [4].

In modern literature, from the point of view of achieving a result, the main are two types of motivation [3]:

- the need to achieve a goal, that is, a social subject who has a significant need to achieve a goal sets himself high, but quite real goals. Moreover, in this type of motivation, positive and even good achievements in rational activity are natural;
- the need for the addition of human activity in the sense that a social subject experiencing a need for activity in conjunction with other subjects begins to value human relations and tries to maintain them.

Let's pay attention to the fact that such a person can be very effective when performing tasks requiring joint, rational activity. It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that any social subject naturally has a need for power. A subject, for example, having a need for the same power, in principle wants to be able to influence other subjects of the same social group, and he is looking for such targeted programs where he would have the corresponding social status of real influence. That is, such an influence, one way or another, leads to an examination of the situation related to the possibilities of using power within the framework of a social group.

Conclusions. The rise of behavioral economics stretched over three centuries. Its main theoretical positions, formulated by Daniel Bernoulli, for a long time lay "dead weight" in the bins of the knowledge storehouse of the human community. At the end of the XX century, they were developed in the works of Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman, and since the beginning of the XXI century, thanks to the efforts of Richard Thaler and his colleagues, they have found wide practical application. The emerging applied directions in the development of behavioral economics are very promising, and the results obtained allow us to hope for a successful solution of many pressing problems of mankind. These points are good reasons to establish specialized departments of behavioral economics in national educational institutions and open a corresponding scientific specialty within the existing system of economic sciences.

References

1. Bertrand, M., Mullainathan, S., & Shafir E. (2016) Behavioral economics and marketing in aid of decision making among the poor. *Journal of Public & Marketing*, 25., 8–31.
2. List, J. (2013) Does market experience eliminate market anomalies. *Quarterly journal of economics*, 118, 47–118.

3. Novemsky, N., Kaneman, D. (2015) The boundaries of loss aversion. *Journal of marketing research*, 42, 119–147.
4. Sokol-Hessner, P., Hsu, M., & Curley, N.G. et al. (2019) Thinking like a trader selectively reduces individuals loss aversion. *PNAS*, 106, 5035–5075.
5. Stevens, S. (1961) To honor Fechner and repeal his law. *Science*, 133, 80–86.
6. Tversky, A., Kahneman, D. (2019) Loss aversion in riskless choice: a reference-dependent model. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106, 1039–1080.
7. Camerer, C., Issacharoff, S., Loewenstein, G., O'Donoghue, T., & Rabin, M. (2018) Regulation for Conservatives: Behavioral Economics and The Case for «Asymmetric Paternalism». *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 151, 1.
8. Loewenstein, G., Haisley, E. (2016) The Economist as Therapist: Methodological Ramifications of «Light» Paternalism. *The Handbook of Economic Methodologies*, 1.
9. Drogobytsky, L.N. Behavioral economics: the essence and stages of formation. *Strategic decisions and risk management*. (1):26-31. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17747/2078-8886-2018-1-26-31>
10. Belyanin, A.V. (2020) Daniel Kaneman and Vernon Smith: economic analysis of human behavior (Nobel Prize for a sense of reality). *Problems of Economics*, 1.
11. Kapeliushnikov, A.I. (2018). Behavioral Economics and "New" Paternalism. *Problems of Economics*, 10.