



FPCEUC FACULDADE DE PSICOLOGIA
E DE CIÊNCIAS DA EDUCAÇÃO
UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA



Master's Project in Work, Organizational, and Personnel Psychology

Name: Aline Fatturi Rodrigues	E-mail: a.fatturi.rodrigues@gmail.com
Home University: Universidade de Coimbra	Home Tutor: Prof. Dr. Leonor Pais Prof. Dr. Nuno Rebelo dos Santos Prof. Dr. Lisete Monico
Host University: Universitat de València (Estudi General)	Host Tutor: Prof. Dr. Vicente Martinez Tur

Decent Work, Work Motivation and Orientation to Happiness: a profile analysis

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to investigate the differences between profiles of Orientation to Happiness in the effect of two dimensions of Decent Work (Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities) on Work Motivation. Fulfilling and Productive work refers to work that allows for a sense of contribution to future generations and personal/professional development. Opportunities refers to the possibility of growth, development and fair earnings at work. Work Motivation, as defined by Self-Determination Theory, can be differentiated in distinct types of motivation: extrinsic, introjected, identified and intrinsic. Happiness was examined in three dimensions (Pleasure, Engagement and Meaning), thus creating the notion of Orientations to Happiness. It was expected that the two dimensions of Decent Work would have a higher positive impact on Work Motivation (intrinsic and identified work motivation) according to different profiles of Orientation to Happiness. Three instruments were applied (Orientation to Happiness Questionnaire, Decent Work Questionnaire, and Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale) to 850 workers from Portugal. Our results corroborate earlier findings that demonstrated a strong relation between Decent Work and Work Motivation. The results also show that there is differential impact of the two dimensions of Decent Work on Autonomous types of Work Motivation according to workers Orientation to Happiness for some profiles but not all. The results of this study call for a need to adapt Human Resources policies, practices and strategies to workers approach to happiness and need of fulfillment.

Key words: Decent Work, Work Motivation, Orientation to Happiness, cluster analysis

INTRODUCTION

Decent Work was first introduced by the International Labor Organization in their 87th session as the converging focus of all its four strategic objectives: the promotion of rights at work; employment; social protection; and social dialogue (ILO, 1999). It was defined as “opportunities for women and men to obtain decent and productive work in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity” (ILO, 1999, p.3).

Building on this general definition of Decent Work, Ferraro, Pais, Dos Santos and Moreira (2016) developed a psychological measure of DW referring to a work and labor context that allows workers to have a fulfilling and productive activity, with prospects of both professional and personal development, opportunities for work that provides fair income, is productive, respects health and safety conditions and does not allow for child or forced labor. It involves respect and acceptance, freedom for people to express their concerns, organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives, work-life balance and gender equality. For the purposes of this study, this is the definition and measure to be adopted in this research as it not only includes the more general and broader definition presented by ILO, but also encompasses very measurable constructs already well established in the field of Work, Organizations and Personnel Psychology (WOP-P), such as Orientation to Happiness and Work Motivation, both of interest to this study.

One of the most researched and current theories on Work Motivation is *Self-Determination Theory* (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Van den Broeck, Ferris, Chang & Rosen, 2016). This theory conceptualizes work motivation as multiple distinguishable facets, each representing a different form of behavioral regulation, and assumed to follow a continuum of self-determination (Gagné & Deci, 2005).

Gagne and Deci (2005), in a review of the literature on SDT and work motivation explain such multidimensional conceptualization of the construct has detailed how motivation which is dependent on separable consequences (extrinsic) can become based in importance (autonomous motivation) and that both are related to performance, satisfaction, trust, and well-being in the workplace.

Work motivation is a construct which depends on both internal and external variables (Gagne, Forest, Vansteenkiste, Crevier-Braud & Van den Broeck, 2015) and it is our hypothesis that Decent Work will predict the several dimensions of employees' work motivation and such prediction differs based on the employee's Orientation to Happiness. We base this hypothesis on the studies conducted by Ferraro, Pais, Moreira and dos Santos (2017a) that show Decent Work positively correlates with work engagement. As previous studies have already shown that work motivation and work engagement are strongly positively correlated as well (Howard, Gagné, Morin & Van den Broeck, 2016; Putra, Cho & Liu, 2015; Masvaure, Ruggunan & Maharaj, 2014), it seems plausible to assume that the presence of Decent Work would be a predictor of more autonomous Work Motivation.

In fact, one of the main contributions of this study is the deepening of the understanding of Decent Work as a psychological construct aligned with the ILO's central concept relevant for sustainable development (Anker, Chernyshev, Egger, Mehran & Ritter, 2003). We also contribute to the enrichment of the nomological network of Decent Work (Ferraro et al, 2016) as well as attempt to bridge a long-argued gap between science and practice in the organizational field (Buckley, Ferris, Bernardin & Harvey, 1998) due to the very applicable dimensions of Decent Work and Work Motivation to the daily concerns of Human Resources (Ferraro et al., 2017a) and employee's well-being.

Although research on happiness and well-being has increased over the past 10 years, there are still gaps in our knowledge pertaining to how people can become happier and live more productive and positive lives (Ross, 2016). Therefore, understanding happiness and how people become successful is an important endeavor in Psychology. Peterson, Park, and Seligman (2005) theory of Orientations to Happiness (OTH) further develops the components of happiness as part of subjective well-being. Orientation to Happiness is a three-dimensional interpersonal construct, namely: pleasure (the continuous search for maximum pleasure at the lowest cost possible); engagement (the psychological state that follows the accomplishment of highly involving tasks); and meaning (the accomplishment of activities with meaning and that produce self-development; Peterson et al., 2005).

Even though studies of happiness in organizations have become more common in recent years (Fisher, 2010), they are often related to job satisfaction, engagement, well-being at work and work engagement (Rothmann, 2013). When paired with motivation, the most common investigations relate engagement with intrinsic motivation (Bakker, 2001; Massarela & Winterstein, 2009; Schernoff, Csikszentmihalyi, Schneider & Schernoff, 2014) and Pleasure (or hedonic states) with extrinsic motivation (Howard et al., 2016). Fisher (2010) argues that there is a need of understanding happiness in organizational contexts with a more holistic approach, either in transient or person level. The current study takes ownership of such holistic approach, by comparing groups of individuals with different orientations to happiness. It is also extremely relevant to study different orientations to happiness in an organizational context as it has been suggested to have an impact on productivity, health, collectivism and safety (Rothmann, 2013).

Each of the dimensions of Orientation to Happiness can be analyzed separately. They differentiate how individuals approach day-to-day challenges and life decisions (Peterson et al. 2005). To better accommodate the intricacies and significant differences with which

workers can be affected in their Work Motivation by Decent Work based on how they are oriented in happiness, cluster analysis will be applied. The analysis in clusters has been referred in the literature as a “holistic, interactionist view in which the individual is seen as an organized whole, functioning and developing as a totality” (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997) and as a person-centered approach (Moran, Diefendorff, Kim & Liu, 2012). It is a statistical method of classification which aims an empirical analysis of subjects according to their likeness in behavioral patterns, which will then focus on such similarities for future analysis (Punj & Stewart, 1983). Although the use of cluster analysis has been criticized on the literature (Clayworthy, Buick, Hankins, Weinman & Horne, 2005) it has been long defended that the very act of classification is at the core of science (Kemeny, 1959). Such analytic approach to happiness is, to the best of our knowledge, fairly new as it differentiates subjects according to patterns and perceptions and searches to avoid overgeneralizations as well as bridge the gap between nomothetic and idiographic approaches (Clatworthy et al., 2005). That is, it allows researchers to better understand individuals by grouping them with other subjects who are like-minded or like-structured (Clayworthy et al., 2005).

We aim to study Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities as determinant variables to Work Motivation according to worker’s Orientation to Happiness. Measuring the way one perceives happiness allows us to distinguish individuals according to their preferences and what is worthy for them (Peterson et al., 2005; Ross, 2016). Considering these dispositional differences, which imply different reactions to the outward aspect of the world (Grimm, Kemp & Jose, 2014), we can expect individuals will experience differently the dimensions of Decent Work in their Work Motivation according to their Orientation to Happiness.

WORK MOTIVATION

Motivation can be defined as the “energetic forces that initiate behavior and determine its form, direction, intensity and duration” (Pinder, 2008, p.11). For a long time, it was studied primarily as a single concept with focus being placed at the overall amount of motivation people have for certain activities and behaviors (Deci & Ryan, 2008). It has been studied in the most varied contexts, such as sports, education, social, personality, organizations, amongst others (Kanfer, 1990). In the field of organizations, it has been linked to employee productivity, task identification, leadership and rewards (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) as a well-supported macro theory of human motivation (Howard et al., 2016) addresses issues such as personality development, universal psychological needs, energy, vitality, nonconscious processes, culture, affect, behavior, social environments, well-being, life goals and aspirations (Deci & Ryan, 2008). It comprises a multidimensional conceptualization of motivation and maintains that distinct types of motivation have different catalyzers, concomitants and consequences (Deci, Olafsen & Ryan, 2017).

There are three main categories of motivation in STD: *amotivation*, *extrinsic* and *intrinsic* (Gagne et al., 2015), which are assumed to follow a continuum of self-determination (Howard et al., 2016). Amotivation is defined as the absence of motivation towards an activity. Extrinsic motivation is the type of motivation where the engagement in activities/tasks happens because of instrumental reasons, such as receiving rewards, avoiding punishment or criticism, reaching a personal goal or value or boosting self-esteem (Howard et al., 2016; Gagne et al., 2015). STD also divides extrinsic motivation into different subtypes, due to its diversity in instrumental reason (Gagne et al., 2015). Therefore, extrinsic motivation can be completely noninternalized (*external regulation*), where the activity is performed to obtain rewards or avoid punishments. Additionally, the authors also differentiate

external regulation into material external regulation (defined by the motivation based on the search for material reward and punishment) and social external regulation (defined by the motivation based on the search of social rewards and avoidance of social punishments) (Gagne et al., 2015). It can be *introjected*, meaning the behavior is regulated because of internally pressuring forces, such as ego, shame and guilt. The third subtype of extrinsic motivation is called *identified regulation*, in which the individuals have personally identified with the importance or value of their work roles and behaviors (Gagne et al., 2015). The main difference between intrinsic motivation and identified regulation is the inherent satisfaction present in intrinsic motivation and the instrumental value present in identified regulation (Gagne et al., 2015). Finally, in the end of the continuum is intrinsic motivation, which occurs when an individual performs an activity or a task because it is interesting and/or enjoyable for itself (Gagne et al., 2015).

The continuum of motivation can be also separated into two bigger groups called *autonomous motivation* and *controlled motivation*¹ (Deci & Ryan, 2005). When individuals are engaged in an activity with a full sense of volition, willingness and choice, they are autonomously motivated (Deci, Olafsen & Ryan, 2016). Autonomous motivation includes both intrinsic motivation and the types of motivation in which people have identified with activities' value, in that case, integrated and identified regulation (Deci & Ryan, 2008). This composite has been found to yield the most desired behaviors, attitudes and affect (Gagne et al., 2015). Controlled motivation is the merging of external and introjected regulation and when people are controlled they usually experience pressure to think, feel or behave in a particular way (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Gagne et al., 2015).

¹This grouping of the different types of motivation into autonomous and controlled motivation is present both in the first model and in the last model (Deci, Olafsen, & Ryan, 2016)

In WOP-P, STD has been studied in many distinct aspects. When related to matters of workplace health, autonomous motivation has been proven to reduce burnout, work exhaustion (Grant, Nurmohamed, Ashford & Dekas, 2011), turnover (Fernet, Austin & Vallerand, 2012) as well as increase work satisfaction, work commitment (Trépanier, Fernet & Austin, 2013) and performance (Kuvaas, 2009). Leaders who were perceived as being transformational leaders usually promoted autonomous work motivation (Graves, Sarkis & Zhu, 2013; Wang & Gagné, 2013). When paired with leadership aspects, supervisors who supported autonomous motivation yielded positive work outcomes, such as greater engagement, work performance, psychological well-being, lesser amounts of exhaustion, ill-being and turnover (Liu, Zhang, Wang & Lee 2011; Williams, Halvari, Niemiec, Sorebo, Olafsen & Westbye, 2014; Nie, Chua, Yeung, Ryan & Chan, 2015; Hon, 2012).

Previous studies have already shown that there is a complex impact of Decent Work on Work Motivation in knowledge workers (Ferraro et al, 2017). All dimensions of Decent Work predicted Work Motivation, but this prediction seems to be stronger and more consistent concerning amotivation (negatively influenced by all Decent Work dimensions) and intrinsic motivation (positively influenced by all Decent Work dimensions; Ferraro et al., 2016). The analysis of the predictive impact of Decent Work on Work Motivation can be further explained with the inclusion of other measures, as is the case of Orientation to Happiness, which is expected to affect the way Decent Work impacts on Work Motivation.

It is our aim in this study to add to the current body of scientific knowledge on Work Motivation by hypothesizing that there is a difference on the impact of the dimensions of Decent Work on Work Motivation, specifically on the Autonomous types according to a person's Orientation to Happiness: pleasure, meaning and engagement, which will be looked at more closely on the next section.

ORIENTATION TO HAPPINESS

The concept of happiness can have different meanings: it may be conceptualized as wellness or as a component of “subjective well-being” (Martin-Krumm, Kern, Fontayne, Romo, Boudoukha & Buniwell, 2015); it can be translated as positive emotions, such as joy or it can integrate a broader reality than simply experiencing such emotions and include mental health, having good social relations and how satisfied one is with life (Martin-Krumm et al., 2015). Humanity has always been concerned with happiness and its study can be traced back to Aristotle and Aristippus, who attempted not only to define the concept but also to demonstrate how it can be achieved (Ryan & Deci, 2001). The result of such attempts fostered the advent of two distinct (and yet overlapping) perspectives to happiness: *hedonism* and *eudemonia*.

According to Peterson et al. (2005), Hedonism was first elaborated by Epicurus (342-270 BC) and reflects the view that happiness consists in the search for *pleasure* and how to maximize it. Such approach to happiness is still present in current theories of psychology, namely hedonic psychology (Kahneman, Diener & Schwarz, 1999) and can be expressed in the wide use of expressions such as “Don’t worry, be happy” (Peterson et al., 2005). Such a concept of happiness has been used in interventions widely by psychologists: savoring and reminiscing, counting one’s blessing, writing down three good things that happened in the day were all proven actions that increased pleasure for at least six months after they were done (Vella-Brodrick, Park, & Peterson, 2009)

On the other side of the spectrum, eudaimonism can be traced to Aristotle (384-322 BC) and entails the belief that happiness is fulfilling or realizing one’s true nature, cultivating it and then living in accordance to it (Peterson et al., 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Such a proposition has influenced many modern psychological theorists including Deci and Ryan (2005), authors

of the self-determination theory which serves as theoretical support for this research regarding Work Motivation. Underlying to eudaimonism is the idea of *meaning* or rather developing what is best within oneself and then using these skills to something greater than life itself (Peterson et al., 2005; Martin-Krumm et al., 2015; Park, Peterson & Ruch, 2009). It is important to notice that eudaimonic pursuits are associated not with a 'better' form of happiness but simply a higher level of happiness (Kashdan, Biwas-Diener & King, 2008) and that it is possible to find immediate hedonistic happiness in eudaimonic pursuits (Huta & Ryan, 2010). Huta and Ryan (2010) also point out that hedonic and eudaimonic perspectives are not distinct because they conceive of different types of well-being states or outcomes but rather because they have altogether different targets: eudaimonism focuses its approach to happiness on outcomes indicative of a good life, such as vitality, intimacy, health, and sense of meaning whereas hedonism focuses on life satisfaction, autonomy, wealth and the pursuit of maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain. The foci of eudaimonic research are to specify what living well entails and to identify the expected consequences of such living.

For a long time in the study of happiness such different points of view – eudaimonism against hedonism - have been conducted separately, with each side playing off the merits of the other (Peterson et al., 2005). However, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) has suggested a third approach to happiness based on the concept of 'flow', an integral part of the third type of Orientation to Happiness that Peterson et al. (2005) interpret as *engagement*. Flow can be defined as a state in which people are "so intensely involved in an activity that nothing seems to matter; the experience is so enjoyable that people will continue to do it even at great cost, for the sheer sake of doing it" (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, p.4). In such a state, time passes very quickly, all sense of self is lost and the aftermath of the experience is very enjoyable and invigorating (Peterson et al, 2005).

Flow is such a powerful state that can transform mundane tasks into invigorating ones (Schueller & Seligman, 2010) and as so doesn't necessarily relate to tasks that are enjoyable in themselves; in fact, flow is non-emotional and even unconscious and therefore the joy related to it is the aftermath of such a state (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Peterson et al., 2005). Flow has been argued to significantly overlap with both hedonism (pleasure) and eudaimonia (meaning) as it can occur in states that lead to personal growth (Waterman, 1993) but it is also experienced in less meaningful and virtuous activities like playing video games (Hsu & Lu, 2004). Because flow is associated with both hedonism and eudaimonia but is also distinct from them, it has been identified as the third component of Orientation to Happiness (Peterson et al., 2005). It is important to note that the flow state does not necessarily result in a subjective experience of happiness or meaning in the moment, but that the experience of engagement is predictive of greater well-being at a later point in time (Huta & Ryan, 2010). Many authors have further studied the relationships of all three pathways to happiness of Peterson et al. (2005). Park et al (2009) have studied the orientation to happiness of more than 24,000 participants from 27 different nationalities and could see that, regardless of nationality, orientations to meaning and engagement were more predictive of life satisfaction than an orientation to pleasure. A similar finding was present in a study comparing samples from the US and Australia (Vella-Brodrick et al., 2009). The authors showed that for the Australian sample engagement predicted life satisfaction and for the US sample engagement and meaning were both strong predictors of life satisfaction.

In a study using data from the World Values Survey and the European Values Survey, Inglehart, Foa, Peterson and Welzel (2008) showed that after a country reaches a certain level of economic security and overall quality of life (such as public safety and health care access), money stops being central to people's happiness and concepts such as freedom of choice, tolerance of gender equality, religious differences, democracy and different sexual

orientations become more predictive of SWB. In fact, the authors concluded that elevated levels of prosperity had a high impact on life satisfaction but not on happiness (Inglehart et al., 2008).

In the field of WOP-P, happiness has been proven to increase when linked to flexicurity (Havenstone, 2011), work life-balance (Pollit, 2008), motivation for work (Gagne & Deci, 2005), business ethics (Clydesdale, 2015), workplace safety (Dickison-Swift, Fox, Marshall, Welch & Willis, 2014), mental health at the workplace (Ford, Shallcross, Mauss, Floerke & Gruber, 2014) and transformational leadership (Vicent-Höper, Muser & Janneck, 2012). It has been connected to job performance (Martinez-Martí & Ruch, 2017), productivity (Oswald, Proto & SgROI, 2013), financial rewards (Park, Min & Chen, 2015) and work performance (Shany & Kaplan, 2014). Considering that the main dimensions of Decent Work approached in this study comprise aspects related to motivation for work, business ethics, rewards, job performance and productivity, we expect that they will be strongly affected by one's orientation to happiness. Moreover, we hypothesize that the relation of all the constructs mentioned above will have an impact on work motivation depending on the participants orientation to happiness. In the next section, we hope to make this relation clearer.

DECENT WORK

The International Labor Organization (ILO) first introduced Decent Work as a concept in 1999, at the 87th session of the International Labor Conference meeting (ILO, 1999). The concept of Decent Work was formulated by the ILO's constituents – governments and employers' and workers' organizations – to identify the Organization's priorities and reform and modernize its approach for the 21st Century (ILO, 2008). In 2011, The European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP) gathered to discuss Decent

Work and its current state and expressed “the intention to contribute through research and professional practice to the achieving the objective of striving Decent Work for all” (EAWOP, 2011). Decent Work is composed by four notions that guide the strategic objectives of Decent Work: employment, worker’s rights, social protection and social dialogue (Ferreira et al., 2016).

ILO (2008) established the Decent Work Agenda that introduced the ILO Framework Work Indicators, composed by 10 key elements that are to be ensured for Decent Work to exist: employment opportunities, adequate earnings and productive work, decent working time, combining work, family and personal life, work that should be abolished, stability and security of work, equal opportunity and treatment in employment, safe work environment, social security and social dialogue, employers’ and workers’ representation. More recently, based on this framework of indicators, Ferraro et al. (2016) developed an instrument after collecting data from 1675 knowledge workers from Brazil and Portugal and found that, from a worker’s perspective, psychological Decent Work can be explained and measured through 7 dimensions: fundamental principles and values at work, adequate working time and workload, fulfilling and productive work, meaningful retribution for the exercise of citizenship, social protection, opportunities and health and safety.

Fundamental principles and values at work are related to the principles that base Decent Work and form its foundations, such as justice, freedom, dignity, clarity of norms, fair treatment, acceptance without discrimination, trust and solidarity. *Adequate working time and workload* is related to work-life balance; *fulfilling and productive work* is related to work as a contribution to future generations, that creates value for the organization the society and costumers, to the work that “makes sense” for the employee and that the work is dignifying; *meaningful remuneration for the exercise of citizenship* relates to the financial rewards generated by the work being done that allows a life of dignity and autonomy with the

perception of fairness on what is being earned. *Social protection* refers to worker's secured protection in case of illness or loss of work; *opportunities* expresses employability, entrepreneurship and future perspectives either in the form of a promotion or development of abilities and skills. Finally, *health and safety* relates to the perception of being protected from risks of harm while performing work activities and a safe workplace environment (Ferraro et al., 2016).

Ferraro et al. (2016) also found moderate correlations between Decent Work, work engagement and burnout. Whenever Decent Work was high, so was work engagement and the participants reported the less burnout. The authors proved that the items that more strongly correlated to burnout were *adequate working time and workload* and *fundamental principles and values at work*, and that work engagement and its sub factors were strongly correlated to *fulfilling and productive work*. Ferraro, Pais, Moreira and dos Santos (2017a) in a study with knowledge workers from Brazil and Portugal found that a decent work context predicts more autonomous types of Work Motivation, specifically Identified Regulation and Intrinsic Motivation, and that this relationship is mediated by Psychological Capital. In a more recent study Ferraro et al (2017b) found that in a sample of 343 Portuguese lawyers there is a strong positive association between Fullfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities with Identified and Intrinsic Work Motivation.

Finally, Ferraro et al (2016) were able to prove that even though Decent Work is a global construct that encompasses many distinct aspects of a worker's professional context, it is possible to select the dimensions of Decent Work that best fit the design of the study being conducted. The authors point out that three of the dimensions of Decent Work have shown to be specially related and of interest when studied in relation to other psychological constructs, such as Work Motivation: Fulfilling and Productive Work, Fundamental Principles and Values at Work and Opportunities in this order (Ferraro et al, 2016; Ferraro et al, 2017a).

Based on this relevance of the core variables of Decent Work, the present research is particularly focused on investigating in more detail the impact of Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities on Work Motivation according to the different profiles of Orientation to Happiness. The dimension of Fundamental Principles and Values at Work was left out because we consider it to be permeated by the individuals own personal values – which are not the focus of this research - and it is very likely that the experience and perception of the worker regarding this dimension be heavily influenced by such personal values.

The exploration of how Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities can be studied in WOP-P is presented in the next sections.

Fulfilling and Productive Work

The dimension of Fulfilling and productive Work in the Decent Work Questionnaire developed by Ferraro et al (2016) is related to work that contributes to personal and professional fulfillment and development of the individual as well as of future generations, that creates value not only for the organization but also for costumers and/or society and the acknowledgement that the employee carries out a worthwhile job. This dimension of psychological Decent Work is related to three of the eleven Substantive Elements established by ILO (2008): Employment opportunities, Adequate earnings and productive work and Economic and social context for work. These aspects refer back to several constructs that have been studied extensively in the field of organization psychology, namely: job satisfaction, work performance, productivity and work motivation (Ferraro et al, 2016).

From a WOP-P approach, there are many aspects that promote job satisfaction and work performance (Martinez-Martí & Ruch, 2017) including Happiness (Oswald, Proto & Sgroi,

2015) and Work Motivation (Ferraro et al, 2017a). Regarding job satisfaction, Deci, Olafsen and Ryan (2017) used a SDT perspective and stated that motivation is an antecedent of productivity and that the satisfaction of the basic psychological needs influences job satisfaction positively. Judge, Weiss, Kammeyer-Mueller and Hulin (2017) and Kanfer, Frese and Johnson (2017) showed in reviews of the literature on work motivation in the past 100 years that not only it is related to job satisfaction and productivity, it is also related to job design and personal satisfaction. Oswald et al (2015) used three different methodologies to study the relation between happiness and productivity. They found that, regardless of the methodology used (be it a questionnaire, lab conducted experiment or task designed assignment) happiness was strongly related to productivity and intrinsic motivation. Olafsen, Halvari, Forest and Deci (2015) affirmed that it's been consistent in literature of different social settings that Autonomous types of motivation enhance performance and productivity, specifically on more heuristic activities. Grant, Nurmohamed, Ashford and Dekas (2011) also proved that for workers who scored high in autonomous motivation the positive relationship between personal initiative and objective indicators of productivity was higher than for those on controlled motivation. Therefore, considering all the definitions presented so far and previous studies conducted using the constructs included in this research our hypothesis for Fulfilling and Productive work are as follows:

H1: In Full life profile Fulfilling and Productive Work has a stronger effect on Self-Determined types of work motivation (intrinsic, identified and introjected) than in Empty Life Profile.

H1a: In Full life profile Fulfilling and Productive Work has a stronger effect on introjected work motivation than in Empty Life Profile.

H1b: In Full life profile Fulfilling and Productive Work has a stronger effect on identified work motivation than in Empty Life Profile.

H1c: In Full life profile Fulfilling and Productive Work has a stronger effect on intrinsic work motivation than in Empty Life Profile.

According to Reiss (2004) pleasure is a common characteristic of Intrinsic Motivation. This viewpoint holds that people are motivated to engage in activities they expect to experience as pleasurable because as Deci and Ryan (2008) put it, when people are intrinsically motivated, they experience interest and enjoyment, they feel competent and self-determined, they perceive the locus of causality for their behavior to be internal, and in some instances, they experience motivation arising from the enjoyment of an activity itself. Furthermore, Waterman (2005) states that it is very possible to find pleasure and life satisfaction through activities – including ones that are work related – that involve a balance of challenges and skills, are viewed as personally important, and where the person can see possibilities of performing well. In other words, it is likely that a worker who feels challenged and who sees the value in putting effort in work related activities will find happiness in the form of hedonistic pleasure. Considering such points of view, it is possible to formulate the following hypothesis:

H2: In Life of Pleasure profile Fulfilling and Productive Work has a stronger effect on Self-Determined types of work motivation than in Life of Meaning and Engagement profile.

H2a: In High Life of Pleasure Profile Fulfilling and Productive Work has a stronger effect on introjected work motivation than in Life of Meaning and Engagement profile.

H2b: In High Life of Pleasure Profile Fulfilling and Productive Work has a stronger effect on identified work motivation than in Life of Meaning and Engagement profile.

H2c: In High Life of Pleasure Profile Fulfilling and Productive Work has a stronger effect on intrinsic work motivation than in Life of Meaning and Engagement profile.

Opportunities

The dimension of Opportunities encompasses employability, professional development and/or a future perspective in which received remuneration, income or benefits are received

accordingly (Ferraro et al, 2016). This dimension of Decent Work is related to three of the eleven Substantive Elements established by ILO, of which two are the same as in Fulfilling and Productive Work: Employment opportunities, Adequate earnings and productive work and Stability and security of work (Ferraro et al, 2016).

In a study with 1456 American full-time employees, Landry, Kindlein, Trépanier, Forest and Zigarmi (2016) found that the outcomes associated with aspiring to accumulate money depended on one's motive for doing so. More specifically, if people's motives for pursuing wealth were more integrated and thus were more need-satisfying and less need-frustrating, the aspiration was positively associated with well-being and negatively with ill-being. However, if the motives were less integrated and thus were less need-satisfying and more need-frustrating, the aspiration was positively associated with ill-being and negatively associated with well-being.

Sheldon and Krieger (2014) identified large samples of private-firm lawyers who had high paying jobs within money-focused firms (e.g., doing securities-related work) and public-service lawyers who had jobs focused on serving the public (e.g., doing sustainability-related work for nonprofit organizations). As one would expect, those lawyers in the money-focused jobs had greater extrinsic aspirations relative to the public service group. They also had much larger annual incomes, suggesting they were getting what they valued. Nonetheless this money-focused group reported greater negative affect, lower subjective well-being, and more alcohol consumption compared to a group of public service attorneys. Here, evidence shows that even a successful focus on the attainment of extrinsic goals does not reliably yield more happiness or well-being. Based on this knowledge our hypothesis regarding Opportunities are as follows:

H3: In Full life profile Opportunities has a stronger effect on Self-Determined types of work motivation (intrinsic, identified and introjected) than in Empty Life Profile.

H3a: In Full life profile Opportunities has a stronger effect on introjected work motivation than in Empty Life Profile.

H3b: In Full life profile Opportunities has a stronger effect on identified work motivation than in Empty Life Profile.

H3c: In Full life profile Opportunities has a stronger effect on intrinsic work motivation than in Empty Life Profile.

Silla, De Cuyper, Gracia, Peiró and de Witte (2009) showed that job insecurity, which implies uncontrollability and feelings of powerlessness, is related to poor well-being, decrease in employee's mental health and in more extrinsic types of work motivation. Weiss et al. (1999), in a study with 24 managers who recorded for 16 days their feelings towards job security throughout their days and which tasks were being performed showed that the hedonic dimension of affect is influenced by perceived threat to job stability and continuous employment. We can therefore hypothesize that for individuals with a greater hedonistic orientation, the effect of Opportunities in more Self-Determined types of Work Motivation will be stronger than for those with a lesser hedonistic orientation as being appropriately compensated for work would bring a lot of pleasure to individuals and would also allow for the pursuit of other pleasurable activities outside of the work environment. This reasoning is better explained in the hypothesis below:

H4: In High Life of Pleasure Profile Opportunities has a stronger effect on Self-Determined types of work motivation than in Life of Meaning and Engagement profile.

H4a: In High Life of Pleasure Profile Opportunities has a weaker effect on introjected work motivation than in Life of Meaning and Engagement profile.

H4b: In High Life of Pleasure Profile Opportunities has a weaker effect on identified work motivation than in Life of Meaning and Engagement profile.

H4c: In High Life of Pleasure Profile Opportunities has a weaker effect on intrinsic work motivation than in Life of Meaning and Engagement profile.

METHOD

Participants

To be eligible to volunteer for this study, the participants had to be currently employed for at least 6 months as well as 3 months of contact with a direct supervisor or manager. Retired personnel, self-employed workers or unemployed individuals were not accepted as part of the sample.

This study had a sample consisted of 850 Portuguese participants, where 57% of participants being female and 43% male, varying from 18 to 69 years old ($M=39$; $SD=11.8$; see Table 1). The majority of participants were of workers from the private sector (70.7%), with 27% of workers being from the public sector, and only 1% of workers from both sectors. Most participants (52%) had a salary between 501€ and 1000€ and worked in companies that hired between 10 and 50 employees (39%). They worked mostly without effective contract (62.2%) as seen in Table 1, with 30% working with contract and 5% working as a service providers.

Table 1 - Descriptive Statistics - Sociodemographic

Sample	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Gender				
Male	357	42	-	-
Female	476	56	-	-
Missing	17	2	-	-
Age	844	-	39.4	.41
Missing	6			
Years of work	811	-	11.38	.370
Missing	39			

DW AND WK: ORIENTATION TO HAPPINESS PROFILES

Sample	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Education				
ISCED* levels 1 and 2 (≤ 9 years of educ)	214	25	-	-
ISCED level 3 (12 years of educ)	289	34	-	-
ISCED level 4 (15/16 years of educ)	173	20	-	-
ISCED level 5 (17/19 years of educ)	156	18	-	-
ISCED level 6 (PhD)	7	0.8	-	-
Missing	11	1.3	-	-
Types of employment contract				
Sole trader (payment by invoice)	43	5.1	-	-
Contractual	254	30	-	-
Tenure	533	63	-	-
Missing	20	2.4	-	-
Holding Management / Leadership role				
184	184	22	-	-
Size of organizations				
Very small (<10)	102	12	-	-
Small (10-50)	328	39	-	-
Medium (51-250)	196	23	-	-
Medium-large (251-500)	65	7.6	-	-
Large (500-1000)	42	4.9	-	-
Very large (>1001)	100	12	-	-
Missing	17	2	-	-

Instruments

Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (Gagné et al., 2015; MWMS, Portuguese version, dos Santos, Mónico, Pais, Gagné, Forest, Cabral, & Ferraro, 2016): a 19 item-scale grouped into 5 factors representing intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, external regulation as a second order factor where social approach and social avoidance are combined into a first order factor and material approach and material avoidance are combined into the other first order factor and finally, amotivation. Integrated regulation is not included as a subscale since it was found to be statistically inseparable from identified and intrinsic motivation subscales. Participants are asked to answer the question “Why do you do or would put efforts into your current job?” using a scale of 1 (nothing) to 7 (completely).

After assessing the model fit using modification indices higher than 60, we decided to correlate the errors associated with the variables within factor 3 in model 2 which improved

the model fit (Table 2). The fit indices obtained were NFI = .94; SRMR = .05; TLI = 94; CFI = .95; $\chi^2/df = 4.334^{***}$ (df = 138) $p < .001$; RMSEA = .06 and were deemed acceptable.

Table 2 - Fit indices obtained in the confirmatory factor analysis of the Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS).

Model	NFI	SRMR	TLI	CFI	χ^2/df	RMSEA	RMSEA Confidence Interval 90%
1	.920	.056	.917	.932	5,959*** (df = 140)	.076	.071-.081*
2	.942	.052	.944	.955	4,334*** (df = 138)	.063	.058-.068*

** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

The overall scale demonstrated good internal consistency as well as all factors, as seen on Table 3 and Cronbach’s alphas for Amotivation, External Regulation, Material, Social, Introjected Regulation, Identified Regulation, Integrated Regulation, and Intrinsic Regulation were .88, .85, .87, .83, .81, .87, and .92 respectively.

Table 3 - Composite Reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE) and Cronbach’s alpha, and descriptive statistics for the Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale

	CR	AVE	<i>A</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Global Scale	-	-	.840	-	-
F1: <i>Amotivation</i>	.886	.723	.882	1.55	1.09
F2: <i>External Regulation</i>	.703	.543	.853	3.36	1.51
F2.1: <i>Social</i>	.871	.694	.869	2.92	1.69
F2.2: <i>Material</i>	.843	.645	.833	3.81	1.81
F3: <i>Introjected Regulation</i>	.792	.493	.809	4.65	1.53
F4: <i>Identified Regulation</i>	.882	.715	.874	5.60	1.38
F5: <i>Intrinsic Regulation</i>	.921	.796	.916	4.68	1.60

Decent Work Questionnaire (Ferraro, Pais, Dos Santos, & Moreira, 2016): a 31-item questionnaire divided into 7 factors measuring fundamental principles and values at work, adequate working time and workload, fulfilling and productive work, meaningful retribution for the exercise of citizenship, social protection, opportunities and health and safety.

Participants answer the statements using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 stands for ‘don’t agree at all’

and 5 stands for ‘completely agree’. For the DWQ, in our model 1, the quality of global fit for the factorial models was obtained through Normed of fit index (NFI), showing a desirable value of .860. The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), by presenting a value < .08 (.065), has revealed an appropriate adjustment per Brown (2006). In model 1 Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) had a score of .877, which couldn’t be considered acceptable. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) also wasn’t deemed acceptable (.887) since it is below the target of .90 determined by Bentler (1990). The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) has revealed to be an indicative of an acceptable adjustment since its value is .065, as defined by Kline (2011), Schumacker e Lomax (1996) and Morôco (2011). These results then led to Model 2, which resulted in a more acceptable model fit, as seen in Table 4.

Table 4 - Fit scores obtained in confirmatory factorial analysis for the Decent Work Questionnaire (DWQ)

Model	NFI	SRMR	TLI	CFI	χ^2/df	RMSEA	RMSEA Confidence Interval 90%
1	.860	.069	.877	.887	4,566*** (df = 427)	.065	.062-.068*
2	.873	.064	.890	.900	4,175*** (df = 425)	.061	.058-.064*

** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Composite Reliability indices for all factors were also satisfactory (see table 5), as they were higher than .70 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2008). In extracted variance, only the factors *Principles*, *Fulfilling* and *Opportunities* were below .50 which per Bagozzi and Yi (1988) is an acceptable value for extracted variance, indicating the presence of convergent reliability between the items of each factor (Fornell & Lacker, 1981), whereas all the other factors showed variance extracted above .50.

Table 5 - Composite Reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE). Cronbach’s alpha, and descriptive statistics for the Decent Work Questionnaire

	CR	AVE	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Global Scale	-	-	.936	3.21	0.66
F1: <i>Principles</i>	.846	.481	.842	3.45	0.88

F2: <i>Time/Load</i>	.809	.517	.802	3.07	0.88
F3: <i>Fulfilling</i>	.803	.455	.807	3.67	0.76
F4: <i>Retribution</i>	.901	.698	.892	2.89	1.03
F5: <i>Social Protection</i>	.826	.546	.819	2.64	0.97
F6: <i>Opportunities</i>	.766	.457	.755	3.16	0.92
F7: <i>Health and Safety</i>	.842	.573	.842	3.33	0.96

Orientation to Happiness Questionnaire (Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005; *OHQ*, Portuguese version, Siurana, N. A. S., Bosch, J. L. C., Pais, L., dos Santos, N. R., & Mónico, L. (2017): an 18-item measure of the different strategies that individuals use to promote well-being (Peterson et al., 2005). These items tap three pathways: pleasure (i.e., ‘I go out of my way to feel euphoric.’), engagement (i.e., ‘I seek out situations that challenge my skills and abilities.’), and meaning (‘In choosing what to do, I always take into account whether it will benefit other people.’). Participants respond to each item on a 5-point scale that rates whether each item is characteristic of their behavior (‘1 - very much unlike me’ through ‘5 - very much like me’). Through a confirmatory factorial analysis, seven items (1, 2, 3, 9, 11, 16, 18) with factorial loadings < .50 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) were deleted, with the three dimensions of engagement, pleasure, and meaning being maintained. After such adjustments, we correlated the errors associated with the variables within factors 2 and 3 in model 2 based on the modification indices higher than 12. This covariation between the errors showed specific characteristics of the respondents, non-random measurement errors, sequential positioning in the instrument, as well as the similarity of the items (Aish & Jöreskog, 1990). The results for the confirmatory factor analysis can be seen on Table 6.

Table 6 - Fit indices obtained in the confirmatory factor analysis of Orientation to Happiness Scale

Model	NFI	SRMR	TLI	CFI	χ^2/df	RMSEA	RMSEA Confidence Interval 90%
1	.802	.058	.798	.826	6.569*** (df = 132)	.801	.076-.086*
2	.934	.038	.926	.947	4.572*** (df =39)	.065	.055-.075*

** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

The quality of the fit improved significantly as seen on Table 2. Based on the criteria presented above, the indices indicated that the model fitted the data well with good NFI, SRMS, TLI, and CFI indices and acceptable indices for χ^2/df and RMSEA. The standardized regression weights of this model ranged from .469 to .738 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The global scale showed good internal consistency estimated by Cronbach Alpha (Table 7) and Factors 1 and 2 proved to have satisfactory internal consistency. Factor 3 hasn't showed satisfactory internal consistency.

Table 7. Composite Reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE). Cronbach's alpha, and descriptive statistics for the OH Scale

	CR	AVE	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Global Scale	-	-	0.85	3.50	0.66
F1: <i>Meaning</i>	.70	.37	.70	3.57	0.76
F2: <i>Pleasure</i>	.70	.37	.71	3.51	0.77
F3: <i>Engagement</i>	.57	.31	.62	3.40	0.77

Procedures

The questionnaires were administered individually by Psychology students from the University of Coimbra and University of Évora in December 2016 and January 2017, as part of their course in Research Methodology in each university. Each student was asked to hand in at least three questionnaires filled in by a worker who fit the minimum criteria mentioned above. Appropriate training was provided by the professors during class, both regarding ethical standards and technical procedures. After reviewing and signing an informed consent,

the participants would then answer a questionnaire containing the scales mentioned above. The expected answer time was of 25 to 30 minutes. To ensure confidentiality, the questionnaires and the informed consent were stored separately in the archives of the university.

Data Analysis

All the analyses were completed using the statistical program SPSS and AMOS 22.0 (Arbuckle, 2013), the last one being used specifically for confirmatory factorial analysis, and estimation method by maximum likelihood (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2004). Outliers were analyzed according to Mahalanobis squared distance (Tabachnick & Fidell 2007) and the normality of the variables was assessed by the coefficients of skewness (Sk) and kurtosis (Ku).

Goodness of fit was analyzed by the indexes of Normed of fit index (NFI, where good fit > .80; Schumacker & Lomax, 2010), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR, with appropriate fit < .08; Brown 2006), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI, where appropriate fit > .90; Brown 2006), χ^2 (where $p > .05$, but irrelevant if $N > 500$; Bentler 1990; Schumacker and Lomax 1996), Comparative fit index (CFI, where good fit > .90; Bentler 1990) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA, where good fit < .05; Kline 2011; Schumacker and Lomax 1996). The fit of the model was improved using modification indices (MI; Bollen 1989), which led to the correlation of the residual variability between variables with $MI > 90$ ($p < .001$). Model fit improvement was evaluated by the modification indices (MI; Bollen, 1989). We also considered liberating parameters with higher MI and opted to follow Arbuckle's proposal (2013) of analyzing the MIs by their statistical significance ($\alpha < 0.05$).

Reliability was calculated by Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally, 1978), where reliability coefficients higher than .70 were considered acceptable for convergence and reliability (Hair, Anerson, Tatham & Black, 2008). In general, the value of .80 was analyzed as a good reliability indicator. Finally, composite reliability and average variance extracted for each factor were evaluated as described in Fornell and Larcker (1981).

Cluster analyses were performed for the Orientation to Happiness dimensions after the descriptive statistics and intercorrelation matrix through the TwoStep procedure for continuous variables, leading to a classification of the participants into groups. The TwoStep Clustering Component is a scalable cluster analysis algorithm designed to handle large datasets, which automatically determines the ideal number of clusters within a data set that would otherwise not be apparent (Bollen, 1989). The distance measure was calculated by the Log-Likelihood method and the classification of clusters was done using the Schwarz's Bayesian Criterion (Marôco, 2011).

The data was then analyzed through a multivariate analysis of variance (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2008), fulfilling the required assumptions for the reliable use of this test, which were independence of observations, normality of distribution within each group with $n < 30$ observations² and homogeneity of error variances³. Considering the results obtained, Pillai's Trace was then used due to its powerful statistic procedure and very robust performance in cases of modest violations of normality and equality of the covariance and variance matrix [(Box's $M = 189.26$, $F(147, 76469.54) = 1.23$, $p = .03$)].

² There was normality of distribution for all variables of the MWMS except for amotivation

³ Assumption evaluated by Levene's test of equality of error variances. The error variance was equal across groups for the dependent variables Introjected Regulation and Intrinsic Motivation ($p > .001$).

Since the independent variable had three levels (Alferes, 1997), Post-hoc Tukey HSD tests for multiple comparisons were performed where a significance level of $p = .05$ for Type I error for all the analyses was considered. Effect sizes of correlations (low, medium, or high correlations) were classified according to Cohen (1988) and the magnitude of the experimental effect was obtained by calculating eta squared (η^2) measure (Howell, 2013).

RESULTS

First, a correlation analysis was performed to ascertain how the various constructs and variables included in this research interact together. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8 - Correlation matrix between OH, MWMS, *Fulfilling And Productive Work*, Opportunity and sociodemographic variables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Meaning (1)	1	.56**	.60**	-.08**	.02	.04	.2**	.3**	.29**	.37**	.15**	.01	.17**	.03
Pleasure (2)		1	.66**	.03	.07	.15**	.22**	.18**	.21**	.22**	.23**	-.07*	-.09**	.04
Engagement (3)			1	-.03	.03	.06	.25**	.26**	.31**	.30**	.26**	-.03	-.01	.10**
Amotivation (4)				1	.22**	.09*	-.05	-.24**	-.26**	-.29**	-.13**	-.06	.00	-.03
Sociall (5)					1	.88**	.37**	.08*	.03	-.02	.01	-.03	-.02	-.16**
Materiall (6)						1	.33**	.08*	.03	-.01	.12**	-.12**	-.14**	-.17
Introjected Regulation (7)							1	.05	.02	.23**	.02	.10**	.08*	,
Identified Regulation (8)								1	.37**	.46**	.09*	.14**	.10**	.12**
Intrinsic Motivation (9)									1	.58**	.28**	.10**	.07	.14**
FPW (10)										1	.42**	.03	.07*	.16**
Opportunities (11)											1	-.23**	-.27**	.05
Gender (12)												1	.12**	.12**
Age (13)													1	-.20**
Education (14) a														1

**p < .001 *p < .005 ^a Spearman correlation

As was expected after reviewing the literature available and presented in the first section of this paper, Orientation to Happiness can be correlated to Work Motivation, specifically for types of motivation that are on the more self-determined side of the *continuum*, namely Introjected and Identified Regulations and Intrinsic Motivation albeit with a weak loading per Cohen (1988) definition of statistical power. The correlations between all three dimensions of

Orientation to Happiness and FPW and Opportunities were also statistically significant, with the highest loadings being present in the correlation between FPW and Engagement (.30).

It is also interesting to notice that FPW and Opportunities correlated negatively with Amotivation but correlated positively with *Identified regulation* and *Intrinsic motivation*. Indeed, it is with Intrinsic motivation that we found the strongest correlation (.58) which is in accordance with the literature. *Extrinsic Material motivation* correlated positively with *Opportunities*, albeit with a weak loading (Cohen, 1988) which was excepted after the review of Self-Determination Theory literature presented in the beginning of this paper.

Definition of Orientation to Happiness profiles

For each dimension of Orientation to Happiness, two clusters were defined differentiating high and low values using the TwoStep procedure (Marôco, 2011). We found a low pleasure cluster ($n = 460$, $M = 2.94$) and a high pleasure cluster ($n = 390$, $M = 4.19$) in Pleasure, a low engagement cluster ($n = 321$, $M = 2.61$) and a high engagement cluster ($n = 529$, $M = 3.89$) in Engagement and a low meaning cluster ($n = 444$, $M = 2.99$) and a high meaning cluster ($n = 406$, $M = 4.22$) in Meaning. All clusters showed satisfactory quality, as their silhouette measure of cohesion and separation was higher than .5 (Table 9).

Participants were analyzed individually to check in which clusters each of them belonged to. Afterwards, the profiles were created by combining the clusters of Low and High in each of the three dimensions of the Orientation to Happiness, resulting in the extraction of a total of eight different profiles (Table 9). This decision was made because of the presence of individuals who scored high in only a one cluster and low in others, requiring the extraction of new clusters (from here onwards called “profiles”) to improve accuracy.

Table 9 - Clusters Sizes, means, and description of Orientation to Happiness Profiles
Clusters.

DW AND WK: ORIENTATION TO HAPPINESS PROFILES

			Pleasure	Engagement	Meaning	<i>n</i>	%
Clusters	Low	Size	54.1% (<i>n</i> = 460)	37.8% (<i>n</i> = 321)	52.2% (<i>n</i> = 444)	-	-
		Mean	2.94	2.61	2.99	-	-
	Input Importance		1.00	1.00	1.00	-	-
	High	Size	45.9% (<i>n</i> = 390)	62.2% (<i>n</i> = 529)	47.8% (<i>n</i> = 406)	-	-
		Mean	4.19	3.89	4.22	-	-
	Input Importance		1.00	1.00	1.00	-	-
Average Silhouette		.07 (good quality)	.07 (good quality)	.07 (good quality)	-	-	
Profiles	Life of Pleasure		High	Low	Low	26	3
	Life of Engagement		Low	High	Low	104	12
	Life of Meaning		Low	Low	High	48	6
	Full Life		High	High	High	243	29
	Empty Life		Low	Low	Low	220	26
	Life of Meaning and Engagement		Low	High	High	88	10
	Life of Pleasure and Meaning		High	Low	High	27	3
	Life of Pleasure and Engagement		High	High	Low	94	11
	Total					850	100.00

As shown in Table 9, the profiles established according to different the different orientations to happiness were: (1) Life of Engagement, constituted of workers with high scores in orientation to engagement and low scores in orientation to pleasure and orientation to meaning. The individuals included in this cluster are those who constantly seek activities that will allow them to be engaged, completely focused and involved (*n* = 104, 12% of sample); (2) Life of Pleasure, constituted of workers with high scores in orientation to pleasure and low scores in orientation to engagement and orientation to meaning. These are individuals who search for happiness through the continuous search for pleasure and avoidance of pain (*n* = 26, 3% of sample); (3) Life of Meaning, made of workers with high scores in orientation to meaning and low scores in both orientation to pleasure and orientation to engagement. The

individuals included in this cluster are those who feel extreme happiness when the task or activity being pursued aligns to their basic values and integrated meaning (or the search for) in what they do ($n = 48$, 6% of sample); (4) Life of Meaning and Engagement, constituted of workers with high scores in orientation to meaning and orientation to engagement and low score in orientation to pleasure. These are individuals who look for meaning and for a state of flow but do not necessarily seek immediate pleasure ($n = 88$, 10% of sample); (5) Life of Pleasure and Meaning, made up of workers with high scores in orientation to meaning and orientation to pleasure but low scores in orientation to engagement. These individuals look for meaning and immediate pleasure/reward in what they do but do not feel the need to be engaged in activities ($n = 27$, 3% of the sample); (6) Life of Pleasure and Engagement, which includes the participants with high scores in both orientation to engagement and orientation to pleasure and low score in orientation to meaning, being described as the individuals who look for immediate pleasure/reward as well as for activities that will engage them but that pay less attention to the value of the activity ($n = 94$, 11% of the sample); (7) Full Life, where the members of this cluster are those workers with high scores in all orientation to happiness, classifying them as the happiest of all profiles ($n = 243$, 29% of sample); (8) and Empty Life, which includes the workers with low scores in all orientation to happiness, being described as the individuals with the lowest levels of subjective and psychological well-being ($n = 220$, 26% of the sample).

Differences in Work Motivation between Orientation to Happiness profiles

The analysis of multivariate test indicates that the overall effect is statistically significant between Work Motivation and the Orientation to Happiness profiles (Pillai's Trace = .182, $F(147, 76469.54) = 3.76, p < .001$), although with a low effect size, $\eta^2 = 0.03$. When we consider the profiles in their specificity, we find differences between all the dimensions of MWMS, except for External Motivation – Material.

Through the Tukey HSD multiple comparison tests, we notice that there were statistically significant differences in the dimensions of the MWMS between some profiles, such as Amotivation, with a difference between the Pleasurable Life, Engaged Life, Full Life, Empty Life, and Meaningful and Engaged Life (Table 11).

Table 10 - Average Scores and Standard Deviations of the MWMS: Multivariate Analysis of Variance (F Ratios) and Effect Size (η^2)

MWMS	Pleasurable Life (n = 26)		Engaged Life (n = 104)		Meaningful Life (n = 48)		Full Life (n = 243)		Empty Life (n = 220)		Meaningful and Engaged Life (n = 88)		Meaningful and Pleasurable Life (n = 27)		Engaged and Pleasurable Life (n = 94)		F (7, 842)	η^2
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Amotivation	2.40	1.47	1.56	1.05	1.62	1.13	1.43	1.02	1.53	1.06	1.40	1.05	1.55	1.20	1.73	1.12	3.35**	.027
Ext. Mot – Social	3.17	1.48	3.00	1.65	3.27	1.72	3.02	1.86	2.71	1.55	2.56	1.53	2.92	1.55	3.15	1.76	1.81	.015
Ext. Mot – Material	3.87	1.39	3.83	1.61	3.78	1.63	4.01	2.00	3.62	1.70	3.28	1.85	4.48	1.91	4.09	1.75	2.78**	.023
Introjected Regulation	4.40	1.40	4.56	1.41	4.70	1.46	5.11	1.55	4.10	1.54	4.74	1.45	4.67	1.27	4.79	1.47	7.83***	.061
Identified Regulation	4.90	1.40	5.54	1.37	5.65	1.07	6.10	1.20	5.13	1.46	5.86	1.37	5.87	0.90	5.36	1.43	10.99***	.084
Intrinsic Motivation	3.80	1.81	4.60	1.46	4.36	1.43	5.38	1.49	4.12	1.53	4.97	1.48	4.59	1.54	4.48	1.69	13.72***	.102

** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 10 – Differences between MWMS according to Orientation to Happiness Profiles: Post Hoc – Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Profile	(J) Profile	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Amotivation	Life of Pleasure	Life of Engagement	.83*	.24	.011	.11	1.55
		Full Life	.97*	.22	.000	.29	1.64
		Empty Life	.86*	.22	.003	.18	1.54
		Life of Meaning and Engagement	.99*	.24	.001	.26	1.75
Material	Life of Pleasure	Full Life	-.74*	.22	.023	-1.42	-.06
		Life of Pleasure and Engagement	-.82*	.27	.045	-1.63	-.01
Introjected Regulation	Empty Life	Full Life	-1.01*	.14	.000	-1.43	-.59
		Life of Meaning and Engagement	-.64*	.19	.017	-1.21	-.07
		Life of Pleasure and Engagement	-.69*	.18	.005	-1.25	-.13
Identified Regulation	Life of Meaning and Engagement	Life of Pleasure	.96*	.30	.028	.06	1.86
		Empty Life	.73*	.17	.000	.22	1.24
	Full Life	Life of Engagement	.57*	.16	.008	.09	1.03
		Life of Pleasure	1.20*	.27	.000	.37	2.03
		Empty Life	.97*	.12	.000	.59	1.35
		Life of Meaning and Engagement	.74*	.16	.000	.25	1.23
Intrinsic Motivation	Full Life	Engaged Life	.77*	.18	.000	.23	1.32
		Life of Meaning	1.02*	.24	.001	.29	1.75
		Life of Pleasure	1.58*	.31	.000	.63	2.54
		Empty Life	1.25*	.14	.000	.82	1.69
		Life of Meaning and Engagement	.90*	.19	.000	.34	1.46
		Life of Pleasure	1.17*	.34	.014	.14	2.21

	Life of Meaning and Engagement	Empty Life	.84*	.19	.000	.26	1.43
--	--------------------------------	------------	------	-----	------	-----	------

*p<0.05

Work Motivation predicted by Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities

To produce more accurate analysis, we added to our regression models the controlling variables of gender, age and education based on the previous research of Teo, Lim & Lai (1999) and Howard, Gagné, Morin, and Van den Broeck (2016).

Hierarchical regression analysis were run within each profile to verify the impact of Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities on Work Motivation. The results can be seen below.

Table 12 - Results of Linear Regression of Amotivation predicted by Fulfilling and Productive Work

Amotivation	Life of Engagement		Life of Meaning		Life of Pleasure		Full Life		Empty Life		Life of Meaning and Pleasure		Life of Engagement and Meaning		Life of pleasure and Engagement	
	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	B	t	β	t
FPW	-.18	-1.87	-.28	-1.93	-.67	-	-1.46	-2.29*	-.25	-3.79***	-.51	-2.29*	.25	-2.39*	-.54	-6.04**
						4.39**										
						*										
	$R=.18, R^2=.03, \Delta R^2=.03$		$R=.28, R^2=.08, \Delta R^2=.08$		$R=.67, R^2=.45, \Delta R^2=.42$		$R=.15, R^2=.02, \Delta R^2=.00$		$R=.25, R^2=.07, \Delta R^2=.00$		$R=.51, R^2=.26, \Delta R^2=.26$		$R=.26, R^2=.07, \Delta R^2=.06$		$R=.54, R^2=.29, \Delta R^2=.29$	
	$R^2_{aj}=.02, SE=1.04$		$R^2_{aj}=.06, SE=1.10$		$R^2_{aj}=.02, SE=1.12$		$R^2_{aj}=.02, SE=1.01$		$R^2_{aj}=.06, SE=1.03$		$R^2_{aj}=.23, SE=1.06$		$R^2_{aj}=.05, SE=1.03$		$R^2_{aj}=.28, SE=.95$	
	$F(1,102)= 3.49$		$F(1,46)= 2.21$		$F(1,24)= 19.29***$		$F(1,241)= 5.26*$		$F(1,218)= 14.32***$		$F(1,25)= 8.67**$		$F(1,86)= 5.73*$		$F(1,92)= 36.89***$	

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

As seen on Table 8, Amotivation doesn't correlate significantly with any of the control variables added to this study, and therefore they weren't included in the regression analysis presented in Table 12. The results show that there is significant prediction of Fulfilling and Productive Work on Amotivation for the profiles of Life of Pleasure (45%), Full Life (2%), Empty Life (7%), Life of Meaning and Pleasure (26%), Life of Engagement and Meaning (7%) and Life of Pleasure and Engagement (29%). There was no significant effect of Amotivation on Opportunities for any of the profiles and therefore it is not present on the table. It is interesting to notice that for all profiles the predictions were negative, which indicates a reduction on the dependent variable.

For Social Extrinsic Motivation, we controlled level of education, based on the intercorrelations obtained and shown on Table 8. The results for this regression model can be seen on Table 13. For this type of regulation, we found significant effects of Fulfilling and Productive Work on Social Extrinsic Motivation for the profile of Full Life (5%) only. However, this effect was not corroborated by the results on the ANOVA. There was also no significant effect of Social Extrinsic Motivation on Opportunities for any of the profiles.

Table 13 - Results of Linear Regression of Social Extrinsic Motivation predicted by Fulfilling and Productive Work

Social	Life of Engagement		Life of Meaning		Life of Pleasure		Full Life		Empty Life		Life of Meaning and Pleasure		Life of Engagement and Meaning		Life of pleasure and Engagement	
	β	T	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	B	t	β	t
Level of Education	-.10	-1.03	-.27	-1.90	.15	.73	-.22	-	-.11	-1.55	-.37	-2.01	.09	.36	.17	1.50
FPW	.13	1.27	-.06	-.40	-.44	-2.29	-.03	.54	-.09	-1.27	-.02	-.12	.17	1.50	-.18	-1.68
	$R=.16, R^2=.03, \Delta R^2=.02$		$R=.28, R^2=.08, \Delta R^2=.00$		$R=.15, R^2=.21, \Delta R^2=.19$		$R=.21, R^2=.05, \Delta R^2=.00$		$R=.13, R^2=.02, \Delta R^2=.00$		$R=.37, R^2=.14, \Delta R^2=.00$		$R=.19, R^2=.04, \Delta R^2=.03$		$R=.18, R^2=.03, \Delta R^2=.03$	
	$R^2_{aj}=.01, SE=1.65$		$R^2_{aj}=.04, SE=1.70$		$R^2_{aj}=.14, SE=1.34$		$R^2_{aj}=.04, SE=1.84$		$R^2_{aj}=.00, SE=1.55$		$R^2_{aj}=.07, SE=1.50$		$R^2_{aj}=.01, SE=1.52$		$R^2_{aj}=.01, SE=1.76$	
	$F(2,99) = 1.34$		$F(2,45) = 1.86$		$F(2,22) = 2.93$		$F(2,235) = 5.83$		$F(2,216) = 2.02$		$F(2,24) = 1.95$		$F(2,83) = 1.50$		$F(2,91) = 1.44$	

* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities also didn't present statistically meaningful results in Material Extrinsic Motivation for any of the profiles of Orientation to Happiness and therefore the table for this data is not included in this study.

However, Introjected Regulation showed to be predicted by both Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities after the control variables of Age and gender were added to the model. Opportunities predicted 15% of the variance on Introjected Regulation on the profile of Life of Engagement, 12% on the profile of Full Life and 17% on the profile of Life of Engagement and Meaning. Fulfilling and Productive Work explained 15% on the variance of Introjected Regulation on the profile of Life of Engagement, 4% on the Full Life profile and 16% on the profile of Life of Engagement and Meaning. These results are shown on Table 14.

Table 14 - Results of Linear Regression of Introjected Regulation predicted by Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities

Introjected	Life of Engagement		Life of Meaning		Life of Pleasure		Full Life		Empty Life		Life of Meaning and Pleasure		Life of Engagement and Meaning		Life of pleasure and Engagement	
	β	<i>T</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Gender	.27	2.82*	-.04	-.30	.12	.55	.01	.19	.12	1.74	-.20	-1.00	.32	3.86*	.19	1.75
Age	.16	1.69	-.04	-.29	-.32	-1.42	.19	3.00**	-.05	-.70	.10	.48	.10	.90	.07	.68
FPW	.22	2.27*	.16	1.04	.08	.34	.29	4.50***	.06	.82	.26	1.30	.23	2.12*	.08	.74
	<i>R</i> =.39, <i>R</i> ² =.15, ΔR^2 =.05 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.13, <i>SE</i> =1.34 <i>F</i> (3,94) = 5.67***		<i>R</i> =.16, <i>R</i> ² =.15, ΔR^2 =.02 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.04, <i>SE</i> =1.48 <i>F</i> (3,44) = .41		<i>R</i> =.30, <i>R</i> ² =.03, ΔR^2 =.00 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.04, <i>SE</i> =1.34 <i>F</i> (3,21) = .69		<i>R</i> =.34, <i>R</i> ² =.04, ΔR^2 =.00 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.01, <i>SE</i> =1.50 <i>F</i> (3,237) = 10.16***		<i>R</i> =.14, <i>R</i> ² =.02, ΔR^2 =.00 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.01, <i>SE</i> =1.54 <i>F</i> (3,213) = 1.37		<i>R</i> =.33, <i>R</i> ² =.11, ΔR^2 =.07 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.01, <i>SE</i> =1.27 <i>F</i> (3,23) = .95		<i>R</i> =.40, <i>R</i> ² =.16, ΔR^2 =.05 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.13, <i>SE</i> =1.38 <i>F</i> (3,78) = 4.93*		<i>R</i> =.23, <i>R</i> ² =.05, ΔR^2 =.02 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.02, <i>SE</i> =1.47 <i>F</i> (3,89) = 1.60	
Opp	.06	.47	-.38	-.215*	.08	.25	-.05	-.64	-.13	-1.52	.34	1.38	-.09	-.73	-.25	-2.00*
	<i>R</i> =.39, <i>R</i> ² =.15, ΔR^2 =.00 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.13, <i>SE</i> =1.34 <i>F</i> (4,93) = 4.27***		<i>R</i> =.39, <i>R</i> ² =.16, ΔR^2 =.10 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .04, <i>SE</i> =1.43 <i>F</i> (4,43) = 1.49		<i>R</i> =.30, <i>R</i> ² =.12, ΔR^2 =.00 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.10, <i>SE</i> =1.37 <i>F</i> (4,20) = .51		<i>R</i> =.34, <i>R</i> ² =.12, ΔR^2 =.00 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.10, <i>SE</i> =1.47 <i>F</i> (4,236) = 7.70***		<i>R</i> =.17, <i>R</i> ² =.03, ΔR^2 =.01 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.01, <i>SE</i> =1.54 <i>F</i> (4,212) = 1.61		<i>R</i> =.43, <i>R</i> ² =.18, ΔR^2 =.07 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .03, <i>SE</i> =1.25 <i>F</i> (4,22) = 1.21		<i>R</i> =.41, <i>R</i> ² =.17, ΔR^2 =.01 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.12, <i>SE</i> =1.38 <i>F</i> (4,77) = 3.80**		<i>R</i> =.30, <i>R</i> ² =.09, ΔR^2 =.04 <i>R</i> ² _{aj} =.05, <i>SE</i> =1.44 <i>F</i> (4,88) = 2.25	

p*≤0.05; *p*≤0.01; ****p*≤0.001

Table 17 – Comparison of regression coefficients for Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities

Regression Coefficient		B		Mean	
Full Life X Empty Life		Full Life	Empty Life	Full Life	Empty Life
FPW - Amotivation	t (461) = 1.48	-.20	-.34	1.43	1.53
FPW - Social	t (461) = 2.97***	.09	-.19	3.02	2.71
FPW– Introjected Reg.	t (461) = 8.61***	.59	.12	5.11	4.10
FPW– Identified Reg.	t (461) = 0.90	.79	.71	6.19	5.13
FPW– Int. Mot.	t (461) = 3.15	1.20	.95	5.38	4.12
OPP - Amotivation	t (461) = .81	.01	-.06	1.43	1.54
OPP - Social	t (461) = .34	.03	-.00	3.02	2.71
OPP – Introjected Reg.	t (461) = 1.44	-.08	-.21	5.11	4.10
OPP – Identified Reg.	t (461) = .84	-.15	-.22	6.10	5.13
OPP – Int. Mot.	t (461) = 1.53	.14	.02	5.38	4.12

		B		Mean	
Life of Pleasure X Life of Meaning and Engagement		Life of Pleasure	Life of Meaning and Engagement	Life of Pleasure	Life of Meaning and Engagement
FPW - Amotivation	t (112) = -4.61***	-1.37	-.31	2.40	1.41
FPW - Social	t (112) = -5.46***	-.88	.35	3.17	2.56
FPW– Introjected Reg.	t (112) = -1.29	0.15	0.44	4.40	4.74
FPW– Identified Reg.	t (112) = 1.68*	1	0.68	4.89	5.86
FPW– Int. Mot.	t (112) = 2.49**	1.53	1.13	3.79	4.96
OPP - Amotivation	t (112) = .49	.02	-.06	2.40	1.41
OPP - Social	t (112) = 1.99**	.57	.13	3.17	2.56
OPP– Introjected Reg.	t (112) = 1.13	.11	-.14	4.40	4.74
OPP– Identified Reg.	t (112) = 1.36	.28	.01	4.89	5.85
OPP– Int. Mot.	t (112) = 3.89***	.67	.04	3.79	4.96

*p≤0.05; **p≤0.01; ***p≤0.001

As seen above, the comparison of the regression coefficients between the dichotomic profiles of Full Life X Empty Life are significant for Social Extrinsic Motivation and Introjected Motivation only for Fulfilling and Productive Work and not significant for Opportunities in any type of Work Motivation. For the dichotomic comparison of the profiles of Life of Pleasure and Life of Meaning and Engagement, the only result that wasn't statistically significant was for Introjected Regulation for Fulfilling and Productive Work. When it comes to Opportunities the comparison between the profiles of Life of Pleasure and Life of Meaning and Engagement are significant for Social Extrinsic Motivation and for Intrinsic Motivations. These results are discussed in the section below.

DISCUSSION

Based on the all the data analyzed, it is now possible to discuss the theoretical approaches presented in the beginning of this study as well as verify which hypotheses are supported. As Ferraro et al (2017b) had already shown, there is a strong correlation between Autonomous types of Work Motivation and the dimensions of *Fulfilling and Productive Work* and *Opportunities* included in Decent Work.

In the comparison between the effects of Fulfilling and Productive Work on intrinsic, identified and introjected work motivation we can say that hypothesis H1a is supported based on the statistically significant comparison of regression coefficients shown in Table 16. The data presented supports the assumption that for individuals who are more introjected motivated, the effect of contextual variations related to Fulfilling and Productive Work – namely the creation of value for all stakeholders involved in the organizational environment including society in general, the acknowledgement that the job being conducted is worthwhile, and the connection between work and personal and professional development – will be stronger for those who have a Full Life in comparison to those who have an Empty Life dispositional Orientation to Happiness.

As mentioned in the beginning of this study, introjected people engage in an activity due to guilt or compulsion or to maintain their self-worth (Koestner & Losier, 2002). In this case the regulation is within the person but is a relatively controlled form of internalized extrinsic motivation and can be strongly related to feelings of self-worth (Gagne & Deci, 2005). For people who live a happy, Full Life there is still an internalized external component to the impact of work that is productive and fulfilling and a placement of Work Motivation on how others perceive them.

It is interesting to notice however, that for Identified and Intrinsic Motivations there was no significant difference for the impact of *Fulfilling and Productive Work* for those on the Full Life and Empty Life profiles (H1b and H1C not supported). This might be because as Ferraro et al (2017b) have already concluded, the association between Fulfilling and Productive Work and Autonomous Motivation is so strong that happiness dispositional differences have no significant role when compared to each other.

In the comparison of the effect of FPW on Self-Determined types of Work Motivation for the dichotomic profiles of Life of Pleasure and Life of Meaning and Engagement, hypothesis H2a was not supported because the comparison of the effect of FPW on the Introjected Regulations was not significant. Such findings might indicate that for those who are pleasure oriented there is no motivation in being productive when an underlying aspect of external control and judgement is considered. This would be equivalent to not being able to find hedonistic rewards to work and would probably result in amotivation and disengagement. However, hypothesis H2b and H2c are supported. This shows that for those participants who were more pleasure oriented, the impact of FPW on autonomous types of Work Motivation was stronger than for those who were more meaning and engagement oriented.

As Gagne & Deci (2005) and Laundry et al (2016) had already shown, the basic psychological need for autonomy underlies intrinsic forms of motivation, meaning that people need to feel competent and autonomous to maintain their intrinsic motivation. Reiss (2004) states that when autonomy is combined with high effort placed in enjoyable activities (those that are challenging, make effective use of a person's skills set and allow for a perception of high productivity and performance) individuals report increased levels of hedonic happiness. If we extrapolate Reiss (2004) statement based on the data found in this study to all individuals who are Life of Pleasure oriented, then it is possible to conclude that for them, the act of working becomes a great source of pleasure in itself and the impact of

Fulfilling and Productive Work on Autonomous work motivation will be felt in a stronger manner than for those on the other side of the happiness spectrum, namely Life of Engagement and Meaning.

Hypothesis H3a, H3b and H3c were not supported as the comparison of the impact of Opportunities on Introjected, Identified and Intrinsic Work Motivation did not seem to be differentiated for people who are Full Life oriented or Empty Life oriented. DeCuyper et al. (2009) found in their study that situational job uncertainty was not related to the hedonic dimension of satisfaction with life, nor was it to the eudaimonic dimensions of self-acceptance, environmental mastery, purpose in life, autonomy and personal growth. Considering their findings and the results obtained in this study, it would be possible that individuals in the Full Life profile would not find their happiness pursuits enabled by financial compensation and job stability, but also meaning and a feeling of contributing to society. However, more research would be needed on this topic to be able to verify this argument.

Hypothesis 4a and 4b were also not supported. A possible explanation for such result would be that as Ferraro et al (2017b) have shown, the association of Opportunities and Introjected and Intrinsic Work Motivation is so strong that dispositional differences for individuals in the Life of Pleasure and Life of Meaning and Engagement profile have no impact when compared to each other. It is interesting to notice that that the comparison between the effects of Opportunities on Intrinsic Motivation on people who are more oriented to a Life of Pleasure is stronger than that of people who are more oriented to a Life of Meaning and Engagement. That is because there is a lot of pleasure and reward to be found in receiving adequate pay for work that satisfies the basic psychological need of feeling competent and autonomous. Not only that but the certainty of employment and that the pursuit of other

activities that bring pleasure outside of the work context can also add another layer of hedonic happiness and Intrinsic Motivation if a person is highly pleasure oriented.

When analyzing all four hypotheses supported in this study it is possible to observe two overarching themes to them: firstly, hedonistic pursuits influence the impact of Decent Work dimensions on Autonomous Motivation to a greater extent than other types of subjective and psychological well being dispositions. Such findings have great implication for current Human Resources policies and personnel development, as well as job design, job crafting, career planning and recruitment strategies. They imply that in order to leverage the full potential and productivity at work of those employees who are highly oriented to a Life of Pleasure it is extremely important to consider how and where one can find enjoyable, challenging and rewarding activities in the work context. It requires thinking and adapting the work according to what is important to them and being curious about what triggers pleasure and autonomy in those workers.

Secondly, and on a more ‘eagle-eyed’ approach to our conclusions, our findings point out that creating conditions which allow workers to give meaning to the tasks at hand, have a sense of appreciation from the organization and feel that are contributing to a bigger project that have intrinsic meaning is extremely important. These findings shine a stronger light on the importance of communicating organizational values, mission and objectives and debating them with employees, aligning personal objectives with those of the organization and ensuring that leadership is ready to be the conduit of these messages. In that way, the variables of Decent Work analyzed in this study are a good starting point to the construction of strategic and successful Human Resources policies.

LIMITATIONS AND RECCOMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Decent Work is the opportunity for productive work in which rights are protected, adequate income is generated, and sufficient social protection is provided. More than just a job, Decent Work provides the means necessary for every man and woman throughout the world to prosper and have a dignified and fulfilling life (ILO, 2008). From a WOPP perspective, empirical research of Decent Work and its dimensions is still on pilot stages. This study intended to contribute to the development of the construct and to further contribute to ILO's Decent Work framework and ultimately, to its agenda as well.

This research provides empirical evidence that highlights the significant impact of the Decent Work dimensions of Fulfilling and Productive Work and Opportunities on Work Motivation, especially for the self-determined types according to workers subjective well-being and dispositional differences. The significant sample of the study and the cluster methodology applied implicate on very practical information that can be used in different settings of organizations aiming the promotion of future contributions to the next generations, workers well-being and, ultimately, to a more sustainable and inclusive business model.

As mentioned previously in this paper, one of the limitations of this study is the choice of analyzing only two dimensions of Decent Work. Future research will verify if the results and conclusions presented here are consistent throughout all dimensions of Decent Work.

Another limitation of this study is its cross-sectional characteristics. Future research, with a longitudinal design that included different data collection points could provide a clearer and better comprehension of the causal mechanisms and variations of all dimensions of Decent Work on Work Motivation and the role different Orientation to Happiness play on this relationship.

One component that was not controlled in this study and that could impact future research findings is contextual and cultural factors. The sample for this study constituted of only Portuguese workers and data was collected when the country was on its first steps out of a big economical recession. Future research could focus on the role of cultural characteristics on subjective well being.

REFERENCES

Aish, A., & Jöreskog, K. (1990). A panel model for political efficacy and responsiveness: An application of LISREL 7 with weighted least squares. *Quality and Quantity*, 19, 716-723.

Alferes, V. R. (1997). *Investigação científica em psicologia: Teoria e prática*. Coimbra: Almedina.

Anker, R., Chernyshev, I., Egger, P., Mehran, F. & Ritter, J. A. (2003). *Measuring decent work with statistical indicators*. Working Paper n°2. Policy Integration Department, Statistical Development and Analysis Group. Geneva: International Labor Office. *Behavior* doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2016.07.004

Arbuckle, J. L. (2013) *Amos 22 user's guide*. Chicago: IBM SPSS Inc.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16, 74-94.

Bakker, A.B. (2001). *Questionnaire for the Assessment of Work-related Flow: The WOLF*. Utrecht: Department of Social and Organizational Psychology, Utrecht University.

Bentler, P.M. (1990). Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(2), 238-46.

Bergmann, L.R., Magnusson, D. (1997) A person-oriented approach in research on developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9(2), 291-319.

Bollen, K. (1989). *Structural Equations with Latent Variables* (1st ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Brown, T. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Buckley, M.R., Ferris, G.R., Bernardin, J., Harvey, M.G. (1998). The disconnect between science and practice of management. *Business Horizons*, 41(2), 31-38.

Clayworthy, J., Buick, D., Hankins, M., Weinman, J. & Horne, R. (2005). The use and reporting of cluster analysis in health psychology: a review. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 10, 329-358. DOI:10.1348/135910705X25697

Clydesdale, G. (2015) Happiness, welfare and ethics: dissonant consequences and conflicting values. *International Journal of Happiness and Development*, 2(2), 137-159. Doi: 10.1504/IJHD.2015.070074

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 14–23. DOI: 10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14

Deci, E.L., Olafsen, A.H., Ryan, M.R. (2017). Self-Determination Theory in Work Organizations: The State of a Science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 19-43. Doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108

Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M. (2000) The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-68.

Dickson-Swift, V., Fox, C., Marshall, K., Welch, N, Willis, J. (2014)," What really improves employee health and wellbeing Findings from regional Australian workplaces ", *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 7(3), 138-155. DOI: 10.1108/IJWHM-10-2012-0026

EAWOP (2011). Declaration for Decent Work. Maastricht: European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology. Decent Work and Work Motivation in Lawyers: An empirical research

Fernet, C., Austin, S., Vallerand, R.J. (2012) The effects of work motivation on employee exhaustion and commitment: an extension of the JD-R model. *Work Stress*. 26(3), 213-29. DOI: 10.1080/02678373.2012.713202

Ferraro, T., dos Santos, N., Pais, L., Moreira, J.M. (2017b) Decent Work and Work Motivation in Lawyers: An empirical research. *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho*, 17(4), 192-200. doi: 10.17652/rpot/2017.4.13908.

Ferraro, T., Pais, L., Dos Santos, N. R., & Moreira, J. M. (2016). The Decent Work Questionnaire (DWQ): Development and validation in two samples of knowledge workers. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Ferraro, T., Pais, L., Moreira, J.M. et al. (2017) Decent Work and Work Motivation in Knowledge Workers: The Mediating Role of Psychological Capital. *Applied Research Quality of Life*, 25(12), 1-15. DOI:10.1007/s11482-017-9539-2

Fisher, C. (2010). Happiness at Work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12, 384–412. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00270.x

Ford, B.Q., Shallcross, A.J., Mauss, I.B., Floerke, V.A., Gruber, J (2014). Desperately seeking happiness: valuing happiness is associated with symptoms and diagnosis of depression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 33(10), 890-905. DOI: 10.1521/jscp.2014.33.10.890

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.

Gagné, M., Deci, E.L. (2005) Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26(4), 331-62. DOI: 10.1002/job.322

Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Van Den Broeck, A. (2015) The multidimensional work motivation scale: validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 178–96. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2013.877892

Grant, A.M., Nurmohamed, S., Ashford, S.J., Dekas, K. (2011) The performance implications of ambivalent initiative: the interplay of autonomous and controlled motivations. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 116(2), 241–51. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.03.004

Graves, L.M., Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q. (2013) How transformational leadership and employee motivation combine to predict employee proenvironmental behaviors in China. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 35, 81–91. DOI: [10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.05.002)

Grimm, C., Kemp, S., Jose, P.E. (2014) Orientations to Happiness and the experience of everyday activities. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 10(3), 201-218. DOI: 10.1080/17439760.2014.941382

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (2008). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). USA: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Hevenstone, D. (2011) Flexicurity, Happiness, and Satisfaction. *International Journal of Sociology*, 41(3), 7-45.

Hon, A.H.Y. (2012) Shaping environments conducive to creativity: the role of intrinsic motivation. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 53(1), 53–64. Doi: 10.1177/1938965511424725

Howard, J., Gagné, M., Morin, A.J.S., Van den Broeck, A. (2016) Motivation profiles at work: A self-determination theory approach, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 95, 74-89. Doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2016.07.004

Howell, D. C. (2013). *Statistical methods for psychology* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Hsu, C. & Lu, H. (2004). Why do people play on-line games? An extended TAM with social influences and flow experience. *Information & Management*, 41(7), 853- 68. DOI: 10.1016/j.im.2003.08.014

Huta, V., & Ryan, R.M. (2010). Pursuing pleasure or virtue: The differential and overlapping well-being benefits of hedonic and eudaimonic motives. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 11(6), 735-62. DOI: 10.1007/s10902-009-9171-4

ILO (2008). Measurement of decent work - Discussion paper for the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work. Geneva: International Labor Office.

Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C., Welzel, C. (2008). Development, Freedom and Rising Happiness. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(4), 264-285.

ILO (1999). *Decent Work*. Report of the Director-General at 87th Session of International Labor Conference. Geneva: International Labor Office.

ILO (2008). *Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work*. Geneva: International Labor Office.

Jöreskog, K.G. & Sörbom, D. (2004). *LISREL 8.7 for Windows*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.

Judge, T. A., Weiss, H. M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D.; Hulin, C. L. (2017) Job attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and of change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 356-374.

Kahneman, D., E. Diener and N. Schwarz (eds) (1999) *Well-being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*. Russell Sage: New York.

Kanfer, R. (1990) Motivation and individual differences in learning: an integration of developmental, differential and cognitive perspectives. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 2:219-237.

Kanfer, R., Frese, M., Johnson, R. E. (2017) Motivation related to work: A century of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 338-355. doi: 10.1037/apl0000133

Kashdan, T.B., Biswas-Diener, R., King, L. (2008) Reconsidering happiness: the costs of distinguishing between hedonics and eudaimonia. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(4), 219-233. Doi: [10.1080/17439760802303044](https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760802303044)

Kemeny, J. G. (1959) *A Philosopher Looks at Science*. New York: Van Nostrand

Kline, R. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Koestner, R., & Losier, G. F. (2002). Distinguishing three ways of being highly motivated: A closer look at introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 101-121). Rochester, NY, US: University of Rochester Press.

Kuvaas, B. (2009) A test of hypotheses derived from self-determination theory among public sector employees. *Employee Relations*, 31(1), 39–56. DOI 10.1108/01425450910916814

Landry, A.T., Kindlein, J., Trépanier, S.G., Forest, J., Zigarmi, D. (2016). Why individuals want money is what matters: using self-determination theory to explain the differential relationship between motives for making money and employee psychological health. *Motivation and Emotion*, 40(2), 226–42.

Liu, D., Zhang, S., Wang, L., Lee, T.W. (2011) The effects of autonomy and empowerment on employee turnover: test of a multilevel model in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1305–316. doi: 10.1037/a0024518

Marôco, J. (2011). *Análise Estatística com o SPSS Statistics* (5ª ed.). Lisboa: Report Number.

Martínez-Martí, M.L. & Ruch, W. J Happiness Stud (2017) The Relationship Between Orientations to Happiness and Job Satisfaction One Year Later in a Representative Sample of Employees in Switzerland. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 18(1), 1-15. Doi: 10.1007/s10902-016-9714-4

Martin-Krumm, C., Kern, L., Fontayne, P., Romo, L., Boudoukha, A.H., Boniwell, I. (2015) French Adaptation of the Orientation to Happiness Scale and its relationship to Quality of Life in French Students. *Social Indicators Research*, 124, 259-281.

Massarella, F.L., Winterstein, P.J. (2009). *Intrinsic Motivation and the Flow Mental State in Street Runners*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). University of Campinas: Campinas

Masvaure, P., Ruggunan, S., Maharaj, A. (2014) Work Engagement, Intrinsic Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Employees of a Diamond Mining Company in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 6(6), 488-499.

Moran, C. M., Diefendorff, J.M., Kim, T.Y., Liu, Z.Q. (2012). A profile approach to self-determination theory motivations at work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81, 354-363. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2012.09.002

Nie, Y., Chua, B.L., Yeung, A.S., Ryan, R.M., Chan, W.Y. (2015) The importance of autonomy support and the mediating role of work motivation for well-being: testing self-determination theory in a Chinese work organisation. *International Journal of Psychology*, 50(4), 245–55. doi: 10.1002/ijop.12110

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Olafsen, A.H., Halvari, H., Forest, J., Deci, E.L. (2015) Show them the money? The role of pay, managerial need support, and justice in a self-determination theory model of intrinsic work motivation. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 56(4), 447-57. doi: 10.1111/sjop.12211

Oswald, A. J., Proto, E., Sgroi, D. (2015) Happiness and Productivity. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 33(4), 789-822. Doi: 0734-306X/2015/3304-0001\$10.00

Park, N., Peterson, C., Ruch, W. (2009) Orientations to happiness and life satisfaction in twenty-seven nations. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4(4), 273-279. Doi: 10.1080/17439760902933690

Park, S.M., Min, K.R., Chen, C.A. (2015). Do monetary rewards bring happiness? Comparing the impacts of pay-for-performance in the public and private sectors. *Journal of International Review of Public Administration*, 21(3), 199-215. Doi: 10.1080/12294659.2016.1237092

Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P., (2005). Orientations to happiness and life satisfaction: the full life versus the empty life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6, 25-41, doi: 10.1007/s10902-004-1278-z

Pinder, C. (2008) *Work motivation in organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). New York: Psychology Press.

Pollit, D. (2008), "Happy employees have a good work-life balance", *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 16(6), 27-28.

Pudra, E.D., Cho, S., Liu, J. (2015) Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on work engagement in the hospitality industry: Test of motivation crowding theory. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 17(2), 228 – 241. Doi: [10.1177/1467358415613393](https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358415613393)

Punj. G., Stewart, D.W. (1983) Cluster Analysis in Marketing Research: Review and Suggestions for Application. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20(2), 134-148

Reiss, S. (2004). Multifaceted Nature of Intrinsic Motivation: The Theory of 16 Basic Desires. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(3), 179–193. DOI: 10.1037/1089-2680.8.3.179.

Ross, C.N. (2016). *The Three Pathways to Happiness: How Orientations to Pleasure, Engagement, and Meaning Relate to Grit and Well-Being in a Longitudinal, International Sample*. (Unpublished master thesis). Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Rothmann, S. (2013). From Happiness to Flourishing at Work: A Southern African Perspective. In M.P. Wissing (Ed.) *Well-being research in South Africa*. South Africa: Springer.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141–166.

Santos, N. R., Mónico, L., Pais, L., Gagné, M., Forest, J., Cabral, P. F., & Ferraro, T. (in press). *Multidimensional work motivation scale: Psychometric studies in Portugal and Brazil*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Schueller, S.M., Seligman, M.E.P. (2010) Pursuit of pleasure, engagement, and meaning: Relationships to subjective and objective measures of well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5(4): 253-263. Doi: 10.1080/17439761003794130

Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2010). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shany, H., Kaplan, O. (2014) Are Happy Customer Service Representatives More Efficient? The Relationship Between Happiness and Work Performance Among Insurance Company Call Center Representatives. *15th Toulon-Verona Conference "Excellence in Service"*, Leizon, Israel.

Sheldon, K.M., Krieger, L.S. (2014) Service job lawyers are happier than money job lawyers, despite their lower income. *Journal of Positive Psychology* 90(3), 219–26. Doi: 10.1080/17439760.2014.888583

Shernoff D.J., Csikszentmihalyi M., Schneider B., Shernoff E.S. (2014) Student Engagement in High School Classrooms from the Perspective of Flow Theory. In: Applications of Flow in Human Development and Education. Springer: Dordrecht. Doi: 10.1007/978-94-017-9094-9_24

Silla, I., De Cuyper, N., Gracia, F.J., Peiró, J.M., de Witte, H. (2009) Job Insecurity and Well-Being: Moderation by Employability. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-008-9119-0>

Siurana, N. A. S., Bosch, J. L. C., Pais, L., dos Santos, N. R., & Mónico, L. (2017). *The pursuit of considering Happiness within the framework of an Organization - Adaptation of the 'Orientations to Happiness Questionnaire' to Portuguese Language*. (Unpublished Erasmus Mundus – WOP-P master's thesis). University of Barcelona: Barcelona.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Teo, T., Lim, V., & Lai, R. (1999). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in Internet usage. *Omega*, 27(1), 25-37. doi: 10.1016/s0305-0483(98)00028-0

Trépanier, S.G., Fernet, C., Austin, S. (2013) Workplace bullying and psychological health at work: the mediating role of satisfaction of needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness. *Work Stress*, 27(2), 123–40. Doi: 10.1080/02678373.2013.782158

Van Den Broeck, A., Ferris, D.L., Chang, C.H., Rosen, C.C. (2016) A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, 42, 1195–229. Doi: DOI: 10.1177/0149206316632058

Vella-Brodrick, D., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2009). Three ways to be happy: Pleasure, engagement, and meaning—Findings from Australian and US samples. *Social Indicator Research*, 90, 165–179.

Vincent-Höper, S., Muser, C. and Janneck, M. (2012) Transformational leadership, work engagement, and occupational success. *Career Development International*, 27(7), 663-682. Doi: 10.1108/13620431211283805

Waterman, A.S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(4), 678-91. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.64.4.678

Waterman, S. (2005). When Effort Is Enjoyed: Two Studies of Intrinsic Motivation for Personally Salient Activities. *Motivation and Emotion*, 29, 165-188. DOI: 10.1007/s11031-005-9440-4

Weiss, H.M., Nicholas, J.P., Daus, C.S. (1999) An Examination of the Joint Effects of Affective Experiences and Job Beliefs on Job Satisfaction and Variations in Affective Experiences over Time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 78(1), 1-24. DOI: 10.1006/obhd.1999.2824

Williams, G.C., Halvari, H., Niemiec, C.P., Sørensen, Ø., Olafsen, A.H., Westbye C. (2014) Managerial support for basic psychological needs, somatic symptom burden and work-related correlates: A self-determination theory perspective. *Work Stress*. 28(4), 404–19. Doi: 0.1080/02678373.2014.971920