

Article

Bill Gore's Management Strategies at W. L. Gore & Associates: A Case Analysis Based on Self-determination Theory

Youyou Zhu^{1,*}

¹ Faculty of Business, University of Nottingham Ningbo China, Ningbo, China

* Correspondence: Youyou Zhu, Faculty of Business, University of Nottingham Ningbo China, Ningbo, China

Abstract: In today's fast-changing business environment where competition for talents is fierce, motivating employees is one of the core strategies for organizations to stimulate innovation and achieve long-term development. Taking W. L. Gore & Associates as the research object, this paper analyzes Bill Gore's management practices from the perspective of self-determination theory. Based on corporate public materials and open academic resources, the study finds that lattice management, staff training, and small-team mechanisms effectively satisfy employees' autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs, thereby bringing high innovation performance and talent retention. However, the management mode has inherent limitations amid corporate expansion, including long adaptation cycles for new employees, potential negative effects of pay-linked peer appraisal, and contradictions between ideal small-team settings and large-scale production. To address these challenges, this study proposes targeted improvement suggestions for the firm and similar enterprises. Specifically, it recommends optimizing onboarding processes to shorten adaptation cycles, refining peer appraisal systems to mitigate interpersonal conflicts, and balancing decentralized team structures with centralized strategic coordination. Furthermore, the findings highlight the critical role of intrinsic motivation in shaping organizational culture and driving continuous improvement. By aligning structural design with psychological needs, companies can foster a more resilient and adaptive workforce. Ultimately, this research provides practical references and theoretical insights for organizations pursuing employee-driven innovation and sustainable growth in complex global markets.

Keywords: self-determination theory; lattice management; employee motivation; organizational behavior; innovation

1. Introduction

In today's rapidly evolving global business landscape, characterized by accelerating technological disruption, intensifying cross-border competition, and heightened expectations for organizational agility and ethical responsibility, the effective motivation of human capital has become a decisive factor in sustaining competitive advantage and enabling long-term strategic resilience. Organizations increasingly recognize that traditional command-and-control management paradigms are insufficient for fostering the creativity, adaptability, and intrinsic commitment required in knowledge-intensive industries. Consequently, contemporary management scholarship and practice place growing emphasis on human-centered approaches that prioritize psychological safety, autonomy support, purpose alignment, and relational trust. This essay undertakes a focused examination of the distinctive management philosophy and operational practices pioneered by Bill Gore, co-founder of W.L. Gore & Associates—a globally recognized materials science enterprise renowned for innovations such as GORE-TEX® fabric and advanced medical devices. Rather than relying on hierarchical authority or extrinsic reward systems alone, Gore cultivated an organizational architecture grounded in principles emphasizing self-direction, peer accountability, natural leadership emergence,

Received: 15 August 2026

Revised: 21 September 2026

Accepted: 06 October 2026

Published: 11 October 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

and collaborative problem-solving. These structural and cultural features align closely with foundational tenets of self-determination theory, particularly the universal psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. The analysis explores how Gore's initiatives—such as the absence of formal job titles, the lattice rather than hierarchical reporting structure, the principle of 'sponsors' instead of supervisors, and the emphasis on voluntary commitment to projects—functioned not merely as procedural innovations but as systemic enablers of sustained employee engagement and discretionary effort. Drawing upon documented organizational outcomes—including high retention rates among technical professionals, consistent innovation output across decades, and repeated recognition as a top employer—the discussion critically evaluates both the demonstrable strengths and contextual limitations of this model. Consideration is given to scalability challenges, cultural adaptation requirements in multinational operations, and potential tensions between decentralized decision-making and regulatory compliance demands in highly governed sectors such as healthcare and aerospace [1]. Finally, evidence-informed recommendations are advanced for organizations seeking to adapt core elements of this philosophy while maintaining operational rigor, legal adherence, and inclusive governance standards.

2. Theoretical Background

Founded in 1958, W. L. Gore & Associates is a globally recognized enterprise specializing in advanced materials science and applied technological innovation. Its portfolio encompasses high-performance functional textiles—most notably waterproof and breathable membrane systems widely adopted in outdoor apparel—precision-engineered medical devices for vascular and implantable applications, and mission-critical components used in aerospace, electronics, and industrial sealing systems. The company's foundational scientific work originated from research on polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), a fluoropolymer with exceptional thermal stability, chemical inertness, and low surface energy. Early development efforts were guided by deep technical insight into the material's microstructural properties, particularly its ability to be expanded into microporous forms that simultaneously resist liquid water penetration while permitting vapor transmission. This breakthrough enabled scalable manufacturing of performance-oriented materials responsive to demanding environmental and physiological requirements [1]. Leadership at the organization emphasized not only product-level innovation but also systemic organizational design—recognizing that sustained technological advancement depends equally on human capital development, collaborative problem-solving frameworks, and adaptive operational structures. Drawing upon insights from organizational behavior and systems theory, the founding team pursued deliberate strategies to foster intrinsic engagement, decentralized decision-making, and cross-functional knowledge integration. A distinctive management philosophy emerged—one characterized by fluid role definitions, peer-based accountability, and minimal hierarchical oversight—designed to align individual initiative with collective technical objectives. This approach reflects a long-standing commitment to cultivating environments where engineers, scientists, and production specialists co-create solutions through iterative experimentation, shared ownership of outcomes, and continuous learning. Such principles are especially relevant in sectors requiring rapid adaptation to evolving regulatory standards, complex user needs, and multidisciplinary integration, including biomedical engineering and sustainable textile development.

Effective employee motivation in knowledge-intensive industries relies on a comprehensive understanding of psychological conditions that support sustained engagement, professional growth, and collaborative effectiveness [2]. A well-established framework identifies three interdependent psychological requirements essential for optimal functioning: volitional agency, mastery orientation, and interpersonal connectedness [3]. Volitional agency refers to the degree to which individuals experience meaningful choice and personal endorsement in their tasks and responsibilities—

manifested through opportunities to influence work processes, contribute ideas, and shape project direction within defined parameters. Mastery orientation captures the intrinsic drive to develop expertise, overcome technical challenges, refine craft competencies, and receive constructive, skill-focused feedback that reinforces progressive learning. Interpersonal connectedness denotes the sense of mutual respect, trust, and shared purpose cultivated through consistent, respectful interaction across teams, functions, and career stages—enabling open communication, psychological safety, and collective identity formation. These elements collectively form the basis for enduring motivation, resilience under pressure, and adaptive responsiveness to changing technical landscapes. In practice, organizations that systematically embed these conditions into structural design—such as flexible assignment protocols, transparent competency development pathways, and inclusive deliberative forums—demonstrate higher levels of innovation output, lower attrition among specialized talent, and stronger alignment between strategic goals and frontline execution. Within the context of advanced materials development, where interdisciplinary coordination, long-term R&D cycles, and stringent quality expectations prevail, attention to these foundational human factors becomes indispensable. Consequently, this conceptual framework provides the analytical foundation for examining how organizational architecture, leadership practices, and cultural norms interact to enable or constrain human potential in technologically sophisticated enterprises.

3. Theory-Based Analysis

During the leadership period associated with the Gore Organization, management practices were deliberately structured to align with foundational principles of self-determination theory, particularly through mechanisms that fostered intrinsic motivation. A central feature was the deliberate minimization of formal hierarchical layers, enabling a highly responsive and adaptive organizational architecture. Within this lattice-based framework, communication channels remained open and unmediated by supervisory tiers; individuals across functions and levels could engage directly, facilitating rapid information exchange and collaborative problem-solving. This structural design supported team-based work arrangements in which members exercised significant discretion over task selection, role definition, and project participation—choices guided by personal interest, professional expertise, and evolving organizational priorities. Employees were empowered to move fluidly between teams, contributing diverse perspectives while cultivating ownership over collective outcomes. Complementing this structural flexibility, the organization implemented a dedicated time allocation policy—commonly referred to as 'dabble time'—which formally reserved approximately ten percent of each employee's weekly working hours for exploratory, self-directed innovation activities. This initiative provided a protected space for experimentation, idea incubation, and cross-domain learning, free from immediate performance metrics or predefined deliverables. Notably, several commercially viable innovations emerged from this practice, including the development of specialized guitar strings—a product line that marked the organization's successful entry into the musical instruments sector. By embedding such opportunities for volitional engagement and creative agency within daily operations, the organization cultivated sustained motivational energy, enhanced psychological investment in work, and strengthened long-term commitment to organizational goals.

The organization also placed strong emphasis on continuous capability development, recognizing that sustained high performance depends on the ongoing expansion of individual competencies and collective skill repertoires. Upon joining, new members participated in comprehensive onboarding programs designed to build foundational leadership capacities, interpersonal effectiveness, and systems thinking—programs grounded in experiential learning methodologies and iterative feedback loops. Beyond initial orientation, employees were systematically encouraged to engage in multiple concurrent projects spanning different technical domains, functional areas, and market

segments. This multi-role exposure enabled them to integrate knowledge across disciplines, refine adaptive problem-solving strategies, and strengthen contextual judgment. Performance evaluation followed a peer-informed model, wherein contributions were assessed holistically based on observable impact—including solution quality, collaborative effectiveness, knowledge sharing, and initiative-taking—rather than narrow output metrics. Evaluation outcomes directly informed compensation decisions and career progression pathways, reinforcing the linkage between demonstrable competence and professional recognition. Importantly, feedback was delivered through structured developmental dialogues rather than summative judgments, emphasizing growth trajectories and future potential. Such an approach not only elevated baseline skill levels across the workforce but also nurtured a culture where mastery was pursued as a shared value, where challenges were reframed as learning opportunities, and where improvement was consistently reinforced through meaningful acknowledgment and tangible support structures [4].

Equally vital to the organization's human-centered philosophy was its intentional cultivation of supportive interpersonal environments. Project teams were deliberately kept small—typically comprising no more than ten members—to ensure consistent interaction, mutual familiarity, and cohesive group identity. This size threshold facilitated deep relational engagement, enabled nuanced understanding of individual strengths and working preferences, and promoted inclusive decision-making processes. To further strengthen social integration, especially during early tenure, the organization instituted a formal sponsorship system. Each new member was paired with an experienced colleague who served as a trusted advisor, guide, and connector—not in a supervisory capacity, but as a resource for navigating norms, interpreting unwritten expectations, and building authentic workplace relationships. Sponsors engaged in proactive, empathetic dialogue, helping newcomers anticipate common collaboration scenarios, reflect on interpersonal dynamics, and co-develop constructive approaches to everyday workplace interactions. For instance, when interpersonal misunderstandings arose, sponsors supported reflective analysis and scenario-based rehearsal of respectful, solution-oriented communication—emphasizing mutual understanding, shared objectives, and constructive resolution pathways. These relational scaffolds contributed significantly to psychological safety, reduced onboarding friction, and enhanced overall affective commitment. Over time, such practices helped embed a consistent cultural ethos characterized by mutual respect, collective responsibility, and enduring belonging—factors empirically linked to higher retention rates, stronger team cohesion, and greater organizational resilience in dynamic operating environments.

4. Theory-Based Critical Evaluations

These management initiatives contributed significantly to employee engagement, innovation capacity, and scalable operational growth within the organization. Empirical indicators of success include its evolution into a globally operating enterprise with consolidated annual revenue exceeding £2.5 billion. Furthermore, consistent recognition in prominent workplace excellence rankings—such as repeated inclusion in lists highlighting top employers—alongside an exceptionally high talent retention rate of 97 percent, reflects broad-based organizational stability and workforce satisfaction [4, 5]. These outcomes are widely attributed to the foundational design and implementation of the management framework. Nevertheless, sustained organizational expansion and leadership transition introduced structural and operational complexities that exposed certain limitations in the original model. As the enterprise matured beyond its founding phase, emergent challenges revealed tensions between theoretical ideals and practical scalability, prompting systematic reassessment of several core mechanisms.

First, the lattice-based structural approach, while designed to support individual initiative and responsive team formation, presents notable operational constraints. At the individual level, new personnel often experience extended onboarding periods due to the absence of fixed reporting lines and standardized procedural pathways; the fluidity of

role definition and team composition necessitates substantial cognitive effort to map responsibilities, decision rights, and interdepartmental dependencies. While some individuals gradually develop adaptive proficiency, others encounter persistent difficulties in navigating ambiguity, leading to reduced early-role effectiveness and diminished confidence in contribution pathways. From an organizational perspective, this model introduces coordination overheads associated with decentralized authority, particularly during cross-functional projects requiring synchronized timelines or integrated resource allocation. Short-term inefficiencies may arise when consensus-building replaces directive decision-making, especially under time-sensitive operational demands. Consequently, optimizing performance requires deliberate calibration—introducing structured governance touchpoints without compromising flexibility, embedding shared process frameworks while preserving contextual responsiveness, and reinforcing accountability mechanisms that align distributed action with strategic objectives.

The peer-based evaluation system, originally introduced to align individual contributions with competency development goals, successfully mitigates hierarchical bias by de-emphasizing tenure in favor of demonstrable impact. However, the direct linkage between assessment outcomes and compensation determination raises important considerations regarding motivational sustainability. Psychological research indicates that extrinsic reward systems tightly coupled to performance metrics can inadvertently weaken internal drivers such as curiosity, mastery orientation, and task absorption—factors empirically linked to creative problem-solving and long-term knowledge integration. In contexts where innovation relies heavily on discretionary effort, intrinsic engagement, and voluntary knowledge sharing, overreliance on quantifiable output metrics for remuneration decisions risks narrowing behavioral focus toward measurable short-term deliverables at the expense of exploratory thinking, collaborative learning, and risk-informed experimentation. To preserve motivational integrity, refinements could include decoupling base compensation from appraisal results while retaining developmental feedback loops, introducing non-monetary recognition pathways tied to mentorship, cross-team collaboration, or process improvement initiatives, and embedding periodic calibration reviews to ensure alignment between evaluation criteria and evolving strategic priorities.

The principle of limiting team size to foster interpersonal familiarity and psychological safety—initially grounded in observations about optimal group cohesion—faces practical recalibration as operational scale increases. Early guidance suggesting a cap of approximately two hundred individuals per facility was intended to sustain informal communication networks and mutual recognition among members. However, contemporary production requirements—driven by expanded market reach, diversified product portfolios, and intensified demand from major distribution partners—have necessitated larger facility footprints and correspondingly broader staffing configurations. This scaling inevitably alters interaction patterns: while smaller units retain advantages in rapid consensus formation and empathetic communication, larger configurations introduce logistical efficiencies, specialized functional depth, and enhanced resilience against absenteeism or skill gaps. The challenge lies not in rejecting either configuration outright, but in designing hybrid structures—such as nested sub-teams with rotating liaison roles, digital collaboration platforms supporting ambient awareness across units, and intentional rhythm-setting activities that reinforce shared identity without requiring physical proximity [6–8]. Such adaptations allow organizations to uphold relational quality while meeting quantitative performance expectations, thereby sustaining both human-centered values and economic viability across growth phases.

5. Suggestions

Drawing upon the comprehensive analysis of organizational dynamics, motivational architecture, and structural adaptability presented in earlier sections, the following three evidence-informed recommendations are proposed for the Gore Organization and for

other enterprises seeking to enhance employee engagement, sustain high performance, and foster long-term operational resilience. These suggestions are grounded in principles of organizational psychology, human resource development theory, and contemporary management science—emphasizing systemic coherence, psychological safety, and scalable design without compromising core cultural values or operational integrity.

First, integrate structured developmental support with decentralized decision-making authority. The Gore Organization's distinctive lattice structure enables peer-led collaboration and organic leadership emergence; however, newly onboarded personnel often experience extended adjustment periods due to initial uncertainty regarding role expectations, cross-functional interfaces, and contribution pathways. To mitigate this, a standardized, multi-phase onboarding framework—incorporating contextualized orientation, mentorship pairing, and milestone-based competency validation—should be implemented. This framework preserves the organization's foundational emphasis on self-direction while introducing calibrated scaffolding during early tenure [9–11]. Furthermore, a hybrid operational model is advised: retaining the lattice's fluidity and flat hierarchy, yet embedding modular, role-specific learning pathways—including technical upskilling, communication protocols, and project governance norms. For external organizations adopting similar decentralized models, it is essential to recognize that excessive diffusion of accountability or absence of shared procedural anchors may inadvertently reduce coordination efficiency. Therefore, any adaptation of lattice-inspired practices must be accompanied by deliberate alignment mechanisms—such as cross-team synchronization rituals, transparent priority-setting forums, and lightweight documentation standards—to ensure coherence across autonomous units without reverting to rigid command-and-control structures.

Second, decouple formal performance assessment from direct financial compensation mechanisms. While the existing peer evaluation system effectively supports employees' psychological need for competence recognition and social validation, empirical research consistently indicates that attaching monetary consequences to subjective appraisal outcomes can diminish sustained intrinsic drive, particularly in knowledge-intensive or creative domains. It is therefore recommended to retain the mutual evaluation process for developmental feedback, capability mapping, and succession planning—but significantly reduce its weight in determining base salary adjustments or bonus allocations. Instead, non-financial reinforcement strategies should be systematically expanded: examples include granting ownership over innovation initiatives, authorizing representation in strategic working groups, offering time-bound sabbaticals for applied research, or assigning cross-divisional liaison responsibilities. Such measures reinforce identity-based motivation and professional growth while preserving fairness perceptions [12, 13]. Other corporations aiming to stimulate innovation should similarly prioritize visibility, voice, and developmental opportunity as primary levers—rather than relying predominantly on incremental remuneration increases—which tend to yield diminishing returns in motivation beyond threshold levels and may inadvertently foster comparison-based dissatisfaction.

Third, institutionalize adaptive team configuration protocols responsive to evolving project demands and organizational scale [14]. Rather than adhering to fixed upper limits on team size, the Gore Organization should adopt a dynamic teaming methodology wherein composition, duration, and scope are explicitly calibrated to task complexity, interdependence requirements, and temporal horizons. For instance, large-scale, multidisciplinary undertakings—such as new product development cycles or sustainability integration programs—may benefit from purpose-built functional subunits (e.g., dedicated R&D integration teams, manufacturing readiness cohorts, or regulatory compliance task forces), each operating with clear mandates and interoperable interfaces. This approach sustains meaningful interpersonal connection and collective efficacy while optimizing throughput and accountability. Similarly, other enterprises undergoing growth phases should proactively assess optimal team granularity—not as a static constraint, but as a strategic variable subject to periodic review. Team design decisions

must balance cognitive load, communication bandwidth, and collaborative density against the need for specialized expertise and cross-pollination. Empirical observation suggests that teams exceeding twelve members often encounter coordination friction unless supported by robust facilitation infrastructure, digital collaboration tools, and clearly defined role differentiation—factors that warrant explicit inclusion in scaling roadmaps.

6. Conclusion

The management philosophy pioneered at the Gore Organization—characterized by its absence of formal hierarchy, self-managed teams, commitment to covenantal relationships, and emphasis on personal initiative—has demonstrated a remarkable capacity to align with foundational psychological conditions necessary for sustained human motivation and engagement. Specifically, the organizational architecture consistently supports autonomy through decentralized decision-making, fosters competence via continuous skill development and peer-based feedback mechanisms, and reinforces relatedness through deeply embedded norms of mutual accountability and shared purpose. As a result, employees report elevated levels of intrinsic motivation, greater willingness to assume responsibility for complex innovation challenges, and heightened identification with organizational mission—factors that collectively contribute to exceptional retention rates, consistent product leadership across diverse technical domains, and enduring reputational strength in global markets. Nevertheless, empirical observation reveals that scalability introduces structural tensions: as headcount expanded beyond several thousand and geographic dispersion increased, maintaining cultural coherence became increasingly reliant on informal transmission rather than codified systems, leading to variability in practice implementation, inconsistent application of core principles across regional units, and emergent coordination bottlenecks in cross-functional initiatives. These developments suggest that while the original model remains profoundly effective at certain scales and contexts, long-term viability necessitates deliberate evolution—not abandonment—of foundational tenets. Future adaptation should therefore focus on institutionalizing adaptive governance mechanisms that preserve the spirit of self-direction while introducing lightweight, principle-based frameworks for alignment, knowledge integration, and strategic coherence. For peer organizations navigating similar transitions from entrepreneurial agility to mature operational complexity, the Gore experience offers not a prescriptive blueprint but a rich source of diagnostic insight into how values-driven structures interact with growth dynamics. It underscores that sustainable innovation-oriented management requires both fidelity to human-centered design and disciplined responsiveness to evolving systemic constraints.

This analysis contributes theoretical value by extending the empirical grounding of self-determination theory into the domain of deliberately flat, non-bureaucratic enterprise structures—particularly those operating without traditional supervisory tiers or standardized performance management systems. It illustrates how motivational support can be systematically engineered through organizational design rather than solely through interpersonal leadership behaviors. From a practical standpoint, the case provides granular, process-level documentation of how decentralized authority, peer accountability, and relational trust function as operational levers—not abstract ideals—in real-world settings marked by technological uncertainty and rapid market shifts. The insights are especially relevant for knowledge-intensive firms seeking alternatives to command-and-control models while avoiding the fragmentation risks associated with unstructured autonomy. However, the inherent limitations of a single-case qualitative approach must be acknowledged: findings reflect the unique historical trajectory, industry context, founder legacy, and sector-specific regulatory environment of one organization and cannot be extrapolated to hierarchical manufacturing enterprises, publicly traded financial institutions, or state-owned entities operating under distinct governance mandates. To strengthen external validity and deepen causal understanding,

subsequent research efforts could pursue comparative case studies across multiple flat-structured organizations spanning different industries, geographies, and stages of maturity. Complementary quantitative investigations—such as longitudinal surveys measuring fluctuations in perceived autonomy, competence, and relatedness alongside objective innovation output metrics—would further illuminate the dynamic interplay between structural features and psychological outcomes over time.

References

1. A. A. Gibb, "Enterprise culture—its meaning and implications for education and training," *Journal of European Industrial Training*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2–38, 1987.
2. G. Hamel and S. Spence, "Innovation democracy: WL Gore's original management model," *Management Innovation Exchange*, 2010.
3. S. P. Robbins and T. A. Judge, *Essential of Organizational Behavior Global Edition*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited, 2012.
4. R. M. Ryan and E. L. Deci, "Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being," *American Psychologist*, vol. 55, no. 1, p. 68, 2000.
5. F. Shipper and C. C. Manz, "Employee self-management without formally designated teams: An alternative road to empowerment," *Organizational Dynamics*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 48–61, 1992.
6. M. Tilley and A. Kates, "Maturing the maverick organization: lessons from WL Gore," *Journal of Organization Design*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 43–50, 2025.
7. C. C. Manz, F. Shipper, and G. L. Stewart, "Everyone a team leader: shared influence at WL Gore & Associates," *Organizational Dynamics*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 239–244, 2009.
8. S. Y. T. Wang, "Delphi Study to Explore the Organizational Characteristics, Conditions, and Infrastructures Needed to Integrate Professional Development with a Career Advancement Framework in the Form of Career Lattice," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts Global, 2026.
9. E. R. Joseph, V. Seshadri, A. A. Kumar, and J. Thankachan, "Reimagining career growth for Gen Z and millennials: Role of career lattices in enhancing employee engagement," *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 103–123, 2026.
10. A. E. Azzi, O. Klein, G. Boudrenghien, M. Frenay, C. Devos, and N. Van der Linden, "Doctoral supervision in the light of the three types of support promoted in self-determination theory," *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, vol. 10, pp. 439–464, 2015.
11. V. W. Forner, M. Jones, Y. Berry, and J. Eidenfalk, "Motivating workers: how leaders apply self-determination theory in organizations," *Organization Management Journal*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 76–94, 2021.
12. X. Parent-Rocheleau, M. Gagné, and A. Bujold, "A self-determination theory framework to develop motivation-enhancing algorithmic management," in *Research Handbook on Human Resource Management and Disruptive Technologies*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2024, pp. 23–38.
13. A. Festré and P. Garrouste, "Self-determination and incentives: a new look at the crowding out effect," Mimeo, University of Paris 1, 2007.
14. M. Gagné, X. Parent-Rocheleau, A. Bujold, M. C. Gaudet, and P. Lirio, "How algorithmic management influences worker motivation: A self-determination theory perspective," *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, vol. 63, no. 2, p. 247, 2022.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.