**Abstract**

Research linking trait gratitude to work outcomes is still limited. In this study, we examined how gratitude relates to employees’ performance and motivation. Specifically, we argued that grateful employees would increase their performance as a way to give back to their companies. Moreover, we drew on the self-determination theory and hypothesized that gratitude would prevent amotivation and promote more autonomous forms of motivation. We also explored whether motivation would mediate the effect of trait gratitude on performance. A sample of 246 Romanian employees participated in the study. They completed measures assessing trait gratitude, work motivation, and job performance twice, with a 10-week interval between assessments. The results indicated that gratitude and performance were positively associated in the cross-sectional analysis, but not over time. However, gratitude was prospectively related to lower levels of amotivation, higher levels of introjected and identified regulation, as well as higher levels of intrinsic motivation. The indirect effect of gratitude on performance through identified regulation and intrinsic motivation was marginally significant. These results suggest that although gratitude might not directly contribute to employees’ performance, it could influence employees’ work behaviors through the type work motivation it fosters.
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**1. Introduction**

Previous literature has provided ample evidence for the benefits of trait gratitude, such as enhanced life satisfaction, decreased anxiety and depression (see Portocarrero et al., 2020, for a meta-analysis), as well as higher levels of prosocial behavior (see Ma et al., 2017 for a meta-analysis). Although fewer studies addressed the correlates of gratitude in organizational contexts, it has been reported that grateful employees are at a lower risk for burnout (e.g., Guan & Jepsen, 2020) and report higher levels of job satisfaction (Chen et al., 2023), among other promising results. Most previous studies appear to have focused primarily on how trait gratitude impacts employees’ personal outcomes, such as their well-being (see Locklear et al., 2023, for a review). Consequently, in order to better understand the implications of thankfulness in the workplace, it is important to examine how other organization members or the organization as a whole could benefit from employees’ dispositional gratitude.

Given the importance that companies have always placed on optimizing employees’ results, in this study we aimed to expand the current knowledge on gratitude in the workplace by examining how it relates to employees’ performance. To our knowledge, only two previous studies explored job performance as a potential outcome of trait gratitude (Cortini et al., 2019; Li et al., 2022). In this paper, we distinguished between task and contextual performance and explored the relationship between employees’ gratitude and both types of performance. While task performance encompasses formally assigned duties that relate to the conversion of raw materials into goods and services, or to the provision of support for these processes, contextual performance includes activities that contribute to the overall effectiveness of an organization through their beneficial effects on the work environment (e.g., volunteering) (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Therefore, it is essential to determine whether employees' gratitude affects task performance, contextual performance, or both. Moreover, our study also explores whether work motivation might serve as an underlying mechanism in the relation between trait gratitude and job performance. Based on the self-determination theory (SDT; Ryan et al., 2019), we argued that grateful employees are more likely to develop more autonomous types of motivation, which in turn positively affect their job performance. In the following subsections, we elaborate on these ideas, providing theoretical and empirical support for the relation between trait gratitude, work motivation, and job performance.

**1.1 Employees’ Trait Gratitude and Job Performance**

Previous literature has consistently shown that personality traits, alongside other individual differences such as cognitive abilities, are significant predictors of employees’ job performance (e.g., He et al., 2019). The strength of the relationship between personality traits and performance may vary depending on the type of performance being considered. For instance, previous studies suggest that traits from the five-factor model are more strongly associated with non-task performance than with task performance (Gonzalez-Mulé et al., 2014; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001).

In this study, we argued that gratitude could be one of the personality traits which positively impact employees’ performance. Some theoretical work suggests that grateful employees might attain better job performance. For example, in their conceptual topography of the grateful disposition, McCullough et al. (2002) argued that people who are more grateful have higher levels of agreeableness and prosociality, showing increased sensitivity towards others, higher levels of helping behaviors, and generosity. Some empirical studies support this idea and indicate that grateful people have a predisposition to repay the benefits they received, by engaging in altruistic behaviors which are directed not only towards their benefactor, but also towards other persons (e.g., Portocarrero et al., 2020). To extrapolate to organizational contexts, it might be plausible that employees who are more grateful seek to improve their performance as a way to reciprocate the company for the opportunities it provides.

Most previous research examined the link between *state* gratitude or *work-specific* gratitude and employees’ job performance (e.g., Cain et al., 2019). Only two studies explored how *trait* gratitude is related to job performance. Specifically, Cortini et al. (2019) found that gratitude was positively associated with job performance, without making the distinction between task and contextual performance. More recently, Li et al. (2022) reported that trait gratitude was positively related to self-reported organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), which are conceptually similar to contextual performance (although the two terms are not synonymous) (see Motowidlo, 2000 for further discussion on these constructs). However, the study of Li et al. did not evaluate employees’ task performance. More research is therefore needed to explore the relation between gratitude and both task and contextual performance, in order to be able to determine how trait gratitude impacts these different forms of job performance (i.e., whether the relations are different in magnitude depending on the type of job performance which is taken into consideration). Moreover, given these studies were cross-sectional, they do not offer evidence for causality or at least for the fact that trait gratitude affects job performance over time.

Based on previous theoretical contributions (e.g., McCullogh et al., 2002) and limited empirical studies (e.g., Li et al., 2022), in this study we argued that employees’ trait gratitude would prospectively predict higher levels of task and contextual performance. Moreover, in line with past findings suggesting that personality variables are stronger predictors of contextual performance, we expected that gratitude would also be more strongly associated with contextual performance than with task performance.

**1.2 Employees’ Motivation and Job Performance**

According to the SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2017), motivation takes various forms, from amotivation to intrinsic motivation. Between these two extremes, there are different types of extrinsic motivation, which involve a gradually increasing degree of internalization (see Table 1 for a short description). A central tenet within the SDT is that the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) fosters more internalized forms of motivation, whereas the frustration of the same needs results in amotivation or controlled motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2017). According to this model, it is important to create environments which satisfy employees’ basic psychological needs and promote their autonomous motivation, as employees who are more autonomously motivated perform better. In line with these assumptions, previous meta-analytic studies indicated that amotivation is negatively related to job performance, while extrinsic (i.e., introjected and identified regulation), as well as intrinsic motivation, predicted job performance positively (Van den Broeck et al., 2021). Although the relation between motivation and performance was extensively explored, several aspects still require further investigation. Specifically, the relation between amotivation and performance (especially contextual performance/ OCBs) is far less investigated in previous studies than the relation between performance and other types of motivation (see Van den Broeck et al., 2021, for a meta-analysis). To advance the literature, in this study we focused not only the quality of employees’ motivation (i.e., controlled motivation, autonomous motivation), but also its quantity (i.e., amotivation). Consistent with the SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2017) and existent empirical evidence (Van de Broeck et al., 2021), we hypothesized that external regulation would be negatively linked to contextual performance. Moreover, we expected introjected and identified regulation, as well as intrinsic motivation, to be positively related to both types of performance. Finally, we hypothesized that amotivation would be negatively related to both task and contextual performance.

**1.3 Employees’ Gratitude and Motivation**

According to SDT (Ryan et al., 2019), personality characteristics can play a role in the satisfaction of individuals’ basic psychological needs and, consequently, their motivation. Specifically, personality traits might influence basic psychological needs by shaping the way people appraise external events. For instance, while some individuals are more likely to perceive certain situations (e.g., performance reviews) as threatening, resulting in the frustration of the basic psychological needs (e.g., the need for competence) and reduced autonomous motivation, other individuals may focus on the positive aspects of the same experiences. Moreover, individuals who are characterized by certain personality traits might create and/ or select environments that will help them satisfy their basic psychological needs, creating the premises for self-determined motivation. For example, people who are high in agreeableness might create better social relations which will satisfy their need for relatedness. In line with this theoretical perspective, we argued that trait gratitude could enhance employees’ motivation.

Previous literature provides some evidence to this idea. First of all, grateful people have a number of cognitive biases which make them concentrate on the positive aspects of their experiences (Wood et al., 2010). Empirical evidence suggests that employees who are higher in trait gratitude focus more on the job resources that were available to them (e.g., opportunities for development) and minimize the difficulty and/ or frequency of the demands (e.g., time pressure) (Nicuță et al., 2023). Due to their tendency to view their jobs more favorably, we might expect grateful employees to be more autonomously motivated. Moreover, grateful employees might also choose and/or craft work environments that are more likely to fulfill their basic psychological needs. For example, previous work has shown that gratitude is an important ingredient in communal relationships (Algoe, 2012). It is therefore possible that grateful employees build positive, caring relationships with their colleagues, which make the work environment more pleasant and the work activities more intrinsically motivating. Further, because grateful individuals are less likely to pursue materialistic values (Polak & McCullough, 2006), they might search for jobs that bring them meaning and intrinsic motivation, prioritizing these over merely pursuing high remuneration.

To our knowledge, few studies, conducted on samples of university students, focused on the link between trait gratitude and motivation, and the results indicated that those who were higher in gratitude tended to report lower amotivation and higher autonomous academic motivation (comprising identified motivation and intrinsic motivation) (King et al., 2018; 2023). Regarding the link between gratitude and controlled motivation (comprising external regulation and introjected regulation), one study reported a positive association between these variables (King et al., 2023), whereas the other indicated a non-significant correlation (King et al., 2018, Study 1). To advance the literature, in this study, we examined the link between gratitude and work motivation at a more granular level, by going beyond the controlled and autonomous categories in order to estimate the relations between gratitude and each type of work motivation. This was especially relevant seeing that it might help us better understand the mixed results that were reported by previous studies regarding controlled motivation.

To summarize, building on the SDT (Ryan et al., 2019) as well previous empirical literature (e.g., King et al., 2023), we hypothesized that trait gratitude would prospectively predict lower amotivation, and higher identified regulation, as well as intrinsic motivation. We also explored the longitudinal relations between gratitude, external and introjected regulation (which are included in controlled motivation), but no specific hypotheses were developed due to mixed prior results regarding these relationships.

**1.4 The Mediating Role of Motivation in the Relation between Gratitude and Job Performance**

According to the SDT (Deci et al., 2017), motivation can serve as a mediating factor for in the relation between personality traits and work behaviors, including job performance. For example, a recent study found that autonomous motivation mediated the relation between psychological capital and employees’ innovative behavior (Blasco-Giner et al., 2023). Psychological capital resulted in higher levels of autonomous motivation, which predicted increased innovative work behaviors.

In line with SDT, in this study, we explored whether work motivation could act as a mediator for the relation between trait gratitude and job performance (i.e., task and contextual job performance). Specifically, we expected that gratitude would decrease employees’ amotivation and promote more autonomous forms of motivation (i.e., identified regulation and intrinsic motivation), which in turn would lead to increased levels of both task and job performance. The mediating roles of external and introjected regulation in these relations were also explored, although no hypotheses were formulated due to the lack of previous studies on the topic.

**2. Method**

**2.1 Participants and Procedure**

Participants in this research were recruited by undergraduate Psychology students in exchange for extra credit in the Work Psychology course. Initially, 305 employees agreed to participate in the study at Time 1 (T1). Of them, 246 (80.65%) also participated two and a half months later at T2. Participants completed the measures twice, 10 weeks apart, using a secure online platform. Employees were aged between 20 and 73 years (*M*age = 36.89, *SD* = 11.36) and 66.3% were female. They had an average tenure of 7.57 years in their current organizations (*SD* = 7.62). Other characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 2. The participants worked in various industries (please see Table 3).

**2.2 Measures**

For all measures used in this study, items were scored on 7-point scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 7 = *completely agree*). The internal consistency coefficients for all the scales are displayed in Table 3, separately for each Time.

***2.2.1 Trait Gratitude***

Gratitude was assessed using the Gratitude Questionnaire (McCullough et al., 2002). The six items of the questionnaire measure the frequency, intensity and density of gratitude in one’s life. The items were summed up to form a total gratitude score.

***2.2.2 Work Motivation***

Employees’ motivation was measured with The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (Gagné et al., 2015). The questionnaire contains 19 items and assesses five types of work motivation: amotivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and intrinsic motivation. Each subscale comprises 3 items, except for external regulation (6 items) and introjected regulation (4 items). Five total scores were calculated by summing up the items corresponding to each of the five types of work motivation. The questionnaire is widely used in organizational psychology research.

***2.2.3. Job Performance***

Job performance was assesed using the self-report version of the Job Performance Scale (Goodman and Svyantek, 1999). The scale assesses task performance (9 items) and contextual performance (7 items). Two total scores were calculated.

**3. Results**

## 3.1 Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses indicated that the assumption of univariate normality was not met for any of the variables. Some moderate outliers were observed on all variables, but no extreme values were identified. The multivariate normality assumption based on Mardia coefficient was not met. Consequently, we used Spearman’s correlation matrix and robust techniques in the path analysis.

**3.2 Associations Among the Study’s Variables**

Descriptive statistics and correlations among the main variables are displayed in Table 3. Employees’ gratitude at T1 was positively related to task and contextual performance, as well as introjected and identified regulations, and intrinsic motivation measured at both T1 and T2. Gratitude at T1 was also negatively related to amotivation and external regulation measured at T1 and T2. At both time points, amotivation was significantly and negatively related to both types of job performance, whereas introjected and identified regulations, as well as intrinsic motivation, were significantly and positively linked to job performance. External regulation and task performance were negatively related at T1. No other relations were significant.

**3.3 Results of the Path Analysis Testing the Hypotheses**

To test the prospective effect of gratitude at T1 on work motivation and job performance at T2, as well as the mediating role of motivation in the relation between gratitude and job performance, a path analysis was used. The tested model had acceptable fit indices, χ2 (42) = 120.14, *p* < .001, CFI = .948, RMSEA = .08, 90 % CI [.07, .010]. The model explained 59.1% of the variance of T2 task performance and 55.3% of the variance of T2 contextual performance. As presented in Figure 1, trait gratitude negatively predicted amotivation and was positively linked to introjected regulation, identified regulation, as well as intrinsic motivation at T2. Identified regulation at T2 positively predicted task performance, while intrinsic motivation positively predicted contextual performance at T2. Identified regulation was a marginal mediator for the relation between gratitude and task performance at T2 (β = 0.03, *p* = 0.07), whereas intrinsic regulation marginally mediated the relation between trait gratitude and contextual performance (β = 0.03, *p* = 0.08).

**4. Discussion**

The present research adds to the literature by providing new insights into how dispositional gratitude shapes workplace behavior, and by exploring the underlying mechanisms for these effects. Specifically, we examined whether trait gratitude might be linked to employees’ job performance over time, while measuring both task and contextual performance. Second, we investigated whether motivation might account for the potential effect of thankfulness on performance.

Consistent with previous empirical work (e.g., Cortini et al., 2019; Li et al., 2022), correlational analyses indicated that trait gratitude was positively associated with both task and contextual job performance cross-sectionally. The results seem to indicate that gratitude has a similar impact on both task and contextual performance. Although gratitude was more strongly linked to contextual performance than to task performance, the difference in the magnitude of the correlations was small (.31 compared to .23 at T1). However, path analyses indicated that gratitude was unrelated to job performance over time. These results suggest that cross-sectional studies could potentially over-estimate the importance of trait gratitude in relation to employees’ performance. The positive relation between gratitude and performance in the cross-sectional data might be inflated by the common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2024). Alternatively, employees who obtain better job performance might have more reasons to be grateful in their lives in general (i.e., there might be an effect of job performance on gratitude rather than the effect of gratitude on job performance). For example, Ford et al. (2018) found that employees felt gratitude in response to their accomplishments and job success. Future studies investigating the effect of gratitude on job performance should employ longitudinal designs with multiple data waves to detect the direction of the relation between these variables. Moreover, it is possible that the structure of our sample influenced the results regarding the relationship between gratitude and job performance. For example, the impact of gratitude may be stronger in customer-facing or collaborative roles, such as those in healthcare or sales, compared to more independent, technical positions. In this study, the relatively small sample size did not allow us to make comparisons to see if the strength of the relationship varies depending on the field of activity, but future studies could try to test this possibility.

In line with the SDT (Deci et al., 2017), and previous studies (e.g.,Van den Broeck et al., 2021), correlation analyses indicated that introjected and identified regulation, as well as intrinsic motivation were positively related to both task and contextual performance. Amotivation was negatively correlated to both types of job performance at T2, while external regulation was unrelated to job performance over time. However, when all types of motivation were simultaneously included in the path analysis, only identified regulation and intrinsic motivation were positive predictors of task performance, and intrinsic motivation was a positive predictor of contextual performance. These findings suggest that autonomous motivation is of utmost importance in order for employees to obtain high job performance. It is therefore essential that companies create opportunities for employees to engage in intrinsically motivating activities, while also finding ways to highlight the fact that their work is valuable and important.

Both correlational and path analyses indicated thatemployees with a high level of trait gratitude reported increased identified regulation and intrinsic motivation, as well as lower levels of amotivation. These results are consistent with prior studies conducted in an academic context (e.g., King et al., 2018) and could be interpreted in a number of ways. In line with the idea that grateful people are more prone to notice and value the positive aspects around them (Wood et al., 2010), it might be that employees who are higher in gratitude concentrate more on the aspects of their jobs that render the work interesting and meaningful (e.g., job resources). Thus, amotivation is prevented and autonomous forms of motivation can develop. It is also possible that grateful people actively search for jobs which are more intrinsically rewarding or intentionally craft work environments which satisfy their psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Further, gratitude was also positively linked to introjected motivation, indicating that employees who are more dispositionally grateful could feel an inner pressure to put effort in their jobs, possibly as a way to reciprocate in response to the benefits which are provided to them by their companies (i.e., indebtedness). Future research might examine the exact mechanisms through which employees’ gratitude leads to different types of motivation. For example, the satisfaction of employees’ basic psychological needs might account for the impact of gratitude on motivation; trait gratitude might contribute to the satisfaction of the basic psychological needs, which in turn are expected to nurture autonomous forms of motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2017).

Our findings indicated that employees’ work motivation played a mediating role on the relation between gratitude and job performance. Although the effects were only marginally significant and should be interpreted with caution, it seems that identified regulation could mediate the effect of gratitude on task performance, whereas intrinsic motivation could explain the effect of gratitude on contextual performance over time. Specifically, higher levels of gratitude resulted in more identified regulation and intrinsic motivation, which in turn were related to improved task and contextual performance ten weeks later. These findings seem to be in line with previous theoretical (Deci et al., 2017) and empirical (e.g., Blasco-Giner et al., 2023) work indicating that motivation could account for the effect of individual differences on employees’ performance. However, these results should be regarded as preliminary evidence and require furhter investigation. Future studies could also explore whether work motivation might help explain the influence of employees’ trait gratitude on other work-related outcomes, such as job satisfaction.

From a theoretical standpoint, the current research contributes to a better understanding of the implications of gratitude in the workplace, being among the first studies that investigated how it might impact employees’ motivation and job performance. While much of the earlier studies focused on the wellness variables which could be associated with gratitude (Locklear et al., 2023), it is essential to also consider other types of outcomes to gain a more comprehensive understanding of this personality trait in organizational settings. From a practical perspective, these results suggests that it might be important to examine whether interventions designed to increase employees’ gratitude could lead to previously unconsidered outcomes, such as increased motivation. For example, previous studies (e.g,. Kaplan et al.; 2017; Locklear et al, 2021) suggested that self-administered gratitude interventions might have various positive outcomes (e.g., improved positive affective well-being and reduced mistreatment at work). Such interventions consist of gratitude journaling, meaning that participants are asked to write down things that they are grateful for related to their job. While these interventions do not aim to influence employees’ trait gratitude, they do increase levels of state or episodic gratitude. According to Fehr et al.’s (2017) multilevel model of gratitude in organizations, repeated experiences of strong episodic gratitude in the workplace can gradually build up, resulting in a stable tendency to feel grateful within the work context (persistent gratitude). If interventions aimed at increasing employees’ gratitude were found to positively impact work motivation, this would add another benefit to the list of potential advantages of such interventions, suggesting that they may be a practical and cost-effective tool for human resources departments and managers dealing with low motivation levels among employees.

Despite its contributions, this research is not without limitations. First, because of the correlational nature of our study, we cannot infer causality. Future studies could employ an experimental design (for example, by implementing an intervention aimed at boosting employees’ gratitude) in order to examine whether an increase in gratitude determines an increase in employees’ motivation and job performance. Second, we used self-report measures, a situation which introduces the potential for common method variance. As Podsakoff et al. (2024) outline, common method bias can arise from the characteristics of the raters, the characteristics and content of the items, or the context in which they are measured. For example, when self-reports are used to evaluate multiple variables, correlations may be exaggerated due to the tendency for respondents to seek coherence in their answers (consistency motif). Additionally, recent experiences and moods can shape respondents’ responses, as their ratings may reflect emotions or events they have recently encountered. Other factors, such as social desirability, leniency bias, item placement (proximity), excessive questionnaire length (leading to fatigue and satisficing), and the concurrent measurement of predictor and criterion variables, can also inflate correlations. To minimize common method bias, we implemented several widely used strategies from the literature: we ensured participants’ anonymity to reduce social desirability and leniency bias, measured gratitude and motivation/performance at two different points in time, and kept the questionnaire length manageable to prevent participant fatigue and satisficing. However, seeing that employees show a leniency bias when evaluating their own performance (Heidemeier & Moser, 2009), future studies might consider including other-report (e.g., supervisor ratings of performance) or objective measures of performance (e.g., financial metrics). Moreover, all variables should ideally be measured at different point in time, including motivation and performance. Third, future research might also investigate the link between gratitude and other dimensions of performance, such as adaptive performance. Fourth, the characteristics of our sample (Romanian employees, the majority of which were women and highly educated) limit the generalizability of the results. Although conducting the study in an Eastern European context can be perceived as a strength, as it bring more diversity in gratitude research, future studies will need to investigate whether these findings can be replicated in other cultures. Finally, future research could also explore potential moderators in the relations between gratitude and employees’ motivation/ performance. For instance, Ren et al. (2023) recently found that grateful employees take charge more in the workplace when they have high role breadth self-efficacy. In a similar way, we might expect gratitude to be significantly linked to contextual performance over time only in those employees who feel confident that they have the competence to make positive contributions in their organizations.

To conclude, the results of the present research seem to suggest that grateful employees tend to be more autonomously motivated in the workplace, which in turn might make them more likely to improve their job performance. Although more research is needed in order to establish whether gratitude has an impact on (objective) performance indicators, these findings are promising in that they suggest that the implications of gratitude in the workplace might extend beyond just promoting employees’ well-being.
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of motivation** | **Definition** |
| Amotivation | a lack of motivation for a certain activity |
| Extrinsic regulation | a completely non-internalized form of motivation, referring to situations when people initiate or abstain from an activity in order to gain external rewards or to avoid punishments |
| Introjected regulation | a form of motivation which pertains to situations when the motivation to carry out an activity stems from an internal pressure to maintain or enhance one’s self-esteem or to avoid guilt and shame; together with extrinsic regulation, it forms controlled motivation |
| Identified regulation | a type of extrinsic motivation where people engage in an activity because they believe that it is important and it serves a purpose |
| Integrated regulation | occurs when the person has fully harmonized different identifications |
| Intrinsic motivation | carrying out an activity for the enjoyment it provides, without the goal of achieving a separate outcome; together with identified and integrated regulation, it forms autonomous motivation |

**Table 1**

*Different Types of Motivation Described Within the SDT* (Ryan & Deci, 2017)

**Table 2**

*Socio-demographic and Occupational Characteristics of the Sample*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Participant characteristic | | % |
| Gender | Male | 33.7 |
|  | Female | 66.3 |
| Education | Less than high school | 2 |
|  | High school | 30.9 |
|  | Post-secondary non-tertiary education | 2 |
|  | Bachelor’s degree | 32.5 |
|  | Master’s degree or higher | 32.5 |
| Type of contract | Full-time | 95.1 |
|  | Part-time | 4.9 |
| Type of organization | State institution | 32.5 |
|  | Private company | 67.5 |
| Management position | Yes | 23.6 |
|  | No | 76.4 |

**Table 3**

*Job Types and Industries Represented in the Sample*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Industry | Example professions in our sample | % |
| Administrative and Management | purchaser,  administrator, archivist | 11 |
| Art and Design | graphic designer | 0.8 |
| Construction and Engineering | architect, construction engineer, electician | 7.3 |
| Customer Relations | customer service representative, front desk officer | 2.8 |
| Economics, Marketing, & Finance | accountant, financial manager | 12.6 |
| Education, Training, & Research | teacher, university professor, researcher | 16.7 |
| Health and Medicine | doctor, nurse | 8.5 |
| IT and Technology | IT engineer, data entry operator | 7.3 |
| Legal | lawyer | 2.8 |
| Production and Industry | tailor, factory worker | 4.5 |
| Public Safety and Law Enforcement | police officer, firefighter | 6.1 |
| Sales and Trade | retail worker | 6.1 |
| Services and Hospitality | waiter, cook | 6.9 |
| Transportation and Logistics | delivery driver, truck driver warehouse supervisor | 5.7 |
| |  | | --- | | Other |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | 0.8 |
|  |  |  |

**Table 4**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| *Time 1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Gratitude | .71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Amotivation | -.45\*\*\* | .74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. External regulation | -.21\*\*\* | .18\*\* | .83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Introjected regulation | .17\*\* | -.29\*\*\* | .27\*\*\* | .71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Identified regulation | .31\*\*\* | -.54\*\*\* | -.01 | .68\*\*\* | .73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Intrinsic motivation | .35\*\*\* | -.62\*\*\* | -.07 | .47\*\*\* | .72\*\*\* | .89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Task performance | .23\*\*\* | -.34\*\*\* | -.13\* | .30\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | .88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Contextual performance | .31\*\*\* | -.39\*\*\* | -.07 | .33\*\*\* | .45\*\*\* | .48\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* | .82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Time 2* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Amotivation | -.32\*\*\* | .64\*\*\* | .26\*\*\* | -.19\*\* | -.47\*\*\* | -.52\*\*\* | -.31\*\*\* | -.34\*\*\* | .78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. External regulation | -.12\* | .15\* | .67\*\*\* | .25\*\*\* | .00 | -.11 | -.09 | -.00 | .21\*\*\* | .86 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Introjected regulation | .28\*\*\* | -.34\*\*\* | .07 | .59\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* | .37\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | .33\*\*\* | -.40\*\*\* | .26\*\*\* | .83 |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Identified regulation | .31\*\*\* | -.49\*\*\* | -.06 | .48\*\*\* | .65\*\*\* | .56\*\*\* | .33\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | -.58\*\*\* | .02 | .75\*\*\* | .77 |  |  |  |
| 13. Intrinsic motivation | .31\*\*\* | -.55\*\*\* | -.09 | .37\*\*\* | .59\*\*\* | .74\*\*\* | .32\*\*\* | .40\*\*\* | -.63\*\*\* | -.02 | .57\*\*\* | .75\*\*\* | .91 |  |  |
| 14. Task performance | .24\*\*\* | -.30\*\*\* | -.14\* | .27\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | .34\*\*\* | .70\*\*\* | .40\*\*\* | -.39\*\*\* | -.05 | .40\*\*\* | .46\*\*\* | .45\*\*\* | .89 |  |
| 15. Contextual performance | .27\*\*\* | -.38\*\*\* | -.10 | .26\*\*\* | .37\*\*\* | .46\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | .68\*\*\* | -.44\*\*\* | -.01 | .41\*\*\* | .51\*\*\* | .56\*\*\* | .58\*\*\* | .89 |
| Means | 33.82 | 5.59 | 21.24 | 21.36 | 16.98 | 16.5 | 53.29 | 37.94 | 5.92 | 21.81 | 21.54 | 16.98 | 16.22 | 53.49 | 37.26 |
| Standard deviations | 5.51 | 3.45 | 8.71 | 5.08 | 3.78 | 4.34 | 7.88 | 7.74 | 3.52 | 8.68 | 5.46 | 3.76 | 4.40 | 7.77 | 8.75 |

*Spearman Zero-Order Correlation Matrix*

*Note. \*\*\* p < .*001; *\*\*p <* .01; *\* p <* .05. Cronbach’s Alpha on main diagonal

**Figure 1**

*Path Model Testing the Mediational Role of Work Motivation*
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*Note*. Unstandardized coefficients. Dotted lines represent non-significant paths.