

LINGUISTIC FRAME AS A GAMIFICATION STRATEGY: THE INFLUENCE OF INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS ON FRAME PREFERENCES

Ia Kutaladze¹, Ph.D., Ana Mkheidze²

Abstract

*The article presents gamification as a communication strategy that goes beyond game mechanics oriented traditional approaches and focuses on its less researched, non-technological form. The study combines the theory of linguistic frames with the concept of gamification effectiveness in organizational environments, and is based on the assumption that the use of linguistic frames (framing) creates a mechanism through which employees' **cognitive, emotional, and motivational responses** can be transformed or "restructured".*

The study analyzes the influence of individual characteristics and organizational culture on gamified communication, preferences for linguistic (including lexical) frames, and their effectiveness. The results indicate that the effectiveness of gamified communication is determined by the interaction between individual and organizational factors, highlighting the importance of personalized and culturally adapted communication in organizational gamification strategies.

Keywords: *gamification, linguistic frame, lexical frame, user types, organizational culture*

Introduction

The work environment is undergoing a profound transformation. In the context of modern, technological, communicative, and social realities, the generation raised in these conditions is rapidly replacing the older generation and is holding significantly different expectations toward work. This inevitably necessitates a systemic reform of management systems (Mazaraki et al., 2021; Getman et al., 2024, p. 280). Consequently, organizations are compelled to revisit traditional approaches to employee motivation. They need to mobilize appropriate temporal and financial resources to adapt to the new reality and develop motivational systems aligned with the demands of the modern workforce. One of the most innovative and effective motivation strategies is gamification, which is the deliberate integration of game design principles into non-game/work contexts (Lieberoth, Møller, & Marin, 2014; Lieberoth, 2015; Vesa, 2021, p. 3). Although such interventions are now widely incorporated into organizational processes and significantly influence management practices, interest in gamification within academic discourse, particularly within theoretical frameworks of management and organizational research, is still limited (Vesa, 2021). The research primarily focuses on the effect of game mechanics³ and a few standard elements,

¹ Ia Kutaladze, Professor, Doctor of Psychology, Tbilisi State University.

² Ana Mkheidze, PhD student at Tbilisi State University.

³ Game mechanics involves the processes that make the game interesting and attractive. These could be a point system, reward mechanisms, challenges, recognition and other instruments that ensure the individual's active engagement and participation in the game. The most common game mechanics are competition, challenge and victory (Man, 2021).

such as points, badges, and leaderboards (Lieberoth, 2015, p. 2). As a result, critics often emphasize that these studies are psychologically impoverished and superficial. Moreover, the framing of activity perception as either game or entertainment (as an independent component) affects the game-based experience (Deterding et al., 2011; Lieberoth, 2015, p. 2).

The *purpose of the study* is to identify and analyze a practical strategy that enables organizations to effectively enhance employee motivation with minimal resources. Such a strategy is the creation of a communication frame and the use of motivating language, because, differently from other organizational practices based on gamification, these strategies allow to increase employee engagement and intrinsic motivation even under low-resource conditions. Gamification based communication and the development of a linguistic frame, through which work or tasks are endowed with additional semantic and symbolic meaning (for example, conceptualized as a “mission”) – significantly alters participants’ perceptions, engagement, and motivation.

The *scientific novelty* of this paper lies precisely in focusing on the less researched, non-technological form of gamification. The study conceptualizes gamification as a **communication strategy**, representing a relatively new interpretation that goes beyond the dominant perspective in this field which is primarily centered on game mechanics. Instead, this approach emphasizes linguistic frames and symbolic-communicative processes that form employees’ cognitive, emotional, and motivational reactions. Additionally, the study examines the interaction between individual and organizational factors and its role in shaping preferences and effectiveness of the linguistic frames based on gamification. It should be noted that this type of interaction is rarely or never addressed in the existing research on gamification and motivation. Furthermore, the integration of cognitive and motivational theories, as well as the frame creation models add an extra layer of novelty to the study.

The theoretical background of the study: How gamified communication works

In cognitive psychology, a frame is understood as “a set of parameters that define either a specific mental schema or a broader cognitive structure through which an individual perceives and evaluates the world” (American Psychological Association, 2018). Creating a frame (“framing”) is a fundamental mechanism of linguistic communication, through which the same event or issue can be described and interpreted in multiple ways (Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 106). One of the primary methods of framing is the label or description manipulation, which influences how a particular issue, person, or group is perceived (Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 133). This process is known as lexical framing and constitutes a central unit of communicative discourse. Lexical framing involves describing a situation using various labels or descriptions that carry different connotations (Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 127). Accordingly, word choice and metaphoric framing can determine the perception, meaning, and behavioral influence of communication. Linguistic framing, in turn, represents a broader category that reflects the construction of frames not only through lexical units but also through various linguistic mechanisms – grammatical formulations, syntactic structures, semantic operations, and discourse organization. Thus, linguistic framing integrates both lexical and other linguistic-structural strategies that ensure the formation of meaning and its social

functioning dynamics. In both cases, how information is presented affects the processing schema of that information (Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2016, p. 12).

The concept of framing is widely applied in psychology and sociology (Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2016). Pioneers of framing research, Kahneman¹ and Tversky (1979, 1981, 1984), are often cited for their classical study on “Asian disease,” which demonstrates that people respond differently to equivalent information presented in terms of gains or losses. The experiment shows that individuals tend to be risk-averse when outcomes are framed as gains (e.g., survival), but more risk-seeking when they are framed as losses (e.g., lost lives) (Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2016, p. 9).

Empirical evidence indicates that lexical framing plays a crucial role in the process of meaning-making, influencing individuals' evaluations and behaviors; for example, people tend to spend more and save less when unexpected income is labeled as a “bonus” rather than a “discount”² (Epley et al., 2006; Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 133); describing cancer as a “battle” has been shown to strengthen fatalistic attitudes toward the disease (Hauser & Schwarz, 2020; Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 118). These experiments demonstrate that framing involves not only specific linguistic strategies but also activates cognitive processes such as perception, reasoning, schema restructuring,³ etc. The cognitive processes mentioned above are known as schema restructuring and help better understand and perceive the environment, especially in complex or unclear situations.

Various communicative frames/contexts shape individuals' situational perceptions, event interpretations, and expectations (Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 118). This is a fundamental cognitive process theoretically based on linguistic frames and shows how meaning is constructed through language (Lakoff, 1996, 2008; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Thibodeau, Hendricks, & Boroditsky, 2017; Thibodeau et al., 2019; Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 118).

Gamified communication can be viewed as a schematic restructuring mechanism. Both gamification and linguistic framing aim to modify an individual's psychological and cognitive frameworks: gamification offers a system organized by rules of game, while linguistic framing helps adapt thinking to those rules. When we use language for communication, we must choose what to say, what not to say, and how to say it – i.e., how to create the *frame of the message* (Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 105). Language units often evoke associated emotional or behavioral reactions. For example, the term “game” activates positive connotations related to fun, social interaction, and motivation (Grünwald, Kneip & Kozica, 2019, p. 557). Conversely, learning in the workplace has traditionally been perceived as a less stimulating activity (Grünwald et al., 2019, p. 557). Therefore, using gamified communication is a strategy aimed at activating positive associations and cognitive frames, which, in turn, are likely to increase employee motivation and engagement.

¹ Kahneman was awarded with Noble Prize in 2002.

² The ‘bonus frame’ creates the perception of money as exceeding a standard income and not included in the mental model of budget. Due to this, it is more freely spent. In the ‘discount frame’, money is presented as part of an already existing budget, which makes the individual set limits for spending (Flusberg et al., 2024, p. 134).

³ Schema restructuring: when a new experience or information does not fit into the existing schemas they are modified or new schemas are created.

About the research model

The present study examines gamified communication as a framing strategy that utilizes lexical, metaphorical, and message framing to restructure employees' perceptions and experiences. The language and symbolism inherent in gaming can create new interpretations of work processes, transforming standard, often boring tasks into positive experiences. Accordingly, it is expected that such framing increases motivation and engagement. The study considers gamified communication as a mechanism, linguistic framing aimed at modifying employees' cognitive and emotional processes to enhance their motivation and involvement. These issues are analyzed through the use and evaluation of linguistic framing within managerial communication.

According to the theoretical model of the given research, the positive effect of framing is not universal and depends on organizational and individual characteristics. Thus, the communication strategy is conceptualized as a construct defined by both individual and organizational contexts and their interaction.

Out of the *organizational factors* we selected organizational culture because it influences employee engagement, communication practices, and motivational mechanisms within the organization. It is hypothesized that the effectiveness of gamification and framing depends on how well gamification elements are adapted and integrated with the core features of the organizational culture. For example, in organizations with an innovative environment, gamification framing may help employees perceive work as a game and increase motivation. Conversely, in strictly hierarchical and formal cultures, such non-standard forms of gamification may poorly align with the existing norms and be less accepted by employees.

Clearly, the effectiveness of gamified communication, regardless of the organizational environment, will not be uniform for all employees, as individual characteristics also play a unique role in this influence. To explore this, the study selected gamification user types based on Self-Determination Theory, classifying motivation into intrinsic (autonomy, competence, relatedness, goal) and extrinsic sources (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Marczewski, 2015; Tondello et al., 2016). The study is particularly interested in examining the interaction between organizational and individual factors and their impact.

Additionally, the study includes the construct of *perceived usefulness of gamification*, reflecting employees' subjective assessment of how beneficial gamification is across various organizational areas (training, career advancement, teamwork, remuneration, etc.). This component allows to assess framing effectiveness not only through the observation of communication functions, but also based on how employees perceive its value and usefulness in the organizational environment.

About the research instruments

The research employs both newly developed and adapted scales. A **Managerial Communication Preference Questionnaire** was developed to investigate employees' attitudes toward different framing styles of managerial communication. Each question presents *two distinct communication styles used by managers, from which respondents*

choose the more motivating style for their work environment. This instrument assesses employees' preferences and reactions to various communication styles. In constructing the **Managerial Communication Preference Questionnaire**, we used Kahneman and Tversky's concept of "equivalent framing", which implies the presentation of different, but logically identical words and phrases to produce different perception effects (Druckman, 2001; Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2016, p. 10). In this new instrument, the content of communication remains unchanged; only the presentation format varies and includes the following structural types based on linguistic framing: emphasis on performance/process (attribute framing), guaranteed loss or potential gain (valence/risky choice), use of terms and metaphors (lexical/metaphorical framing), specificity of instructions (psychological distance), and the language of demand, empathy, and meaning (motivational language). The instrument combines unique linguistic frames (e.g., lexical, psychological distance, etc.), making the internal consistency assessment and traditional reliability testing impossible. The instrument has a strong theoretical foundation. It utilizes linguistic taxonomy of framing, motivational language theory (MLT), and the principle of "equivalent framing," providing a solid conceptual basis.

The Perceived Gamification Usefulness Scale. This scale assesses *subjective perception of the usefulness* of gamification across seven areas: (1) education and professional development, (2) performance evaluation, (3) career advancement, (4) teamwork, (5) remuneration, (6) recruitment /selection, and (7) marketing. Each area includes a description/example illustrating possible applications of gamification (e.g., using points and badges to recognize achievements, role-playing in recruitment, virtual currency for idea monetization, etc.). The scale helps identify the areas where gamification is perceived as most functional and effective. Psychometric analysis confirms high reliability ($\alpha = .88$), with internal consistency and stability.

Assessment of Organizational Culture. The well-established and widely employed OCAI (Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument) was used to evaluate organizational culture. It is renowned for its effectiveness and reliability and has been applied in over 10,000 organizations worldwide (Tyler, 2018, p. 3). It provides detailed information about various dimensions of organizational culture and profiles the organization into four categories: **clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy culture**. For this study, the questionnaire was adapted by the Human Personnel Management Center (PMC). The reliability of subscales ranges from 0.85 to 0.97.

To explore the impact of **Individual-Level Factors** the study singled out the types of gamification users (Gamification User HEXAD model) which is based on Self-Determination Theory (SDT). The theory identifies three primary dimensions of intrinsic motivation: relatedness, competence, and autonomy, with an additional goal component (Deci, Eghrari, Patrick, & Leone, 1994; Tondello et al., 2016, p. 231). The factor analysis revealed four types of gamification users: freedom-oriented (Free Spirit), relationship-oriented (Socialiser), reward-oriented (Player), and change-oriented (Disruptor). The internal consistency of the scales ranges from 0.7 to 0.8.

Sample

273 employees participated in the study, aged between 18 and 68 ($M = 35.53$, $SD = 12.12$). Participants were selected through convenience sampling. Demographic variables (gender, education, employment sector, managerial position) were weighted based on the data from the National Statistics Office. The data were collected online via Google Forms.

Empirical Results

Below are discussed only some statistically significant results, highlighting the roles of individual and organizational factors in determining managers' communication framing preferences. The data analysis was conducted using binary logistic regression due to the dichotomous nature of the dependent variable¹.

Analysis of communication framing preferences by individual factors: Types of gamification users

Linguistic Frame 1. ML (Motivational Language): Types of gamification users are significant predictors in determining leaders' preference for motivational language; the model is statistically significant ($\chi^2(4) = 40.47$, $p < .001$) and explains between 9.2% (Cox & Snell R^2) and 20.4% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in the dependent variable. The results indicate that leaders' use of motivational language is effective in building relationships with relationship-oriented employees ($B = 0.55$, $S.E. = 0.23$, $Wald = 5.84$, $p < .05$, $Exp(B) = 1.74$). This means that it is beneficial where cooperation and socio-emotional support need to be strengthened. However, it is less effective with innovative and change-oriented personnel ($B = -0.94$, $S.E. = 0.211$, $Wald = 19.81$, $p < .001$; $Exp(B) = 1.74$).

Linguistic Frame 2. Gamified communication elements: Gamified communication involves managers using game elements in the work environment to reduce routine and support employee engagement. Preferences for this frame significantly differ across user types. The model is statistically significant ($\chi^2(4) = 22.34$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 6.9\%$), showing that the work frame is preferred by *freedom-oriented* ($B = 0.243$, $S.E. = 0.091$, $Wald = 7.085$, $p = .008$; $Exp(B) = 1.357$) and *change-oriented* employees ($B = 0.243$, $p = .008$, $Exp(B) = 1.275$). *Reward oriented users* show different preferences and favor game-based frame ($B = -0.365$, $S.E. = 0.098$, $Wald = 14.007$, $p < .001$; $Exp(B) = 0.694$).

Linguistic Frame 3. Psychological Distance: Psychological distance refers to whether the manager focuses employees' attention on direct, concrete actions or on more abstract, long-term goals. The model is statistically significant ($\chi^2(4) = 12.76$, $p < .05$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 4.4\%$). The results show that *relationship-oriented individuals* are more motivated by communication that emphasizes abstract, long-term visions ($B = 0.401$, $S.E.$

¹ The respondents had to choose one phrase out of the pairs of phrases that were *identical in content*. The selected phrase had to be more motivating in terms of communication from the respondent's perspective. We emphasize once again that the phrases in the pairs were different in terms of their presentation form rather than their content.

= 0.171, Wald = 5.514, $p = .019$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 1.494$), while reward *oriented* employees value direct, specific instructions ($B = -0.292$, S.E. = 0.102, Wald = 8.205, $p = .004$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.747$).

Linguistic Frame 4. Attribution: Attribution refers to whether the manager emphasizes results/performance quality or the work process itself in communication. A clear differentiation was found in preferences related to attribution ($\chi^2(4) = 32.74$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 14.2\%$). Specifically, the manager's communication focusing on performance is more preferred by *freedom/autonomy oriented* individuals ($B = 0.406$, S.E. = 0.202, Wald = 4.057, $p < .05$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 1.501$) and *relationship-oriented* individuals ($B = 0.608$, S.E. = 0.193, Wald = 9.940, $p < .005$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 1.836$), whereas the work focused frame is more preferred by *change-oriented* ($B = -0.384$, S.E. = 0.148, Wald = 6.708, $p < .05$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.681$) and *reward-oriented* ($B = -0.610$, S.E. = 0.194, Wald = 9.877, $p < .005$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.543$) individuals. This differentiation highlights that the perception of work and results are significantly linked to an individual's motivational structure and the understanding of one's role within the gamification processes.

The study confirms that a unified gamified communication strategy cannot ensure universal effectiveness, as attitudes towards gamified communication are significantly dependent on individual characteristics.

Analysis of preference for communication frames: The role of organizational factors – organizational culture types

This section discusses how organizational culture influences managers' communication style preferences among employees. The research shows that employees' responses to frames are determined not only by cognitive mechanisms (such as framing effects) and individual factors, but also by **cultural-organizational context**, which is one of the main findings of this study. The logistic regression analysis results are as follows:

Linguistic Frame 1: Valence/Risk Choice (Guaranteed Loss vs. Opportunity for Loss). The model is statistically significant ($\chi^2(4) = 19.22$, $p < .005$), explaining from 4.5% (Cox & Snell R^2) to 7.2% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in frame preference. The framing effect varies depending on the type of organizational culture. In a **market-oriented culture**, where the dominant values are predictability and control, employees are more likely to choose the guaranteed loss frame, as it is associated with stability and the preliminary calculation of results. Statistical analysis shows that in a *market culture* ($B = -0.607$, S.E. = 0.179, Wald = 11.472, $p = .001$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.545$), the likelihood of choosing the loss opportunity frame by managers is lower; consequently, employees in this culture are more oriented toward predictable and less risky communication. Conversely, in a **hierarchical culture**, which is based on the authority respect and order, employees tend to prefer the *loss opportunity frame* ($B = 0.400$, S.E. = 0.136, Wald = 8.632, $p = .003$; $\text{Exp}(B) = 1.492$). The preference for the loss opportunity frame in a *hierarchical culture* may seem surprising, as hierarchical environments are generally associated with stability, order, and avoidance of uncertainty. This trend may indicate that in hierarchical structures, authority influences

increase employees' acceptance of relatively riskier options that align with managerial proposals. In hierarchical environments, less responsibility lies with employees, which makes managerial authoritative messages particularly influential. This result further demonstrates that framing effect analysis cannot be fully explained by individual cognitive mechanisms alone; it is strongly dependent on institutional environment and cultural norms.

Linguistic Frame 2: Psychological Distance (Long-term Goal: Abstract Instruction vs. Concrete Instruction). The variables that have been selected in advance for the model significantly distinguish the cultures with different preferences for psychological distance frames in communication ($\chi^2(4) = 12.81, p < .05$). The model explains from 3% (Cox & Snell R^2) to 4.6% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in this preference. The analysis of individual variables revealed two statistically significant predictors: In an adhocratic culture, employees are less likely to prefer concrete instructions in leader communication under long-term goals ($B = -0.354, S.E. = 0.146, Wald = 5.867, p < .05; Exp(B) = 0.702$). Consequently, in an adhocratic environment, employees focus more on general principles and frames than on specific steps. In a *market-oriented culture*, employees are more likely to prefer **concrete instructions** under long-term goals ($B = 0.442, S.E. = 0.169, Wald = 6.811, p < .05; Exp(B) = 1.55$). This demonstrates that in the given culture the priority is given to result-oriented, practical approach.

Therefore, in an adhocratic environment, abstract frames used in instructions foster creativity and independent thinking, whereas in a market-oriented culture, performance efficiency and the control of specific steps are more important.

The role of the interaction of individual-organizational factors in the perception of gamification benefits

In the next phase of the research, we introduced a variable related to the perception of the benefits of gamification. First, we would like to note that the overall attitude towards gamified approaches¹ is mostly positive (79.9%). Gamification is particularly effective in stimulating engagement and motivation among young people. The perception of the benefits of gamification in various organizational processes is high ($M = 5.56; SD = 1.11$). Gamification is especially perceived as effective in the contexts of collaboration, performance evaluation, and learning and development.

The preliminary analysis showed that the perception of gamification benefits was significantly predicted by the user types, which means that a positive attitude towards gamification and its perceived benefits largely depend on the individual's motivational profile. At the same time, it was found that organizational culture has virtually no direct effect on the *perception of gamification benefits*, which emphasizes the importance of mediating mechanisms. Specifically, the mediating role of the user types in the relationship between the organizational culture and the perception of gamification benefits was assessed using a simple mediation model (PROCESS model 4).

¹ The study evaluated three aspects of gamification attitude: general attitude (affective), perception of usefulness (cognitive) and engagement motivation (behavioral).

According to the results, the relationship between the organizational culture and the perception of gamification benefits is mediated by the following user types: freedom-oriented, relationship-oriented, and reward-oriented. In all cases, full mediation was confirmed, except for the relationship between hierarchical culture and the perception of gamification benefits, where the reward-oriented type played a partial mediating role.

For illustration, we will present only the example of a *clan culture*. In the case of clan culture, full mediation was confirmed under all three mediator conditions (freedom-oriented, relationship-oriented, and reward-oriented types):

- *Mediator: Freedom-oriented type.* The direct effect of culture on the perception of gamification benefits was not statistically significant ($B = 0.051$, $SE = 0.033$, $p = .121$); however, the indirect effect through the mediation of freedom-oriented type was statistically significant ($B = 0.039$, $BootSE = 0.012$, 95% CI [0.019, 0.066]).
- *Mediator: Relationship-oriented type.* Similarly, the indirect effect of culture was statistically significant ($B = 0.050$, $BootSE = 0.015$, 95% CI [0.024, 0.081]), while the direct effect was not ($B = 0.040$, $SE = 0.034$, $p = .235$).
- *Mediator: Reward-oriented type.* The direct effect of culture remained non-significant ($B = 0.054$, $SE = 0.033$, $p = .106$), whereas the indirect effect was significant ($B = 0.037$, $BootSE = 0.015$, 95% CI [0.012, 0.069]).

The standardized indirect effect size (ranging from .05 to .09) highlights the pivotal role of mediators. Accordingly, the influence of organizational culture on the benefits of gamification occurs not directly, but through the activation of different motivational tendencies. This indicates that organizational cultures affect the perception of the usefulness of gamification precisely by activating certain user types that align with their values. Therefore, the formation of the perception of the benefits of gamification is determined by the organizational culture and the ways in which it influences employees' motivational structures. This conclusion provides a significant theoretical basis for further research on the integration of gamification tools within the organizational behavior and the organizational environment.

Conclusion

The presented research confirms that the effectiveness of linguistic framing in managerial communication depends on the organizational culture and individual characteristics. The organizational culture acts as a critical contextual factor that fundamentally determines the effectiveness of linguistic frames used in managerial communication. The study also highlights the importance of individual traits, which influence the personal preferences for communication styles. Mediation analysis shows that the culture types – clan, adhocratic, market, and hierarchical – influence specific user activation, mostly indirectly affecting perceptions of gamification benefits. The presence of mediation mechanisms further supports the idea that the effectiveness of gamification strategies depends not only on technical solutions but also on the context and alignment with the target audience.

Organizational culture as a semantic frame

According to the theoretical framework of the study, the linguistic (lexical, metaphorical, and message-based) frames determine the perception, interpretation, and cognitive-emotional processing of information (Kahneman & Tversky, 1981; Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2016). The organizational culture defines preferences and the overall system of values within an organization. It encompasses norms, beliefs, symbols, and values that significantly influence how employees interpret work processes and experiences¹. The current research also shows that employees process events and communication specifics through the lens of cultural meanings; culture functions similarly to a semantic frame. Just as linguistic frames shape how we see and evaluate specific information, organizational culture constructs the context in which information gains certain meaning and personality characteristics (such as motivational types) determine how individuals transform this frame into personal motivational processes. As a result, the interaction between culture and personal traits influences perceptions of the usefulness of gamified communication and, ultimately, its effectiveness within the organizational environment.

Future Perspectives

The study was based on accessibility principles, which imposes certain limitations on the data interpretation. The subsequent phase of the study aims to use experimental designs to increase data reliability and analytical potential. At this stage, it can be said that the effective implementation of gamified approaches in organizational settings requires an integrated analysis of organizational culture and individual characteristics. Considering the organizational context and personalizing communication strategies (aligning with cultural and individual profiles) ensure greater employee motivation, engagement, and the overall successful adoption of gamification strategies in organizations.

Bibliography

- American Psychological Association. (2018, April 19). *Frame*. In *APA dictionary of psychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/frame>
- Cacciatore, M. A., Scheufele, D. A., & Iyengar, S. (2016). The end of framing as we know it... and the future of media effects. *Mass communication and society*, 19(1), 7-23.
- Deci, E. L., Eghrari, H., Patrick, B. C., & Leone, D. R. (1994). Intrinsic motivation: Understanding and promoting self-regulation in education. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Motivation, achievement, and task performance* (pp. 59–85). Information Age Publishing.
- Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. E. (2011). From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining “Gamification”. *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments*, 9–15.
- Druckman, J. N. (2001). The implications of framing effects for citizen competence. *Political Behavior*, 23(3), 225–256.
- Epley, N., Mak, D., & Idson, L. C. (2006). Bonus or rebate? The impact of framing on spending and saving. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 19(3), 213–222.

¹ Goffee & Gareth Jones, “What Holds the Modern Company Together?”, 2009

- Flusberg, S. J., Holmes, K. J., Thibodeau, P. H., Nabi, R. L., & Matlock, T. (2024). The psychology of framing: How everyday language shapes the way we think, feel, and act. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 25(3), 105-161.
- Getman, A. P., Yaroshenko, O. M., Demenko, O. I., Lutsenko, O. Y., & Prokopiiev, R. Y. (2024). Gamification for staff motivation: Impact on work efficiency and corporate culture at the international level. *Journal of Economics and Management*, 46, 274-299.
- Grünewald, H., Kneip, P., & Kozica, A. (2019). The use of gamification in workplace learning to encourage employee motivation and engagement. *The Wiley handbook of global workplace learning*, 557-575.
- Hauser, D. J., & Schwarz, N. (2020). How metaphorical framing shapes our understanding of cancer. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute. Monographs*, 2020(56), 9–15.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453–458.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values, and frames. *American Psychologist*, 39(4), 341–350.
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral politics: What conservatives know that liberals don't*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2008). *The political mind: Why you can't understand 21st-century American politics with an 18th-century brain*. Viking.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lieberoth, A. (2015). Shallow gamification: Testing psychological effects of framing an activity as a game. *Games and Culture*, 10(3), 229-248.
- Lieberoth, A., Møller, J. F., & Marin, A. (2014). Gamification in organizational contexts: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Proceedings of the 8th European Conference on Games Based Learning*, 282–290.
- Marczewski, A. (2015). *Even ninja monkeys like to play: Gamification, game thinking & motivational design*. Andrzej Marczewski.
- Mazaraki, A., Melikhova, O., & Kupriichuk, V. (2021). Gamification as a tool for human capital management: Theoretical aspects. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 5(3), 79–86.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78.
- Thibodeau, P. H., Crowder, J. P., Flusberg, S. J., & Paul, D. H. (2019). Metaphorical framing in health messages. *Health Communication*, 34(14), 1643–1650.
- Thibodeau, P. H., Hendricks, R. K., & Boroditsky, L. (2017). How linguistic metaphor frames political debate: The case of immigration. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 2(1), 25.
- Tondello, G. F., Wehbe, R. R., Diamond, L., Busch, M., Marczewski, A., & Nacke, L. E. (2016, October). The gamification user types hexad scale. In *Proceedings of the 2016 annual symposium on computer-human interaction in play* (pp. 229-243).
- Tyler, U. T. (2018). *Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument*. Zwolle, Netherlands, 41.
- Vesa, M. (2021). Organizational Gamification: Roots, Readings, Directions. In *Organizational Gamification* (pp. 3-19). Routledge.