

The Relationship between Work Engagement, Work Motivation,  
Organisational Commitment, Age and Socio-Economic Status in Target-  
Based Jobs.

Aidan Pasquetti

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the BA Hons in Psychology at Dublin  
Business School, School of Arts, Dublin.

Supervisor: Dr. Barbara Caska

Program Leader: Dr. Pauline Hyland

Word Count: 8936 words

March 2020

Department of Psychology

Dublin Business School

Contents	Page
Table of Contents.....	
Acknowledgement .....	
<b>1: Abstract</b> .....	
<b>2: Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1 Motivation4	
2.1.1 The Goal Setting theory of Motivation.5	
2.1.2 The Social-Cognitive theory of Motivation.....	6
2.1.3 The Organisational Justice Theory of Motivation.....	8
2.2 Engagement9	
2.3 Organizational Commitment11	
2.4 Motivation, Engagement, Commitment and Job Target Model of Compensation12	
2.5 Motivation to Work and Socio-Economic Status13	
2.6 Literature gap and Hypotheses15	
<b>3: Method17</b>	
3.1 Participants17	
3.2 Measuring Instruments17	
3.2.1 Utrecht Work Engagement Scale(UWES).....	17
3.2.2 Multidimensional Organizational Commitment Scale (MOCQ).....	17
3.2.3 The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS) .....	19
3.2.4 Demographic Questionnaire.....	19
3.3 Design20	
3.4 Procedure20	
3.5 Statistical analysis21	
<b>4: Results22</b>	
4.1 Demographics and Descriptive Statistics.....	22
4.2 Hypothesis 1 Analysis .....	25
4.3 Hypothesis 2 Analysis	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4.4 Hypothesis 3 Analysis	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

4.5 Hypothesis 4 Analysis **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**5: Discussion** **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**References** **37**

**Appendices** **42**

Appendix A: Survey Cover Sheet and Contact information.....	42
Appendix B: Consent Form.....	43
Appendix C: De-brief Sheet .....	44
Appendix D: Demographic Questionnaire .....,.....	45
Appendix E: Elements of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale .....	47
Appendix F: Elements of Multidimensional Work Commitment Questionnaire .....	48
Appendix G: Elements of the The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale .....	49

**Declaration**

‘I declare that this thesis that I have submitted to Dublin Business School for the award of BA (Hons) Psychology is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated, where it is clearly acknowledged by references. Furthermore, this work has not been submitted for any other degree.’

Word count: 8936 words

Signed: AIDAN PASQUETTI

Date: 18/3/20

## **Acknowledgement**

I would like to thank my Research Supervisor, Dr. Barbara Caska, for all the support and guidance she has given me throughout this whole process.

I would also like to thank Dr. John Hyland and Dr. Pauline Hyland for making the process much more effective by sharing their knowledge and skills, and Dr. Rhonda Barron for sharing her background and expertise in the subject area.

I would like to thank my Mother for her patience and guidance during this time and for always supporting me. She has always provided patience and support in times when I am under pressure. I cannot express how grateful I am for her as I know I could not have gotten this far without her. I would also like to thank my partner for her continued support and patience throughout the whole process. I would like to thank all the staff at Dublin Business School for their guidance throughout the whole process, and finally I would like to thank all the participants who took part in this study. I am eternally grateful for everyone's contribution to this study and I deeply appreciate all the help you have all given me.

## **1: Abstract**

The main goal of this study was to research the relationships between targets-based jobs, work motivation, organisational commitment, socio-economic status, age, and work engagement. A survey study, with regression-correlational design, was used to examine a sample of 45 people, who were recruited on Facebook, and completed the survey through the Survey Monkey Platform. The results from testing the first hypothesis showed that engagement is a significant predictor of work motivation in target-based jobs, explaining over half of the variability in work motivation. It was shown that employees' level of motivation is independent from their emotional attachment to an organization. Analysis of continuous commitment showed that motivation is determined by the cost-benefit analysis between an employee and their organisation. Analysis of normative commitment showed that employees motivation proved not to be affected by their colleague's attitudes or the reliability of the organisation. Socio-economic status proved to be an irrelevant factor when it came to examining motivation levels and extrinsic motivation did not decrease with age.

## **2: Introduction**

Today we live in a global society where countries are interconnected more than ever before (Grossman & Helpman, 2015). There are many multinational and transnational organizations with long successful business traditions that have put production and efficacy at its highest place in history. This created a highly competitive climate in our society where organizations need to have and retain a highly motivated workforce if they want to stay in this very competitive race, ensuring survival and expansion. One of the key factors for staying competitive and creating more value and profit is high motivation of employees (Danish & Usman 2010). A great majority of companies recognized that and adopted various models of work compensations. One model of compensation adopted by many companies is working targets compensation model. This model postulates that additional income can be made through meeting certain business objectives or Key Performance Indicators (Gagné, 2014). However, there is still no consensus between the scholars as to what is the relationship between this type of compensation and motivation to work.

Some theories relevant to motivation and compensation, such as Expectancy Theory (1964), emphasize the importance of incentives in guiding employees' behavior; hence they indicate that workers' effort is sensitive to incentive rewards, and that these rewards have significant effects on the motivation and performance of employees at work (Gagné, 2014). In other words, they propose that a higher rate of incentive rewards should be associated with higher employee performance, as a positive impact of incentives should lead to a positive impact on employees' motivation, engagement, commitment, and consequently productivity. Such a positive effect has been confirmed particularly for piece-rate wages paid for simple jobs (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1997).

However, some empirical findings are in contradiction with this hypothesis. In the 1990's, Bruno Frey (Frey, 1997) demonstrated that in certain cases, the performance enhancing effect of incentives is overruled by a negative effect on individual performance called the 'crowding out effect' (Gagné, 2014) (Frey, 2012). Frey and Jegen (2001) identified how if an activity was originally intrinsically motivated, and a reward is given for that activity which is seen as a monitoring device, then the extrinsic motivation associated with the reward does not counterbalance the loss of intrinsic motivation (Gagné, 2014).

Target based compensations are based on performance, and because performance is a complex phenomenon influenced by many factors of which some are out of employees control (sickness, death of a family member or a close friend, fluctuations in global market and economic crises), they introduce a higher level of job related insecurity and uncertainty. Job insecurity is regarded as the 'overall concern about the continued existence of the job in the future (Sverke, Hellgren & Näswall, 2002); while Income insecurity is the lack of assurance associated with an individual's minimum level of income (Sverke, Hellgren & Näswall, 2002)

Consequently, a target depending income, is more unstable, which lowers down job security. Lack of job and income security stress workers and influence negatively their physical health and psychological well-being (Kuhnert, Sims, & Lahey, 1989; Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2002), and organizational engagement (Sverke, et al., 2002). A longitudinal study conducted by Hellgren and Sverske's (2003) showed that job insecurity had a detrimental impact on worker's mental health (Hellgren & Sverke, 2003). Consequently, people with lower job and income security tend to show less vigour, dedication and absorption while working (Seppälä, et al., 2009). In conclusion, these studies indicate that introducing job targets can have negative effects on employees' motivation.

In the following text, the most influential theories of work motivation will be reviewed in order to demonstrate how they apply the target-based model of incentive. In addition, empirical findings regarding relationships between different types of work compensations, motivation and workers performance, engagement and organizational commitment will be presented. It is important to outline the difference between these theories, as they all play a role in the examination of motivation in target-based environments.

### *2.1 Motivation*

There are many theories of work motivation and although they do not agree on what its most important regulating factor is, many agree that work motivation is a very complex construct that depends on various intrinsic and extrinsic variables (Ramlall, 2004). Altogether, theories of work motivation specify that the key factors of motivation are: 1) needs of the employees and balance between them; 2) characteristics of work environment (productive, respectful, and cooperative 3) responsibilities (balance between employees' capabilities, job tasks, and compensations); 4) supervision quality (need to teach, coach, and develop others; 5) fairness and equity (being treated and rewarded fairly according to efforts and contribution, regardless of demographic attributes such as age, gender, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, geographic location, etc.); 6) effort (depends on employees' general job satisfaction and perceived rewards); 7) development opportunities (personal development based on success and demonstrated interests; Ramlall, 2004).

There are many theories of work motivation and because going through all of them is beyond the scope of this paper, only the three approaches that have been most influential in the

past 30 years for target-based environments will be reviewed, and they include: the goal-setting, social cognitive, and organizational justice theory (Latham & Pinder 2005).

### *2.1.1 The Goal Setting theory of motivation.*

According to this theory, human behaviour is guided by two cognitive constructs- values and aims (goals, or intentions). The theory defines aims as something that person wants to achieve consciously. The creators of this theory, Locke and Latham (1968), posited that every person experiences judgements about his own core values emotionally (Locke & Latham, 2012); hence, in order to experience positive emotions and avoid negative ones, people tend to do things that are consistent with their own core values (Lunenburg, 2011). In contrast, intentions or goals influence behaviour through a significantly different mechanism, by guiding conscious or unconscious attention and action. Hence, challenging but important goals may motivate people to mobilize higher amounts of energy and to increase persistent effort. In addition, goals may motivate people to develop strategies, and accomplishing these goals may lead to satisfaction and higher motivation, or frustration and lower motivation (Lunenburg 2011). Hence, goals setting can be a powerful tool for enhancing motivation inside organisations; however, the creators of this theory specified that this can only be the case “under the right conditions” (Lunenburg 2011).

Firstly, goals need to be specific, hard but attainable, and accepted. Statements that are today very often used by supervisors as instructions for acquiring wanted goals include the following: “you need to improve”, “work harder”, “do your best”, etc.; however, this is ineffective because it does not specify what concretely the employees should do to achieve the goal. Goals need to be precisely quantified and measured, and when that is the case, absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover significantly decreases (Locke & Latham, 2002).

The second important thing is the balance between difficulty and attainability of goals. In other words, easy goals will lead to potential waste and low efficacy; however, if goals are too high and almost impossible or impossible to attain, they will have a counter effect, because when employees perceive goals as unreasonable and impossible, they reject them (Lunenburg 2011). One factor that can moderate perceptions of goal attainability is employees' internal belief of self-efficacy; hence, management can increase perceptions of goal attainability to a certain extent by reinforcing employees' self-efficacy (Lunenburg 2011).

The third important factor is congruency between personal and group goals. Social conflict related to goal setting is a key factor in achieving a goal. More specifically, when personal goals conflict with group goals (i.e. working team goals), personal goals significantly lower group performance. In addition, the greater the number of people in the group, the greater the conflict between personal and group goals (Seijts & Latham, 2000).

### *2.1.2 The Social-Cognitive theory of motivation.*

Social-cognitive theory (SCT) of motivation is a neo-behaviouristic theory which postulates that human motivation is at least partly controlled and moderated by our conscious cognitive processes (Wood & Bandura, 1989). Our interaction with environmental antecedents produces some outcomes and this process is mediated by our cognitions which interact with our motivation. More specifically, according to SCT, motivation is a self-regulatory process controlled by two opposing but synchronized systems: 1) discrepancy production system and 2) discrepancy reduction system (Bandura 2001). Hence, both perceptions that goals can be achieved and experience with unrealized goals can positively influence people's motivation in target-based jobs, only if they perceive their KPI's as attainable targets.

Motivation regulation is the ability of an individual to sustain and increase their motivation to perform and learn new tasks, comprising of cognitive, affective and social aspects. All elements of motivational regulation are developed through social and cultural interaction (Wolters & Mueller, 2010). It is a process which goes through the following phases: 1) a person sets a goal that is above his current abilities, 2) the set goal creates discrepancy between current and wanted (desirable) states, 3) a person estimates necessary things and conditions for goal achievement, 4) a person mobilizes resources necessary for goal achievement, 5) goal achievements and fails influence new goal setting and motivation.

SCT specifies that self-efficacy is a key factor in motivation regulation. When people achieve a goal, those with high self-efficacy will set a new higher goal because the discrepancy between current and wanted state will influence their motivation positively. In addition, when people fail in achieving their goals, self-efficacy is a significant predictor of the type of behaviour that will follow the failure (i.e. apathy, despondency, or an increase of efforts; Latham & Pinder, 2005). However, even if it may seem that high self-efficacy is always desirable, that is not the case. It can be rather detrimental for a person and an organisation if the set goal is unattainable. In this situation, high self-efficacy will lead to irrational persistence in achieving an impossible goal (Whyte, Saks, & Hook, 1997), which could cause the loss of time and resources. An employee or an organisation will have a high probability to fall into a dysfunctional persistence cycle if: 1) they have a successful history with many goals achieved and high satisfaction with those goals, 2) they have high self-efficacy, 3) they set an impossible goal which they perceive to be possible (Audia, Locke, & Smith, 2000; Whyte et al., 1997).

### *2.1.3 The Organizational Justice theory of motivation.*

Two basic concepts in this theory are inputs and outcomes, and justice is perceived when these two are in balance. More specifically, inputs include everything that employees perceive they invest in their relationship with their organisations and outcomes are tangible and intangible compensations that employees get for these investments. Employees calculate ratio between their own inputs and outcomes, compare them with those of other colleagues and form attitudes about their organisation's fairness. The main idea of this theory is that employees are motivated to work only if their organisation is perceived as just and fair (De Cremer & Van Knippenberg, 2002, Skarlicki & Latham, 1997).

When an organization is perceived as unfair, there are several negative consequences that can affect the organization negatively. First, negative behaviours such as sick leaves, turnover, conscious sabotage of one's and colleagues' work, and general absenteeism become more frequent (Susanna, 2006). In addition, employees start to experience negative emotions such as low commitment and motivation, and apathy towards their organization. Moreover, employees start to experience general subjective feelings of fear, anger, hopelessness, sadness, rage, irritation, shame, embarrassment, guilt, dread, and cynicism (Latham & Pinder 2005). Many studies researched negative effects of the unfair organisation perceptions and they found that it may lead to: stealing from organization (Greenberg 2002), exploitation of colleagues (Turillo, Folger, Lavelle, Umphress, & Gee, 2002), revenge (Tripp, Bies, & Aquino, 2002), and sabotage (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002).

## *2.2 Engagement*

One of the most important factors that significantly determine employee's motivation and commitment inside an organization is the congruence between individual and organizational goals. Those individuals whose goals are highly congruent with organizational goals will be highly motivated and committed to their organizations (Gagné, 2014). This means that they will endorse ethical work, be committed to their professional carrier and emotionally committed to their organization, and highly engaged in their job (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009). Engagement is workers' devotion, dedication, and involvement in their job (Roberts & Davenport, 2002). Work engagement consists of three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption, and is assumed to be a positive indicator of occupational well-being. It is a state of mind characterized by positive and fulfilling attitudes towards one's work (Seppälä, et al., 2009).

In context of engagement, Vigour is a state characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest more working efforts, and perseverance when faced with job-related difficulties (Seppälä, et al., 2009). On the other hand, Dedication is a state when one has a high sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge while working. Finally, Absorption as a facet of engagement, is a state of one being fully concentrated on and deeply immersed in one's work. In the state of high absorption people report that they feel that time spent working passes very quickly while detaching from work causes psychological difficulties such as strong wish to continue to work (Seppälä, et al., 2009).

Work engagement is positively correlated to mental and psychosomatic health, intrinsic motivation, efficacy beliefs, positive attitudes towards work and the organization, and high performance (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). People who are highly engaged to their job experience it as part of their identity, are intrinsically motivated to do the job

and do not need extrinsic reinforcers to increase their job motivation (Gagné, 2014). In addition, they are more productive and provide more often results that organizations require. Moreover, they experience their job to be a positively challenging and stimulating personal developer which gives them a sense of self-actualization (Roberts & Davenport, 2002). Engagement mediates the relationship between workers perception of job meaningfulness and job performance, and low job engagement can be an indicator that job demands, workplace's resources and workers' abilities are not balanced (Roberts & Davenport, 2002).

Today, employees' engagement is a key factor of organizational success (Lockwood, 2007). More precisely, employees who are not engaged feel that there is a significant imbalance between their skills and job demands (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009). In addition, they tend to bide their time and work with very low motivation. Finally, they actively try to find a way to leave their organization (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009). In contrast, engaged employees, are hardworking, highly motivated (committed) and tend to perform above their working norms (Lockwood, 2007). They also feel proud and tend to trust their supervisors.

The key factor in maintaining high work engagement among employees' is their perception of how much their organization cares about them and their wellbeing. More specifically, employees have high engagement if they perceive that organization values and appreciates them (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009); hence, if organizations are committed to development, well-being, and actualization of their employees they will get in return highly motivated and engaged workers (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009).

### *2.3 Organizational Commitment*

One model of Organizational commitment is a three-faceted construct which consists of affective, continuance, and normative dimension (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The affective component of organizational commitment reflects the employees' emotional attachment, identification and involvement in the organization. The continuance component encompasses commitment that is based on the cost-benefit analysis that an employee associates with leaving the organization. And the third component, the normative commitment, is employee's personal feeling of obligation to remain with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

The antecedents of affective commitment comprise of various perceptions regarding work tasks, one's own skills, and relationship with the management. The important perceptions regarding work tasks are: perceived task autonomy, significance, and identity; regarding skills is skill variety; and regarding employee's relationship with management are supervisory feedback, perceived participation in management or employees belief in how much they can influence decision making and problem solving inside the organization (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994).

The antecedents of normative commitment include co-worker commitment (which includes affective and behavioural commitment such as professional communication with colleagues and appropriate affect modulation in working environment), organizational dependability (perception of how much one can rely on his organization), and participatory management (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994).

Continuance commitment antecedents include age, tenure, career satisfaction, and intent to leave. In addition, Age and tenure function as predictors of continuance dimension because they reflect employees' level of investment in the organization. For example, tenure could be a measure

of investments such as close working relationships with co-workers, retirement, career, and investments in other skills acquired through the relationship with that particular organization. Finally, intent to leave the organization is an antecedent that is negatively correlated to continuance commitment. Employees who want to leave are less likely to become or be committed to their organization (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994).

#### *2.4 Motivation, Engagement, Commitment and Job Target Model of Compensation*

High motivation of employees is, among others, a key factor for staying competitive, and creating more value and profit (Danish & Usman 2010). Today, many companies take this for a fact, and in order to keep motivation of their employees at high levels, they adopted a model of compensations that depends on working targets. However, some studies showed that working targets can have a counter effect and influence motivation in a negative direction. More specifically, job targets-conditioned incomes are significantly more unstable than fixed incomes, which makes employees' life and long-term planning also more unstable. Consequently, target based jobs provide people with less security (Kuhnert, Sims, & Lahey, 1989; Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2002)). On the other hand, the lack of job and income security are key factors that are negatively correlated to occupational stress and lack of them influence people's physical health and psychological well-being negatively (Kuhnert, et al., 1989; Sverke, et al., 2002). In the same manner, the lack of income and job stability diminishes employees' organizational engagement (Sverke, et al., 2002); consequently, people with lower job and income security tend to show less vigor, dedication and absorption with their work (Seppälä, et al., 2009). Hence, based on the presented findings we may conclude that job targets modelling of work compensations can have negative effects on employee's working motivation.

The results of Cable's, and Judge's (1994) study are in concordance with this hypothesis, and they showed that people prefer fixed pay or fixed work compensation above flexible and performance related compensation. These findings are not surprising because fixed compensation gives to employees a higher sense of security and stability in life and long-term planning. In addition, fixed incomes provide a higher job security, which is negatively correlated to stress and stress-induced negative health outcomes such as psychosomatic symptoms, anxiety, depression, and interpersonal sensitivity (Kuhnert, et al., 1989; Sverke, et al., 2002).

Work motivation and job satisfaction are in significant low to moderate positive correlation (Danish & Usman 2010). Specifically, motivation to work is highly influenced by job security, job compensation (salary), supervision, and growth potential. On the other hand, job security and work engagement are correlated positively. In addition, these two variables significantly predict and explain 25 % of organizational commitment (Moshoeu & Geldenhuys 2015). Specifically, the facet of job security (probability of losing current level of job salary) and facet of work engagement (Vigour) are significant predictors of organizational commitment. These findings indicate that people who have fixed salary are probably more engaged in their work, tend to be more committed to their organizations, and to invest themselves more in their work.

### *2.5 Motivation to Work and Socio-Economic Status*

Currently there are no available studies that researched the relationship between motivation to work and socio-economic status. However, there is a study that examined other aspects of human motivation such as motivation to learn and because learning is a part of every professional career these findings could be perhaps relevant in this context. Specifically, Shin and So (2018) analysed the impact of socio-economic status on foreign language learning and through a series of

hierarchical linear models found empirical evidence that participants with high socio-economic status, generally showed significantly higher levels of effort, mastery goal orientation, and internal control, and they made greater use of cognitive, metacognitive, compensatory, and social strategies. These findings confirmed that socio-economic status is a significant moderator of motivation-learning relationship because it significantly affects the selection and the efficacy of the learning strategies, the same as the effort invested in learning (Shin & So 2018). Finally, their findings indicated people from the lower socio-economic group need greater fostering for achieving the same level of efficacy as the higher socio-economic group.

Another study investigated how socio-economic status influences work-orientation; a construct that seems very closely related to work motivation. Namely, a survey study conducted among farmers in eastern England farmers of lower status give particular emphasis to the value of independence in their work, middle status farmers are predominantly oriented towards social values in their job, while those of highest socioeconomic status are the most business oriented (Gasson, 1974). Hence, these findings indicate three things. These findings indicate that people of higher socio-economic status tend to be more focused on business gains (work targets) than people of middle and lower socio-economic status. This makes sense, because people of higher socio-economic status are probably already highly independent and have very well established social positions, thus they do not have to focus themselves on pleasing anybody, do not have to rely on anybody and have more choice opportunities in their profession (Gasson, 1974). This finding also suggest, that people of higher socio-economic status will prefer more and will be more comfortable and motivated to work in an environment that offers working target based compensations when compared to the people of lower socio-economic status who are still predominantly motivated by values such as independence and social stability and positioning. In concordance with the findings

of Gasson (1974) another study has shown that people prefer stable jobs and work compensations (fixed salaries) because that gives them more financial stability and makes their life more predictable (Cable & Judge, 1994). Hence it is once more reasonable to assume that in comparison to people of higher socio-economic status, people of lower socio-economic status would be less motivated to work target based jobs because their life is much less stable and financially secure; hence, in that context, job targets could act as additional psychological hindrance which would lower their motivation to work.

## *2.6 Literature gap and Hypotheses*

The relationships between, work engagement, commitment, years of experience, age, and motivation was in the main focus of many studies (i.e. Cable & Judge, 1994; Danish & Usman 2010; Inceoglu, Segers, & Bartram, 2012; Kahn & Robertson, 1992; Kuhnert, et al., 1989; Moshoeu & Geldenhuys, 2015; Sverke, et al., 2002); however, in available literature there were not studies that researched relationships between job target modelled work compensations work motivation, commitment, years of experience, age, and work engagement. The findings of previous studies (i.e., Danish & Usman 2010; Kuhnert, et al.; Sverke, et al, 2002) indicated that people prefer job security over job insecurity, and when given a choice they would prefer fixed job compensations over flexible and performance related compensations (Cable & Judge, 1994). In addition, some studies such as Crawford, et al, (2010) showed that job demands significantly influence work engagement, and if that demand is perceived as something that interferes with action or progress, work engagement will significantly decrease; hence, if people prefer fixed compensations over flexible and performance related compensations, it is reasonable to assume that work targets will be perceived as hindrance, which perhaps may have a negative impact on

the relationship between work engagement and work motivation, and work commitment and work motivation.

Some studies also showed that as the years pass by, the quality of employees' motivation significantly changes (Inceoglu, Segers, & Bartram, 2012). Hence, older employees tend to have significantly lower extrinsic motivation, and significantly higher intrinsic motivation (Inceoglu, Segers, & Bartram, 2012). Because job targets compensation models reinforce extrinsic motivation (for example, the more sales an employee makes the more money he will earn) it is reasonable to assume that job targets will lead to lower work motivation of older employees.

Hence, in concordance to the indications of the findings from the previous studies presented above this study tested the following hypotheses:

H1: Engagement, affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment significantly predict motivation in target based jobs.

H2: People of lower socio-economic status are less motivated to work target based jobs.

H3: Age is negatively correlated to extrinsic motivation in target based job environment.

H4: Age has a negative association with motivation in general in target based job environment.

### **3: Method**

#### *3.1 Participants*

The sample consisted of 45 participants. The structure of the sample on different demographic variables is presented in the table in the results section below (See table 1)

#### *3.2 Measuring Instruments*

##### *3.2.1 Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES).*

Work engagement was measured with UWES scale (Seppälä, et al., 2009); UWES scale measures three facets of Engagement: Vigour, Dedication, and Absorption that employees experience in relation to their work. Confirmatory factor analysis of this questionnaire showed that three-factor model of UWES measurement was statistically significant with  $\chi^2= 409.06, p < .001$ , and had the following parameters: RMSEA = .06, CFI = 0.97, and NNFI= 0.96. The standardized stability coefficients of the work engagement were very high for all three facets: Vigour 0.85, Dedication 0.86, and Absorption 0.82 (Seppälä, et al., 2009). The questionnaire consisted of 17 Likert-type items, and each one represented a seven-point scale (from zero to six) with zero meaning “never” and six meaning “every day”. (See Appendix E)

##### *3.2.2 Multidimensional Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (MOCQ).*

Work commitment was measured with MOCQ scale created by Allen and Meyer (1990). This scale measured three facets of organizational commitment: The Affective, Continuance, and Normative commitment. The Affective Commitment of organizational commitment encompasses emotional attachment, identification, and involvement, of the employees in the organization and its goals. The Continuance Commitment is a facet that refers to the costs that employees associate

with leaving the organization. And the third facet, Normative Commitment consists of employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

The three-factor model of MSC was evaluated with confirmatory factor analysis and the results showed that the three-factor oblique model best fits the data. Namely, a multi-group analyses confirmed the consistency of the three-factor oblique model across multiple samples. The factor structure was invariant across all samples  $\chi^2(747, N = 979) = 2117.52$ , NFI = .81, the same as factor loadings,  $\chi^2(795, N = 979) = 2185.08$ , NFI = .81; NFI change = .005. In addition, matrix of factor loadings and variances and covariance was also invariant  $\chi^2(801, N = 979) = 2197.56$ , NFI = .80; NFI change = .005 (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994). A multi-sample internal consistency analysis of the questionnaire showed that Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .89 to .90 for the total scale, from .74 to .87 for the Affective Commitment, from .73 to .81 for Continuance Commitment, and from .67 to .78 for Normative Commitment (Dunham et al., 1994). Finally, the scale had good test- retest reliability with the correlations between the scores in two points in time being moderate to high (Dunham et al., 1994). The questionnaire consisted of 24 Likert-type items, and each one represented a seven-point scale (from zero to six) with zero meaning "strongly disagree" and six meaning "strongly agree" (Allen & Meyer, 1990). (See Appendix F).

### *3.2.3 The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS).*

Motivation was measured with MWMS scale (Gagne et al., 2015). The scale measured five facets of work motivation: amotivation, extrinsic regulation (two sub facets- social and material), introjected regulation, identified regulation, and intrinsic motivation. The scale consists 19 Likert-type items, and each one represents a seven-point scale (from one to seven). The questionnaire consisted of the items that were actually different answers to the question “Why do you or would you put efforts into your current job?” After the question all items were listed and everyone is followed by the seven point scale (the scale: 1 = “not at all”, 2 = “very little”, 3 = “a little”, 4 = “moderately”, 5 = “strongly”, 6 = “very strongly”, 7 = “completely”). Confirmatory factor analysis has shown that the six faceted model of motivation best fit the data,  $\chi^2(143, N = 568), 633.01$ , CFI= .87, RMSEA= .08, AIC= 347.01. The scale had very good convergent and discriminant validity. Finally, the facets’ internal consistency was the following: Amotivation (.91), Extrinsic Regulation (.75), Introjected Regulation (.70), Identified Regulation (.76), and Intrinsic Motivation (.79; Gagne et al., 2015). Hence, we may conclude that MWMS is reliable and valid instrument for measuring multidimensionality of work motivation. (See Appendix G).

### *3.2.4 Demographic questionnaire.*

This questionnaire was designed for the needs of this study. It collected the information regarding basic demographic variables of the participants. The questionnaire collected the following information: sex, age, type of job, ethnicity, race, education, socio-economic status, working hours, and relationship status. (See Appendix D)

### *3.3 Design*

This was a survey study, with regression-correlational design. The target variables of this study were: engagement, affective commitment, continuous commitment, normative commitment, socio-economic status, extrinsic motivation and work motivation in general. All these variables except socio-economic status were numerical continuous interval variables. Socio-economic status was operationalised as ordinal variable with five ranks: the lowest 20 percentile, from 21<sup>st</sup> to 40<sup>th</sup> percentile, from 41<sup>st</sup> to 60<sup>th</sup> percentile, from 61<sup>st</sup> to 80<sup>th</sup> percentile, from 80<sup>st</sup> to 100<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Demographic variables were operationalized as following: 1) sex (nominal variable, two groups, males and females), age (numerical, ratio), occupation (nominal, three categories- physical worker, administrative worker, manager), ethnicity (nominal, multiple categories), race (nominal, multiple categories), education (ordinal, five levels- primary school, secondary school, bachelor's degree, master's degree, and PHD), working hours (ordinal variable), relationship status (nominal, six categories- single, not in a serious relationship, in a serious relationship, married, divorced, and widowed).

### *3.4 Procedure*

Participants were recruited on Facebook. Survey Monkey platform was used for creation of electronic versions of the questionnaire. An informed consent form was included into the test battery and only participants who accepted participation were redirected to the rest of the test battery (See Appendix C). A coversheet was attached before the participants gave consent, informing them of the study (See Appendix A). All data was stored on the researcher's laptop, which was protected with Avast antivirus, Malware bytes software, and an administrator's password in order to secure the data from a third-party security breach. The researcher did not

collect the information about participants' names and whole research was completely anonymous. A de-brief sheet was attached afterwards with support services offered for those who may have needed them (See Appendix D)

### *3.5 Statistical analysis*

The data was processed in the IBM's statistical software SPSS, version 25. Before the main analysis data was screened for missing values, wrong entries, and outliers. The analysis of missing values was conducted in order to determine whether the missing values were missing by chance or there was some systemic problem in the data collection. Univariate outliers were detected with standardized z-scores, and multivariate outliers were detected with Mahalanobis's distances. Normality of data distributions were tested with the inspection of skewness, kurtosis and q-q plots. The hypotheses were tested with regression models and correlation analyses.

## 4: Results

### 4.1 Demographics and Descriptive Statistics

The structure of the sample on different demographic variables is presented in the tables below.

Table 1.

*Descriptive statistics for Variable Age*

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Age	20	40	28.18	6

Table 2.

*Frequencies for Variable Sex*

Sex	Percent
Male	64.4
Female	35.6
Total	100.0

Table 3.

*Frequencies for Variable Type of Work*

Type of work	Frequency	Percent
Physical worker	3	6.7
Administrative worker	27	60.0
Managerial position	15	33.3
Total	45	100.0

Table 4.

*Educational Structure of the Sample*

Type of education	Percent
High School	55.6
Bachelor	37.8
Master	6.7
Total	100.0

Table 5.

*Socio-Economic Structure of the Sample*

<b>Socio-economic category</b>	<b>Percent</b>
The poorest 20 %	4.4
Between 20th and 40th percentile	42.2
Between 41st and 60th percentile	37.8
Between 61st and 80th percentile	13.3
Between 81st and 100th percentile	2.2
Total	100.0

Table 6.

*Frequencies for Variable working hours*

<b>Working hours per week</b>	<b>Percent</b>
11 to 20 hours	17.8
31 to 40 hours	62.2
41 to 50 hours	15.6
51 to 60 hours	4.4
Total	100.0

Table 7.

*Participants' relationship status*

<b>Relationship status</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Single	35.6
Not in a serious relationship	4.4
In a committed relationship	44.4
Married	15.6
Total	100.0

All data was processed in IBM's statistical software SPSS version 25. No wrong entries were found in the data set. Missing data analysis showed that only four data points were missing, or, more precisely, one data point on four different variables. In total, .1 % of data was missing, and Little's MCAR test showed that it was missing completely at random  $\chi^2(236) = 8.2, p > .05$ , which allowed data imputation with expectation-maximization method. Univariate outlier analysis pointed out two univariate outliers that had standardised z-scores higher than + 3.29. They were removed from the further analyses. The presence of multivariate outliers was tested with Mahalanobis's distances, and the analysis did point out any. In the next step, data distributions were tested for normality. Skewness and kurtosis of all variables were in the range between + 2 and - 2; hence we may conclude that the data distributions were not significantly different from a normal one and that normality assumption was satisfied. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 8.

Table 8.  
*Descriptive Statistics of Psychological Measures*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>
Affective Commitment Total	22.82	28.00	5.21	-.31	1.41
Continuance Commitment Total	22.64	33.00	8.35	-.10	-.55
Normative Commitment Total	23.20	20.00	5.02	-.26	-.43
Extrinsic Motivation-Social Total	9.96	18.00	5.53	.44	-.82
Extrinsic Motivation- Material Total	12.27	18.00	5.00	.20	-.92
Engagement Total	59.67	96.00	25.69	-.96	.23
Motivation Total	67.60	84.00	20.32	-.10	-.30
Age	28.18	20	6	.58	-.79

#### 4.2: Hypothesis 1 Analysis

In order to test whether engagement, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment significantly predict motivation in target-based jobs, a multiple regression analysis was computed. The results of the regression analysis showed that the regression model is statistically significant  $F(4, 40) = 12.28, p < .001$ , adjusted  $R^2 = .51$ . In addition, the standardized coefficient of engagement was significant  $\beta = .69, p < .001$ , while others were not statistically significant- affective commitment  $\beta = .04, p > .05$ , continuance commitment  $\beta = .18, p > .05$ , and normative commitment  $\beta = -.17, p > .05$ . Hence, based on the model, one's work motivation in target-based jobs can be calculated with the equation

$$\text{Motivation to work} = 36.86 + \text{engagement} * .55 + \text{affective commitment} * .17 + \text{continuance commitment} * .45 + \text{normative commitment} * (-.68)$$

In conclusion, the regression analysis showed that the model explains 51 % of work motivation in target-based jobs, which is statistically significant. However, although the analysis showed that the model is significant, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment did not give a significant unique contribution to the predicting model. Continuance commitment and normative commitment were significantly correlated to engagement  $r = .36, p < .05$  and  $r = .36, p < .05$  respectively, while engagement and affective commitment were not significantly correlated  $r = .28, p > .05$ . However, continuance commitment does not have a significant unique contribution to the predictive capacity of the model, it was significantly correlated to work motivation in target-based jobs  $r = .40, p < .01$ . Hence, continuance commitment probably did not have a significant unique contribution to the predictive capacity of the model because of its significant correlation with engagement. Finally, affective and normative

commitment were not significantly correlated to work motivation  $r = .23$   $p > .05$  and  $r = .13$   $p > .05$  respectively.

#### *4.3: Hypothesis 2 Analysis*

In order to test the relationship between socio-economic status and motivation to work in target-based jobs, Spearman's  $\rho$  correlation was computed. The results of the analysis have shown that socio-economic status does not influence people's motivation to work target-based jobs  $\rho = -.24$ ,  $p > .05$ .

#### *4.4: Hypothesis 3 Analysis*

In order to test the relationship between social and material aspects of extrinsic motivation and age, Pearson's  $r$  correlation was computed. The results of the analysis have shown that neither social nor material aspect of extrinsic motivation are significantly correlated to people's motivation to work target-based jobs  $r = -.14$ ,  $p > .05$  and  $r = -.11$ ,  $p > .05$  respectively.

#### *4.5: Hypothesis 4 Analysis*

In order to test the relationship between motivation to work target-based jobs and age, Pearson's  $r$  correlation was computed. The results of the analysis have shown that age is not significantly correlated to people's motivation to work target-based jobs  $r = -.01$ ,  $p > .05$ .

## 5: Discussion

The main goal of this study was to research the relationships between targets-based jobs, work motivation, organisational commitment, socio-economic status, age, and work engagement. This study tested four hypotheses. The first hypothesis stated that engagement, affective commitment, continuous commitment, and normative commitment can significantly predict motivation in target-based jobs. This hypothesis was confirmed.

First, the findings have shown that work engagement is a significant predictor of work motivation in target-based jobs and that it explains almost a half of variability in work motivation. Furthermore, the results showed that even small changes in engagement could induce large and significant changes in work motivation. These results are in concordance with the findings of previous studies (Roberts & Davenport, 2002; Seppälä, et al., 2009; Schaufeli, et al., 2002). Namely, this study once more confirmed that when workers are devoted, dedicated and involved in their job, they will be more motivated to work (Roberts & Davenport, 2002). Engaged workers have more vigour, dedication and absorption, which are all positively correlated to well-being and to positive attitudes towards one's work (Seppälä, et al., 2009). Hence, high work engagement, lowers the dissonance between one's internal states and their work, which positively influences work motivation. Furthermore, engaged workers have higher levels of energy and mental resilience while working, they also have willingness to invest more working efforts, and perseverance when faced with job-related difficulties (Seppälä, et al., 2009), which also contributes to higher levels of working motivation. In addition, higher engagement means more work dedication which means more, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge while working. Moreover, highly engaged people tend to be fully concentrated and deeply immersed in their work, which prevents them from experiencing boredom and losing their motivation (Seppälä, et al.,

2009). Finally, high engagement could also have an indirect positive effect on motivation. To the point, work engagement is positively correlated to mental and psychosomatic health, and healthier workers have higher levels of intrinsic motivation to work (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

The findings of this study also showed that low engagement predicts low work motivation which is congruent with the findings of Chalofsky and Krishna (2009), who showed that employees who are not engaged feel that there is a significant imbalance between their skills and job demands and consequently, they tend to bide their time and work with very low motivation. Finally, the low engaged workers actively try to leave their organizations (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009). Thus, if an employer wants to keep high the motivation of his employees who work target-based jobs he needs to measure, follow-up, and enhance their work engagement. The key factor in maintaining high work engagement among employees' is their perception of how much their organization cares about them and their well-being above and beyond financial interest. Hence, by enhancing and maintaining positive perceptions about the organisation's mission and policies employers can increase workers' engagement (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009); hence, if organizations are committed to development, well-being and actualization of their employees they will get in return highly motivated and engaged workers (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009).

Regarding affective commitment, this study showed that although the prediction model is significant, this variable did not have a significant unique contribution to the prediction capacity of the model. In addition, affective commitment was not significantly correlated to work motivation in target-based jobs. Hence, the findings indicate that, in target-based jobs, employees' motivation is independent from their emotional attachment, identification, and involvement with the organization. When we take in consideration the findings of previous studies and the findings regarding hypothesis one from this study this finding is a little bit unexpected, surprising, and

counterintuitive; however, there is some sense in it. Namely, previous studies did not examine human behaviour in target-based jobs environment; hence the context of these studies was significantly different than the context of the current study. In contrast to the fixed compensation jobs, it is quite reasonable to assume that people who work in target-based jobs are highly goal-oriented people. This means that when they have a goal everything else is less relevant and subdued to that goal. Hence, the affective commitment which reflects the employees' emotional attachment, identification, and involvement in the organization (Dunham, et al., 1994) is completely irrelevant to them and does not affect their motivation at all. In other words, these people are focused on the result that they want or need to achieve and they could not care less about the things such as perceived task autonomy, significance, identity, skill variety, supervisory feedback, perceived participation in management or their role in decision making and problem solving inside the organization. Hence, perhaps the most efficient performance in target-based jobs have highly goal-oriented people. However, organisations must be aware that there is a trade off in employing extremely highly goal-oriented people. Although, most probably, these people will in target based jobs outperform any other person who is guided in his work with other values, these people will only care for their organisation, colleagues or organisational policies as long as they fit their own agenda. In the long term, this could have very negative and destructive consequences on an organisation's functioning, because it will most certainly create a dysfunctional, unpredictable, and over competitive work climate where mistrust and colleague manipulation will be an everyday thing.

When it comes to continuance commitment, this variable also did not have a significant unique contribution to the prediction capacity of the model. This is probably the case because it was significantly correlated to another predictor- engagement. However, continuance commitment

was significantly correlated to work motivation in target-based jobs. In other words, this study showed that in target-based jobs one's motivation is significantly determined by his cost-benefit analysis of the relationship between him and his organisation. More precisely, workers' motivation in target-based jobs will significantly depend on their age, tenure, career satisfaction, and intent to leave (Dunham, et al., 1994). In addition, age and tenure are direct predictors of continuance dimension because they reflect employees' level of investment in the organization, hence, from the group of factors that influence continuance commitment they have also the strongest effect on work motivation. For example, tenure could be a measure of investments such as close working relationships with co-workers, retirement, career, and investments in other skills acquired through the relationship with that organization. Hence, the longer the period of investment into the organisation, the higher the continuance commitment, the lower the intention to leave the organisation, and consequently the higher the motivation to work (Dunham, et al., 1994). Hence the findings regarding this hypothesis indicate that people who work target-based jobs will work for longer periods for one organisation, will have lower probability to leave that organisation. Furthermore, this indicates that more experienced workers on higher hierarchical positions will accept higher job targets with less resistance and higher efficacy than less experienced employees on lower hierarchical positions.

When it comes to normative commitment, this variable did not have a significant unique contribution to the prediction capacity of the model. In addition, normative commitment was not significantly correlated to work motivation. The factors that make normative commitment include perceptions of co-workers' commitment (which includes affective and behavioural commitment such as professional communication with colleagues and appropriate affect modulation in working environment), organizational dependability (perception of how much one can rely on his

organization), and participatory management (Dunhame, et al., 1994). In addition, normative commitment, includes employees' personal feelings of obligation to remain within the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Thus, if a person, for some reason, perceives that his colleagues are not committed to their work, or if he perceives that organisation is too flexible and unreliable and that he cannot influence that in any way, that will not affect his motivation to work a target based job as long as he can achieve his professional goal (Dunham, et al., 1994). These findings indicate that target-based jobs and organisations do not necessarily have to have extremely strict reward and punishment policies if they want to maintain high level of work motivation among goal-oriented people. Similarly to the second hypothesis and affective commitment, the findings regarding normative commitment once more suggest that employees who work target based jobs are goal-oriented people who are not easily distracted by factors such as relationships between the colleagues and organisation's reputation as long as they can achieve their professional goal. However, although this makes them very efficient, that also could make them competitive to the level that would harm the organisation for which they work because they will tend to create a working climate where goals and competitiveness is more important than the team work, trust, or the long-term goals of the organisation.

The second hypothesis that was tested in this study stated that people of lower socio-economic status are less motivated to work target-based jobs. This hypothesis was rejected. This finding was a little bit surprising. Specifically, previous studies have shown that people prefer stable jobs and work compensations (fixed salaries) because that gives them more financial stability and makes their life more predictable (Cable & Judge, 1994). Hence it was reasonable to assume that in comparison to people of higher socio-economic status, people of lower socio-economic status would be less motivated to work target based jobs because their life is much less

stable and financially secure; hence, in that context, job targets could act as additional psychological hindrance which would lower their motivation to work. However, this study showed that that was not the case and that socio-economic status is completely irrelevant factor in target-based jobs working motivation. The answer to this peculiar finding we can find in the demographic structure of the sample used in this study. Concretely, regarding the socio-economic structure, 80 % of the sample were middle class people with the income that varied between 20<sup>th</sup> and 60<sup>th</sup> percentile of the population; hence all socio-economic groups were not equally represented in the sample. Only 4.4 % of the sample consisted of people from the lowest socio-economic class and only 2.2 % was made of people from the highest social class. Therefore, the greatest part of the variability on which the calculation of the correlation between socio-economic status and work motivation was based came from the middle social class, which could significantly distort the results.

The third hypothesis that was tested in this study stated that age is negatively correlated to extrinsic motivation in target-based job environment. This hypothesis was rejected. This finding was unexpected and is in contradiction with the findings of previous studies that showed that as the years pass by, the quality of employees' motivation significantly changes (Inceoglu, et al., 2012). Specifically, according to the previous studies, older employees tend to have significantly lower extrinsic motivation, and significantly higher intrinsic motivation (Inceoglu, et al., 2012). Hence, because job targets compensation models reinforce extrinsic motivation (for example, the more sales an employee makes the more money he will earn) it was reasonable to assume that job targets will lead to lower work motivation of older employees; however, this study showed that that was not the case. The answer to this unexpected finding we can once again find in the demographic structure of the sample. Concretely, regarding the age structure, 68 % of the sample

consisted of people that were from 22.18 to 34.18 years old. And the age range covered by the sample was only from 20 to 40. Hence, the sample consisted only of young adults with zero old and middle-aged people, and this sample did not cover the whole range of the age variable. Therefore, the variability on which the calculation of the correlation between age and work motivation was based came only from the population of young adults, which could produce a significantly distorted results in comparison to general population.

The fourth hypothesis that was tested in this study stated that age has a negative association with motivation in general in target-based job environment. This hypothesis was rejected. This finding was not expected; however, the same as with the previous hypothesis, it is highly probable that this finding is a result of the limited age range covered by this sample.

This study had a few limitations that should be taken in consideration when interpreting its findings. First, all demographic strata were not equally represented in the sample. More specifically, the sample mainly consisted of young adult, middle class, male, administrative workers with secondary level education. The other groups of people on variables age, socio-economic status, type of work, and education level were significantly less present in the sample. This lowers generalisability of the findings on the groups outside the one's dominant in this study's sample and on the general population of target-based jobs employees (Emerson, 2015).

The second limitation of this study comes from its design. Namely, this study used a correlation- regression design which does not allow causal inference. In addition, although regression and correlation can be useful for making a model foundation, for more reliable conclusions, other statistical techniques and experimental design that allow control of other third relevant variables should be applied.

The third limitation of this study emerges from the type of measures that were used. To the point, this was a survey study that used self-reported measures that are highly vulnerable to the biases such as impression management and social desirability. Unfortunately, because of the time and resource limits put onto this study other types of measures that could control for these biases (i.e. measures acquired from others, qualitative measure, and observational measures) were not applied; hence, it is highly advised to the reader of this paper to take those facts into consideration when interpreting the findings.

The fourth limitation of this study is reflected in its sampling technique. Monkey Survey platform and Facebook were used for acquiring the sample. Hence, the sample acquired for this study was a non-probabilistic, snow-ball sample. Although, snow-ball sampling can give highly reliable results in big samples (i.e. 500+ participants), in smaller ones it can significantly influence and distort the results (Emerson, 2015). In snowball sampling, researchers ask the few chosen participants to tell their friends and acquaintances about the study (i.e. put the link to the research survey on their Facebook newsfeed wall; Emerson, 2015). This method might help researchers obtain the number of participants they desire; however, the way the participants are gathered can easily influence the results by introducing unexpected or uncontrolled factors (Emerson, 2015). In snowball sampling, especially in smaller samples, all of the resultant participants will generally be from the same geographical area, they will have similar socioeconomic statuses or other demographical characteristics (Emerson, 2015). Any of these factors might have an impact on what the study is investigating. In other words, if all the participants are similar on one or more factor, it might skew the results of the study significantly (Emerson, 2015).

When we compare the findings of this study that researched motivation of target based job employees and the findings of the previous studies that researched motivation in different types of

working environment, there are some indices that working motivation of these two groups is somewhat differently regulated. In order to put that hypothesis to the test, future studies could directly compare the motivation in target-based jobs with the motivation in fixed salary jobs. For example, it is highly probable that people of different personality structure are selected for these two types of jobs and work compensation. And it would be very interesting to see the results, the impact, and the possible differences that engagement and other demographic variables have on work motivation in these two groups. In addition, it would be very interesting to determine whether one group or the other, has a higher average level of work motivation when personality and other demographic variables are controlled. Moreover, it would be interesting to investigate how type of work compensation (job targets and fixed salary) influence work performance, is there a significant difference between the two when other demographics and personality factors are controlled or the both groups are on average equally performing.

In conclusion, although previous studies indicated that people prefer job security over job insecurity, and when given a choice they will prefer fixed job compensations over flexible and performance related compensations (Cable & Judge, 1994; Danish & Usman 2010; Kuhnert, et al.; Sverke, et al, 2002), this study showed that people could also be highly motivated and highly performing in working environments that practice job targets. The most important factor that influences motivation in this type of working environment is work engagement. Hence, if a company wants to improve and maintain high motivation in employees who work target-based jobs it needs to improve their engagement. One of the efficient ways for achieving high engagement is that a company shows to its employees that it genuinely cares for them, their goals, and their achievement.

Another very important insight that came out from this research is that people who work target-based jobs are highly focused on their goals. This can be good to the certain point but after that it can transform into over competitiveness that can have many negative long-term consequences for the organisation in the long term. Over competitiveness can produce unfriendly working environment where there is very little regard for teamwork or the organisation. Hence, when making its targets model, a company must carefully observe workers' performance but also psychodynamics in the workplace and how that interacts with the adopted targets model.

The study also showed that although without a significant unique contribution to the predictive capacity of the model of work motivation in target-based jobs, continuance commitment is significantly correlated to the work motivation. Hence, there are strong indices that age and tenure play a significant role in the motivation of the employees in target-based jobs. Hence, older people who work on the higher hierarchical positions in the organisations will be more motivated to work in a target base working environment than younger people who work on lower hierarchical positions. In addition, that means that older and higher positioned workers will most probably be better performing and less resistant to higher job targets. Finally, the study showed that socio-economic status is completely irrelevant factors in the work motivation of the people who work target-based jobs.

## References

- Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *63*, 1–18.
- Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behaviour and human decision processes*, *89*(1), 947-965.
- Audia, P. G., Locke, E. A., & Smith, K. G. (2000). The paradox of success: An archival and a laboratory study of strategic persistence following radical environmental change. *Academy of Management journal*, *43*(5), 837-853.
- Susanna, B. (2006). Organizational justice. *Institute for Employment Studies, University of Sussex Campus*.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology*, *47*(2), 317-348.
- Chalofsky, N., & Krishna, V. (2009). Meaningfulness, commitment, and engagement: The intersection of a deeper level of intrinsic motivation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *11*(2), 189-203.
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: a theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(5), 834-847.
- Danish, R. Q., & Usman, A. (2010). Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation: An empirical study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(2), 159-167.
- De Cremer, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2002). How do leaders promote cooperation? The

- effects of charisma and procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 858.
- Grossman, G. M., & Helpman, E. (2015). Globalization and growth. *American Economic Review*, 105(5), 100-104.
- Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castaneda, M. B. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 79(3), 370-380.
- Emerson, R. W. (2015). Convenience sampling, random sampling, and snowball sampling: How does sampling affect the validity of research?. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 109(2), 164-168.
- Frey, B. S. (1997). A constitution for knaves crowds out civic virtues. *The Economic Journal*, 107(443), 1043-1053.
- Frey, B. S. (2012). Crowding Effects on Intrinsic Motivation!.
- Frey, B. S., & Jegen, R. (2001). Motivation crowding theory. *Journal of economic surveys*, 15(5), 589-611.
- Gagné, M. (Ed.). (2014). *The Oxford handbook of work engagement, motivation, and self-determination theory*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Van den Broeck, A., Aspel, A. K., & Halvari, H. (2015). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 178-196.
- Gasson, R. (1974). Socioeconomic status and orientation to work: the case of farmers. *Sociologia ruralis*, 14(3), 127-141.
- Greenberg, J. (2002). Who stole the money, and when? Individual and situational determinants

- of employee theft. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 985-1003.
- Inceoglu, I., Segers, J., & Bartram, D. (2012). Age-related differences in work motivation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(2), 300-329.
- Kahn, H., & Robertson, I. T. (1992). Training and experience as predictors of job satisfaction and work motivation when using computers: A correlational study. *Behaviour & information technology*, 11(1), 53-60.
- Kuhnert, K. W., Sims, R. R., & Lahey, M. A. (1989). The relationship between job security and employee health. *Group & Organization Studies*, 14(4), 399-410.
- Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty first century. *Annual Review of Psychology* 56, 485-516.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705-717.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2012). Goal setting theory. In *Motivation: Theory and research* (pp. 23-40). Routledge.
- Lockwood, N. R. (2007). Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage. *Society for Human Resource Management Research Quarterly*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Goal-setting theory of motivation. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 15(1), 1-6.
- Moshoeu, A. N., & Geldenhuys, D. J. (2015). Job insecurity, organizational commitment and work engagement among staff in an open distance learning institution. *Southern African Business Review*, 19(1), 22-43.
- Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for

- employee retention within organizations. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5(1/2), 52-63.
- Roberts, D. R., & Davenport, T. O. (2002). Job engagement: Why it's important and how to improve it. *Employment Relations Today*, 29(3), 21-29.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.
- Shin, H. W., & So, Y. (2018). The moderating role of socioeconomic status on motivation of adolescents' foreign language learning strategy use. *System*, 73, 71-79.
- Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. P. (2000). The effects of goal setting and group size on performance in a social dilemma. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 32(2), 104-116.
- Seppälä, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2009). The construct validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multi sample and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(4), 459-481.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1997). Leadership training in organizational justice to increase citizenship behaviour within a labour union: A replication. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(3), 617-633.
- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Näswall, K. (2002). No security: a meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(3), 242-264.
- Tripp, T. M., Bies, R. J., & Aquino, K. (2002). Poetic justice or petty jealousy? The aesthetics of revenge. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 966-984.
- Turillo, C. J., Folger, R., Lavelle, J. J., Umphress, E. E., & Gee, J. O. (2002). Is virtue its own

reward? Self-sacrificial decisions for the sake of fairness. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 839-865.

Whyte, G., Saks, A. M., & Hook, S. (1997). When success breeds failure: The role of self-efficacy in escalating commitment to a losing course of action. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behaviour*, 18(5), 415-432.

Wolters, C. A., & Mueller, S. A. (2010). Motivation regulation.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of management Review*, 14(3), 361-384.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Survey Cover Sheet and Contact information

I am conducting a research project in relation to the Relationship between Work Engagement, Work Motivation, Organizational Commitment, Age and Socio-Economic Status in Target Based Jobs as part of my BA undergraduate degree with Dublin Business School. Details on the survey are attached below. For additional resources and questions regarding the survey please contact me via email ([REDACTED]@mydbs.ie)

You are invited to take part in this study and participation involves completing and returning the attached consent form. While the survey asks some questions that might cause some minor negative feelings, it has been used widely in research. If any of the questions do raise difficult feelings for you, contact information for support services are included on the final page attached to the de-brief sheet afterwards.

Participation is completely voluntary and so you are not obliged to take part. Participation is anonymous and confidential. Thus responses cannot be attributed to any one participant. For this reason, it will not be possible to withdraw from participation after the questionnaire has been collected.

The questionnaires will be securely stored and data from the questionnaires will be transferred from the paper record to electronic format and stored on a password protected computer.

**Title;** The Relationship between Work Engagement, Work Motivation, Organisational Commitment, Age and Socio-Economic Status in Target Based Jobs

**Purpose of Research;** This study examines whether the Organisational Commitment and Engagement are predictors of Motivation in target based jobs, and examines the impact that age and socio economic status have on motivation levels.

*It is important that you understand that by completing and submitting the questionnaire that you are consenting to participate in the study.*

Should you require any further information about the research, please contact

The researcher, ([REDACTED]@mydbs.ie)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Appendix B: Consent Form

**The Relationship between Work Engagement, Work Motivation, Organisational Commitment, Age and Socio-Economic Status in Target Based Jobs**

I have read and understood the attached Information Leaflet regarding this study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the study with the researcher and I have received satisfactory answers to all my questions

I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason and without this affecting me

I agree to take part in the study

Please fill in your Name and the Date in order to be redirected to the survey via the survey monkey link below.

Name ; \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C: De-brief Sheet

Thank you for participating as a research participant in the present study concerning the Relationship between your Work Engagement, Work Motivation, Organisational Commitment, Age and Socio-Economic Status in Target Based Jobs

Again, I thank you for your participation in the study. If you know any friends or family who would like to take part in the study and meet the criteria please let them know. Prior knowledge of questions asked can invalidate the results. Therefore, we greatly appreciate your co-operation.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to get in contact with the researcher via email on [REDACTED]@mydbs.ie

If in the event you feel psychologically distressed by participation in this study, we encourage you to call one of the support services which we have listed on a separate sheet below that you can take with you.

Contact details for support services

Samariatans; 116 123

Samaritans SMS; 087 260 9090

## Appendix D: The Demographic Survey

Hello. I am an Undergraduate Psychology student, and I am conducting a research project for my thesis. The topic of my thesis concerns organizational motivation, engagement, and commitment, and their relationships to various demographic variables and target-based jobs. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. Nobody, except for the researcher will have access to your data. In addition, nobody will be able to identify you through your answers. Based on your pace, this survey will last from 5-10 minutes. Please read and answer all the questions, there is no time limit and you do not have to hurry. Please remember that you can revoke your participation consent and stop filling in the survey at any moment. Based on the all information presented above, do you voluntary accept participation in this study?

Yes

No

*Select your gender*

Male

Female

Other

*3. How old are you? (enter only the age number)*

*4. What is the best description of your occupation?*

I am a physical worker

My job is of administrative nature

I work at a managerial position

I am an CEO in a company

*5. Is your current job a target-based one?*

Yes

No

*6. Please enter your ethnicity.*

*7. Please enter your race.*

*8. What is the highest level of education that you acquired? w*

Primary School

- Secondary School
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree or above

9. *How would you estimate your socio-economic status?*

- I belong to the poorest 20% of the population
- I belong somewhere between 21st and 40th percentile of the population
- I belong somewhere between 41st and 60th percentile of the population
- I belong somewhere between 61st and 80th percentile of the population
- I belong somewhere between 81st and 100th percentile of the population

10. *How many hours per week you usually work?*

- 10 hours and less
- from 11 to 20 hours
- from 21 to 30 hours
- from 31 to 40 hours
- from 41 to 50 hours
- from 51 to 60 hours

11. *What is your relationship status?*

- Single
- Not in a serious relationship
- In a committed relationship
- Married
- Divorced
- Widowed

## Appendix E: Elements of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

The following 17 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, choose “0” (zero) as your answer. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by choosing the answer that best describes how frequently you feel that way

Possible responses are: Never, Almost never (a few times a year or less), Rarely (Once a month or less), Sometimes (a few times a month), Often (once a week), Very Often (A few times a week), Always (Every day).

1. At my work, I feel that I am bursting with energy
2. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose
3. Time flies when I'm working
4. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous
5. I am enthusiastic about my job
6. When I am working, I forget everything else around me
7. My job inspires me
8. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work
9. I feel happy when I am working intensely
10. I am proud of the work that I do
11. I am immersed in my work
12. I can continue working for very long periods at a time
13. To me, my job is challenging
14. I get carried away when I'm working
15. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally
16. It is difficult to detach myself from my job
17. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well

## Appendix F: Elements of Multidimensional Work Commitment Questionnaire

Organizational commitment questionnaire. Please choose the answers to the following statements in relation to the organization for which you are currently working. Choose only one answer for each statement. The possible answers are as follows: Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Neither Agree Nor Disagree, Slightly Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree.

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization
2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it
3. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one
5. I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization
6. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization
9. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up
10. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to
11. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now
12. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now
13. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire
14. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization
15. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives
16. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice ;another organization may not match overall benefits I have here
17. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
18. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization
19. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me
20. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain
21. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization
22. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization
23. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers
24. I do not think that wanting to be a 'company man' or 'company woman' is sensible anymore

## Appendix G: Elements of the The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale

Work Motivation Scale. The following statements are all possible answers to the question "Why do you or would you put efforts into your current job?". Choose one answer for each of the following statements.

The possible options are as follows: Not at All, Very Little, A Little, Moderately, Strongly, Very Strongly, Completely.

1. I don't, because I really feel that I'm wasting my time at work.
2. I do little because I don't think this work is worth putting efforts into.
3. I don't know why I'm doing this job, it's pointless work.
4. To get others' approval (e.g., supervisor, colleagues, family, clients ...).
5. Because others will respect me more (e.g., supervisor, colleagues, family, clients ...).
6. To avoid being criticized by others (e.g., supervisor, colleagues, family, clients ...).
7. Because others will reward me financially only if I put enough effort in my job (e.g., employer, supervisor ...).
8. Because others offer me greater job security if I put enough effort in my job (e.g., employer, supervisor ...).
9. Because I risk losing my job if I don't put enough effort in it.
10. Because I have to prove to myself that I can.
11. Because it makes me feel proud of myself.
12. Because otherwise I will feel ashamed of myself.
13. Because otherwise I will feel bad about myself.
14. Because I personally consider it important to put efforts in this job.
15. Because putting efforts in this job aligns with my personal values.
16. Because putting efforts in this job has personal significance to me.
17. Because I have fun doing my job.
18. Because what I do in my work is exciting.
19. Because the work I do is interesting.