

The relationship between Leadership, Orientation to Happiness and Work Motivation

Estela Calderaro Pontinha Leite

Universidade de Coimbra

Home Tutors

Prof. Dr. Leonor Pais

Prof. Dr. Nuno Rebelo dos Santos

Prof. Dr. Lisete Mónico

Universidade de Coimbra

Host Tutor

Prof. Dr. Vicente Martínez-Tur

Universitat de València

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Abstract..... | 4 |
| The relationship between Leadership, Orientation to Happiness and Work Motivation | 5 |
| Leadership..... | 6 |
| Work Motivation..... | 10 |
| Orientation to Happiness..... | 14 |
| Aim of the research and contribution of the study..... | 18 |
| Method | 24 |
| Participants..... | 24 |
| Instruments..... | 26 |
| Orientation to Happiness Scale (Oths) | 26 |
| Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS)..... | 28 |
| Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) | 30 |
| Toxic Leadership Scale (TLS) | 31 |
| Procedures..... | 32 |
| Data Analysis | 33 |
| Results..... | 35 |
| Creation of OTH profiles | 37 |
| Differences in MWMS between OTH profiles..... | 40 |
| MWMS predicted by Leadership..... | 42 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Hypotheses testing - Comparing Regression Coefficients..... | 50 |
| Discussion..... | 51 |
| Conclusion | 57 |
| Implications, Limitations, and Further Studies..... | 58 |
| References..... | 62 |
| Appendix A – Chronogram | 78 |
| Annex A – Questionnaire | 79 |

Abstract

The goal of the present study is to analyze in which extent the effect of Toxic and Empowering Leadership on Work Motivation is significantly different between various profiles of Orientation to Happiness. According to the corresponding definitions, empowering leaders support their team, promote autonomy, self-direction and encourage self-management and toxic leaders bully and belittle their subordinates, impacting their enthusiasm, creativity, and autonomy. In other words, while empowering leaders address the autonomy and competence needs satisfaction, toxic leaders undermine competence, autonomy, and relatedness, the three basic needs underlying work motivation according to the Self-Determination Theory, the theoretical framework adopted by us in this study. Starting from the evidence that those leadership types influence, in general, work motivation of followers, this phenomenon will be more accurately described if we consider their orientation to happiness. Four questionnaires (Orientation to Happiness, Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale, Empowering Leadership Questionnaire, and Toxic Leadership Scale) were applied to a sample of 850 Portuguese workers. MANOVA, Cluster analysis and hierarchical multiple regression analysis were performed. Results confirmed that Empowering Leadership is positively related to work motivation, Toxic Leadership is negatively related to work motivation, and those effects are different among orientation to happiness profiles (groups). Implications for future research and limitations of the research are also discussed.

Keywords: Empowering Leadership; Engagement; Meaning; Orientation to Happiness; Pleasure; Toxic Leadership; Work Motivation.

The relationship between Leadership, Orientation to Happiness and Work Motivation

Empowering leaders are characterized by several actions, as supporting their teams, modeling appropriate behaviors, providing social and emotional encouragement, and promoting self-directed goals (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014a; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Lawler, 1986; Liden & Tewnsbury, 1995; Manz & Sims, 1987; Pelletier, 2010; Wu & Chen, 2015; Zhang & Zhou, 2014). There is also evidence of the impact of this form of leadership on employee work motivation (Salvador & dos Santos, 2018). Contrariwise, toxic leadership is defined as a maladjusted and malicious leadership (Schmidt, 2008; Whicker, 1996), where leaders have a destructive behavior and exhibit personal characteristics considered to be dysfunctional (Lipman-Blumen, 2005), negatively impacting enthusiasm, creativity, and autonomy in people with whom they work (Pelletier, 2010). It is expected that the impact of this form of leadership can be felt negatively in the work motivation of employees. This idea was previously confirmed by Salvador and dos Santos (2018). In the present study, work motivation will be approached in the perspective of Self-Determination Theory and, therefore, considering the motivational multidimensionality that evolves from amotivation to intrinsic motivation (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Gagné et al., 2015). It is expected that there is an impact of these two types of leadership on work motivation, as found by Salvador and dos Santos (2018) but that such impact can be more accurately described if we take into account personal characteristics or preferences of the workers. Specifically, we chose to include in our analysis the orientation to happiness (OTH), a construct that showed to distinguish individuals according to their preferences and visions on what happiness is (Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005). We expect that the impact empowering and toxic leaderships have on work motivation will depend on the orientation to happiness

evidenced by the follower. Different orientations to happiness correspond to different preferences which means different things people value and pursue. Considering leadership under which people work is part of their working life related to what they do, perceive and expect when working, that leadership enables, prevents or undermines their pursuit of goals and happiness. Therefore, the idea that depending on the specific OTH people have the impact of leadership on work motivation is different sounds plausible. Moreover, the leadership types here approached are defined by the impact they have on subordinates, empowering or damaging them, which reinforces the argument that different OTH correspond to different impacts of leadership on work motivation. The OTH is understood here as an intra-individual construct, a preference determining how people pursuit happiness. It is composed of three dimensions: pleasure (related to the hedonistic tradition of pursuing a maximum of pleasure and a minimum of suffering), meaning (eudaimonia, carrying out meaningful activities and promoting self-development) and engagement (psychological state that accompanies highly engaging activities; Peterson et al., 2005).

Leadership

Leadership is a topic that has been studied for over 100 years. It has already been characterized “in terms of individual traits, leader behavior, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals, and influence on organizational culture” (Yukl, 1989, p. 252). In addition, some perspectives approach leadership highlighting universal characteristics, traits, behaviors, or virtues while others focus on situational contingencies that require specific ways of performing the leadership role or specific traits that suit leadership function better.

Within the first type of approaches mentioned, in the past 20 years, new virtuous leadership theories emerged and were developed, such as authentic leadership (Banks, McCauley, Gardner, & Guler, 2016; Cianci, Hannah, Roberts, & Tsakumis, 2014; Fallatah, Laschinger, & Read, 2016), ethical leadership (Chen & Hou, 2016; Özbağ, 2016; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Misati, 2017), and empowering leadership (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014a; Wu & Chen, 2015; Zhang & Zhou, 2014), to name a few. An authentic leader is a virtuous leader that, besides being ethical, is true and acts according to oneself, promoting self-awareness and psychological strength to the subordinates, a worthy leader is the one that is capable of guiding or influencing others with excellence (Thompson & Riggio, 2010), an ethical leader is the one that encourages subordinates and collective fairness in the group (Walumbwa et al., 2017), while an empowering leader will support the team, promote autonomy, self-direction and encourage self-management (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000). The reason why we consider Empowering Leadership a virtuous leadership model is that the leader transfers part of their power to subordinates empowering them. So, this kind of leader is more focused on developing people than on their own power, career or even on the organizational results. Organizational results are the side effect of developing and empowering people through empowering leadership practices.

Empowering and transformational leadership improve team performance whereas increased autonomy also presents positive effects on performance. However, the strength of the relationship between empowering and transformational leadership and of the relationship between autonomy and performance depends on the context (Stewart, 2006).

The concern with empowerment is on the rise, and we see it more frequently in the literature (Bakker & Van Brakel, 2012; Cicolini, Comparcini, & Simonetti, 2013; Thorpe,

VanderEnde, Peters, Bardin, & Yount, 2015; Wiggins, 2011). Empowering is the process of creating and implementing conditions to enhance employee's feelings of control and self-efficacy and eliminate conditions that promote a sense of powerlessness (Arnold et al., 2000). Empowering leaders and their empowering behaviors are usually recognized as positive (Cheong, Spain, Yammarino, & Yun, 2016) which facilitates long-term exchange relationships with employees (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2015). Empowering leadership replaced the traditional hierarchical management structures to improve the overall efficiency and flexibility of their organizations (Arnold et al., 2000).

Biemann, Kearney, and Marggraf, (2015) studied how and whether empowering leadership affects individuals' career perceptions (self-efficacy and career satisfaction). They found that empowering leadership was positively related to career self-efficacy at the individual and group levels, and that career self-efficacy mediated the relationship between empowering leadership differentiation and career satisfaction.

Amundsen and Martinsen (2014b) researched the effect of interpersonal perception in empowering leadership on leader effectiveness, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in Norwegian workers. They found that leaders who overestimated themselves and their empowering leadership (due to possible arrogance and narcissistic tendencies) had subordinates who reported higher turnover intention and lower job satisfaction whereas the opposite was found in subordinates of under-estimators. However, when talking about empowerment and empowering employees, it is important to cite Spreitzer (1995). The author affirms that not only the manager needs to empower employees but that the employees must have the skills and cognitions to be empowered and feel the empowerment. Spreitzer (1995) defined it as psychological empowerment, a motivational construct manifested in four cognitions: competence

(confidence about one's ability to do their work well), meaning (sense of importance about one's job), impact (belief that one's work will influence others) and self-determination (independence to do one's work). Moreover, these cognitions combined create psychological empowerment and the degree of felt empowerment may diminish (although not be completely eradicated) if any of the cognitions are absent.

Salvador and dos Santos (2018) researched the effect of Toxic and Empowering Leadership on Work Motivation. She found that Empowering Leadership has a positive effect on Work Motivation whereas Toxic Leadership has a negative effect on Work Motivation, especially on Identified Regulation and Intrinsic Motivation. Those findings support the idea that the leadership type will influence the subordinates' work motivation. Moreover, the empowering leadership is defined through its effect on followers (empowering them). Since this effect is on empowering dimensions one can expect to see changes on followers as a consequence of the leadership. These consequences are related to empowerment which gives more autonomy and promotes competence development. These are two of the three needs underlying work motivation, according to the Self-Determination Theory.

On the opposite side, various counter-virtuous leadership models were proposed. For instance, destructive leadership (Einarsen, Aasland & Skogstad, 2007), toxic leadership (Gallus, Walsh, van Driel, Gouge, & Antolic, 2013), and abusive leadership (Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao & Chang, 2012). It is a somewhat new topic, while some scholars are interested in understanding how one person's hero can be another person's toxic leader (Pelletier, 2010), others prefer to verify its relationship to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Gallus et al., 2013). Gallus et al. (2013) when verifying the effects of toxic leadership on unit civility and employee outcomes concluded that toxic leadership behavior had a significant negative indirect effect on

organizational commitment and on job satisfaction, however, toxic leadership had no direct effect on job satisfaction with unit civility as a mediator variable.

The toxic leadership concept (Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Schmidt, 2008) was chosen since it is defined by its effects on subordinates, which means it can be compared properly with empowering leadership. While empowering leaders address the autonomy and competence needs satisfaction, toxic leaders undermine competence, autonomy, and relatedness, the three basic needs underlying work motivation according to the Self-Determination Theory.

To sum up, it is expected an effect of the leadership type (empowering *versus* toxic) on work motivation, and this effect is opposite when comparing both leadership types. Salvador and dos Santos (2018) have confirmed this general opposite effect. However, a general effect is not accurate enough for showing different patterns that may occur in the relationships between leadership and work motivation. That is the reason why we have decided to add complexity to this relationship between leadership and work motivation aiming to improve the accuracy in distinguishing different reactions on work motivations to the leadership types. As explained below, that complexity is made through the inclusion of the orientation to happiness in the equation.

Work Motivation

The concern with work motivation migrated from Philosophy to Psychology toward the end of the nineteenth century, at a time when Psychology was a brand-new science. By the 1950s, work motivation had become more prominent and several new models of work motivation had been created. However, it was in the late 1960s and early 1970s that the most important models were created or revamped, period that was known as the “golden age” of the

motivation theories (Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004). More recently, work motivation was conceptualized within the framework of the Self-Determination Theory. This approach has shown to be very accurate and able to catch subtle cross-cultural patterns regarding work motivation (Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Fernet, Gagné, & Austin, 2010; Gagné & Deci, 2005; Olafsen, Halvari, Forest, & Deci, 2015). The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) suggests three fundamental human needs underlying work motivation: to engage challenges and experience efficiency, to seek connections with others and feelings of security and belonging, and to work towards demands and goals. The first one is the need for competence (mastery, behave effectively). It is the satisfaction of learning something because you want to be able to do it and know the possible outcome (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The second one is the need for relatedness. It is the craving of the feeling of belongingness, the desire to interact and have a close relationship with others (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The third and last one is the need for autonomy. This is the need of controlling one's own life and having a sense of free will (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

SDT emerged as a response to the incapability of the Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) of being put into test in the organizational field. That approach incorporated CET and expanded its use (Gagné & Deci, 2005). SDT distinguishes between amotivation and motivation; it suggests that autonomous motivation and controlled motivation are intentional, and “together they stand in contrast to amotivation” (Gagné & Deci, 2005, p.334), amotivation being a lack of intention and motivation. Moreover, any activity that is not intrinsically motivating requires extrinsic motivation. According to Gagné and Deci (2005), there are four types of extrinsic motivation: (1) external regulation (behavior will be initiated and maintained by contingencies external to the person); (2) introjected regulation (contingent self-esteem, one will do something in order to feel worthy or to avoid feeling guilty); (3) identified regulation (one understands the

importance and value of the job that has to be done); and (4) integrated regulation (one knows that the activity is instrumentally important for one's goals and well-being and it is closely related to the personal values and identity). Intrinsic motivation is present when the person enjoys the work performed. When all types of work motivation are absent, the authors call it amotivation. To sum up, SDT deals with the content of work motivation through the three basic needs considered, and with the relationship between the task performed and the goal intended (Gagné & Deci, 2005). SDT is a well-rounded theory that describes the conditions that undermine and facilitate happiness and well-being and has embraced the concept of eudaimonia (self-realization; Ryan & Deci, 2001); therefore, being useful for this study as can be extrapolated to different social contexts (friendships, school, and workplaces). According to SDT, when the three needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) are fulfilled, people thrive, when they are not, wellness diminishes, happiness fades and motivation lowers (DeHaan & Ryan, 2014; Ryan, Huta, & Deci, 2013).

As mentioned before, several scholars studied work motivation using SDT. Chen and Bozeman (2013) studied the work motivation of public and nonprofit managers and found that the overall level of self-determination of public managers is compromised by their external motivation and amotivation. Therefore, their work requirements may make them less motivated than their nonprofit peers. Nonprofit managers, however, have a stronger introjected regulation than public managers. In another empirical research, Olafsen et al. (2015), when studying the relationship between salary, need support, need satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation, found that managerial need support was the most important factor in their model, both as predictor of need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation, and as a moderator to enhance need satisfaction.

Fernet et al. (2010) studied the effect of the work environment and relationship with co-workers on work motivation. They found that employees that do not find personal meaning in their work nor experience pleasure are not autonomously motivated to do their work tasks, rely on their relationship with co-workers to cope with their work experience and reduce the possibility of burnout. A good relationship with peers for those with low self-determined work motivation foster feelings of personal accomplishment and reduces exhaustion and depersonalization whereas the opposite can make employees more vulnerable to such states. Moreover, the authors also concluded that for autonomous motivated employees the intrinsic significance of accomplishing stimulating, and meaningful goals is sufficient to protect them against negative states, such as stress.

According to Deci, Olafsen, and Ryan (2017), a leader can support the basic psychological needs through listening to the employees' opinions, offering support and feedback, promoting autonomy, and refraining from toxic behaviors, therefore, facilitating the employee's autonomous motivation. That idea was supported by an empirical research done by Hetland, Hetland, Schou Andreassen, Pallesen, and Notelaers (2011) that confirmed that an empowering leadership such as transformational leadership supports, indeed, the basic psychological needs of autonomy and relatedness.

In another study with 192 individuals, Machin, James, and Silcox (2015) found that empowering leadership was a significant negative predictor of amotivation and extrinsic regulation (Social) and a significant positive predictor of identified regulation and intrinsic work motivation. Such result supports our idea that Empowering Leadership will have a general significant positive effect on work motivation.

Orientation to Happiness

Among the several studies about the subject, we have found Happiness being defined as “predominance of the frequency of occurrence of positive emotional experiences over negative ones” (Scorsolini-Comin & Santos, 2010, p.474). It is used interchangeably with the term well-being (MacKerron, 2011), considered subjective well-being (Tay & Kuykendall, 2013), and defined as the lack of negative emotions and experiences (Thingujam, 2015), and as an individual life satisfaction (Cuñado & de Gracia, 2012).

For Waterman, Schwartz, and Conti (2006), happiness has two different conceptions: Hedonism (maximizing good experiences and feelings) and Eudaimonia (subjective experiences of moving towards self-realization). Csikszentmihalyi (1999) suggested a third conception to happiness: flow, a concept that “describes a particular kind of experience that is so engrossing and enjoyable that it becomes autotelic” (p. 824).

We can find several research studies in the literature about Happiness. Some authors focused on the diversity of conceptions of happiness (Ashkanasy, 2011; Bekhet, Zauszniewski, & Nakhla, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2001), others on relating happiness with contextual variables (Cuñado & de Gracia, 2012; Joshanloo & Weijers, 2014; Schubert, 2012; Scorsolini-Comin & Santos, 2010; Tay & Kuykendall, 2013). Other authors focused on relating happiness with dispositional variables (Ali et al., 2013; Dillon & Carr, 2007; Dobewall, Realo, Allik, Esko, & Metspalu, 2013; Howell, 2005). There are also other studies focused on relating happiness with relational variables (Demir & Özdemir, 2010). Such a demand is also expressed in several happiness-themed journals in the Academic world, such as the *Journal of Happiness Studies* and the *Journal of Happiness and Wellness*.

Even though there are some previous studies about the relationship between happiness and motivation (Ceci and Kumar, 2015; do Paço and Nave, 2013; Miron, Parkinson, and Brehm, 2007), the relationship between happiness and work motivation is still weak and unclear. We recognize the opportunity to contribute for clarifying this relationship through our research focused on work motivation (which is part of the general motivation subject) and orientation to happiness (which is part of the general happiness subject).

In the research model we follow, the orientation to happiness (OTH) has three dimensions: 1) pleasure, 2) meaning, and 3) engagement (Peterson et al, 2005). The concept of OTH assesses individuals according to their preferences concerning what happiness is for them. These three dimensions present three different possible paths to happiness as well as shape different conduct, and individuals express different patterns of these orientations in pursuing of happiness and well-being (Peterson et al., 2005). Through the distinction of these preferences, we can differentiate workers and accordingly expect different reactions to leadership types as far as these leadership types encourage or prevent their strive for happiness. Peterson et al. (2005) describe the three dimensions as: (1) pleasure (search for happiness through pleasure or positive emotions, aiming to experience the maximum amount of pleasure), (2) meaning (search for happiness through belonging and serving in something bigger, immersing oneself in meaningful activities and in self-actualization), and (3) engagement (search for happiness through flow, experiencing complete absorption into an activity).

Taking into account the three dimensions presented, it is possible to define different profiles according to the combination of the prevalence of each orientation in the same individual. Peterson et al. (2005) consider individuals with a full life (high scores in all

orientation to happiness dimensions). They have greater life satisfaction than those with an empty life (low scores in all orientation to happiness dimensions).

Analyzing profiles enables us to get additional relevant information about the functioning of the orientations had they been studied in isolation. Such approach has already been used in other research studies with the construct of OTH. Park, Peterson, and Ruch (2009) found three clusters (empty life, high pursuing of pleasure and engagement, and high pursuing of meaning and engagement) that facilitated the analysis of life satisfaction amongst samples from 27 countries. Kavčič and Avsec (2013) named it Person-centered analysis, and it yielded four clusters with similar profiles of orientation to happiness (full life, empty life, pleasurable life, and meaningful life). They found that individuals within the empty life profile were associated with the poorest outcomes, those within the full life profile presented the highest well-being and those within the meaningful and pleasurable life profiles reported on moderate well-being. The authors affirm that such result “suggests that the profiles are meaningfully different and highlights the importance of the multiplicative influences of the three specific orientations to happiness” (p.141).

Measuring the way one perceives happiness allows us to distinguish individuals according to their priorities and what they think is worthy. Considering these dispositional differences imply different reactions to the outward aspect of the world, we can expect individuals will react to empowering and toxic leadership differently accordingly to their OTH. Through the creation of profiles according to different combinations of OTH, we will be able to clarify the effect of toxic and empowering leadership in work motivation while noting the different personal characteristics of workers.

Work motivation is a construct that depends on both internal and external variables. As previously mentioned, according to SDT the internal need of autonomy, competence and relatedness lead individuals to strive for satisfying them, and the way work is seen by the worker means that when facing different jobs and tasks they found ways of filling those needs through the motivated behavior. The point is that the way individuals perceive their tasks and jobs depends on (1) the type of leadership they have and (2) the internal dispositions regarding their OTH. Reminding Smircich and Stubbart (1985), they highlighted the leadership role as the managing of the meaning. Through toxic or empowering leadership, the leader will have strong influence on the way subordinates perceive the environment, the task, and their job. At the same time, they have a specific disposition regarding what happiness is, and therefore they will show an impact of the type of leadership they have according to their OTH.

The Orientation to Happiness scale (OtHS) has already been used in several studies in the literature. In one study, Pollock, Noser, Holden, and Zeigler-Hill (2015) hypothesized that the orientation to happiness mediated the associations that personality traits have with subject well-being. The results have shown that an orientation to meaning in life partially mediated the relationship between extraversion as life satisfaction, and also that all three orientations to happiness (meaning, pleasure, and engagement) partially mediated the relationship between extraversion and positive effect.

Park et al. (2009) measured the OTH and life satisfaction of 24,836 adults from 27 different nations. The authors divided the 27 countries into 3 clusters: one with countries that had low scores on all three orientations to happiness, the second with higher scores on orientations to pleasure and to engagement, and the third with higher scores on orientations to engagement and

meaning. Regardless of nation, orientations to meaning and to engagement were more strongly predictors to life satisfaction than the orientation to pleasure.

Anic and Tončić (2013) compared the life goals, subjective well-being, and self-control of people with the three profiles of orientation to happiness (engagement, pleasure, and meaning) of 769 students and concluded that those who live a full life (high scores on all approaches to happiness) are the happiest and value intrinsic life goals as well as have good self-control. In another study, Hirschi (2011), looking to find the relationship between career development and happiness in Swiss teenagers, found out that orientation to engagement and to meaning was positively related to vocational identity achievement, but not orientation to pleasure.

Concerned about work and life satisfaction of Swiss military workers, Proyer, Annen, Eggimann, Schneider, and Ruch (2011) examined the relationship between OTH, career success, and work and life satisfaction. All three orientations to happiness were positively related to life satisfaction, and the meaningful life also correlated with work satisfaction.

In sum, previous research suggests the OTH plays a role in the psychological life of people. However, the role OTH plays in the work environment is still unclear. What is new in the present research is the study of the differential impact of toxic and empowering leadership on work motivation according to the OTH, clarifying its role in the work environment.

Aim of the research and contribution of the study

Work environment, roles and responsibilities, supervision, feedback, and rewards are key contributing factors that help us to further understand and define leadership types (Ramlall, 2004). As mentioned before, a leader can support the basic psychological needs through empowering behaviors, thus, facilitating the employee's autonomous motivation (identified

regulation and intrinsic work motivation; Deci et al., 2017). Further research confirms that characteristics and traits of a leader are the most decisive factors creating work motivation and that there are at least 8 suitable leadership styles impacting on work motivation (Khuong & Hoang, 2015).

Kark and Van Dijk (2007) claimed that different forms of leadership can lead to different outcomes in employees, including work motivation and organizational commitment, among others. Additional research supports that a sense of self-efficacy and competence of workers can be influenced through the provision of positive emotional support, persuasion, encouragement, and models of success and achievement with others that they identify with, and positive task mastery experiences (Bandura, 1986).

The idea of leadership predicting work motivation is supported by Gagné and Deci (2005) when they affirm that job characteristics, choice, constructive feedback, and interpersonal style of leaders are very important when influencing autonomous motivation. In one of their field studies, Deci, Connell and Ryan (1989) found that when leaders behaved in a more autonomy-supportive way (encouraging subordinates' initiative, providing feedback, and understanding their perspectives) than in a controlling way, subordinates displayed more positive work-related attitudes. They concluded work climates that promote the satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs enhance employee's intrinsic motivation and promote full internalization of extrinsic motivation.

Moreover, workers in empowered teams are granted more control over their work environment, more autonomy, and self-direction (Gagné & Deci, 2005). In other words, empowering leadership may contribute to the satisfaction the basic psychological needs defined by the SDT, hence improving intrinsic motivation and promoting internalization of extrinsic

motivation whereas toxic leadership has a long-term negative impact as well as an immediate and destructive impact towards work motivation (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Toxic leadership is believed to have an undermining effect and that, as found in a previous study, empowering leadership has a positive correlation with job satisfaction (Tietjen & Myers, 1998).

When examining the relationship between OTH, career success, work and life satisfaction, researchers concluded that all three orientations can be positively correlated to life satisfaction, while only meaningful life was positively correlated with work satisfaction (Proyer et al., 2011). This would lead us to think that, since different orientations to happiness correlate differently with work satisfaction, it is possible that they will also correlate differently with work motivation. Likewise, as OTH is a dispositional variable, it is anticipated that it will influence the way toxic and empowering leaderships affect work motivation. Thus, we propose that one will be affected differently by Toxic/Empowering Leadership concerning its effect on work motivation.

Peterson et al. (2005) affirmed that those with empty life (low scores in the three dimensions of OTH) have lower life satisfaction and less happiness. Self-esteem and happiness have a strong and direct relation (Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2003). Thus, those with an empty life will most likely have low self-esteem. According to Schmidt (2008), the perception of a toxic leadership might be affected by low self-esteem. The author defends that subordinates with low self-esteem may be more tolerant because the negative behavior might reinforce their low opinion of themselves – so toxic leadership should not affect their work motivation as strongly as it would affect workers within the full life profile. Those in full life profile (high scores in the three dimensions of OTH) most probably have high self-esteem. Therefore, they will be more affected by a toxic leader.

Whereas one with low self-esteem will not find oneself worthy of empowering leadership behaviors and most likely will not appreciate participating in decision making, an individual with high self-esteem (full life profile) is more willing to speak up in groups, feeling somewhat comfortable criticizing if needed (Baumeister et al., 2003). Therefore, the full life profile seems to be willing to provide feedback and participating in decision making and then being more affected positively by an empowering leader. Since we are aware that we have no self-esteem measured in the present study, the use of the concept here serves only for describing a possible mechanism that justifies hypothesis 1 and 2 (presented below). While testing the differential impact of leadership type on work motivation, according to the orientation to happiness, it would be wise to consider and contrast the opposite orientations towards happiness in order to highlight, contrast, and better test our *hypotheses*.

H₁: The negative effect of Toxic Leadership on Work motivation is stronger in workers of the Full Life profile than in workers of the Empty Life Profile.

H₂: The positive effect of Empowering Leadership on Work motivation is stronger in workers of the Full Life profile than in workers of the Empty Life Profile.

Amongst the different types of OTH, the search for pleasure may be felt by any class of activities, whenever pleasant emotion accompanies the satisfaction of needs, either intellectually, socially based, or physically bringing inherent satisfaction to the individual (Waterman, 1993). Furthermore, social contextual factors that promote feelings of competence and autonomy enhance intrinsic motivation while factors that lower said feelings will undermine intrinsic motivation (Gagné & Deci, 2005). We can assume that the same will happen to social (external

regulation) and introjected regulation. As mentioned before, the former is a motivation that provides the idea of immediate recognition through achieving an externally imposed reward or avoiding a possible negative social outcome, while the latter provides the idea that individuals will act in a certain way or do something to feel worthy or avoid guilt, looking for a reward or avoiding a negative outcome (Gagné et al., 2015).

Orientation to Pleasure is the search for happiness through immediate pleasure or positive emotions and avoidance of pain or negative emotions. It emerged from the hedonic tradition (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Due to the constant search for immediate pleasure and avoidance of pain of workers within the pleasurable life profile, it's reasonable to expect that the work motivation dimensions above will be more affected by leadership (positively or negatively according to the leadership dimensions in action) in workers within the pleasurable life profile than those within non-pleasurable life profiles (engaged and meaningful life; high engagement and meaning, but low pleasure). In other words, work becomes more painful under toxic leadership and consequently those who are included in the pleasurable life profile are more strongly affected by that type of leadership. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be stated:

H₃: The negative effect of Toxic Leadership is stronger on Introjected Regulation, External Regulation (Social), and Intrinsic Motivation of Workers within the pleasurable life profile (low engagement and low meaning) than in workers within non-pleasurable life profile (i.e., the engaged and meaningful life profile; low pleasure).

Contrariwise, work becomes more pleasurable under Empowering Leadership. Workers feel recognized, informed, respected and consequently the positive impact of that leadership on

work motivation is stronger on those who are included in the pleasurable life profile compared to those included in the non-pleasurable life profile. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be stated:

H4: The positive effect of Empowering Leadership is stronger on the Intrinsic Work Motivation of workers within the pleasurable life profile (low engagement and low meaning) than in workers within non-pleasurable life profile (i.e., the engaged and meaningful life profile; low pleasure).

Regarding identified work motivation, another distinction is arguably relevant. Since identified work motivation brings together personal values and the meaning of the work, it is expected empowering leadership will enrich the meaning of work through activating empowerment. Furthermore, it is also expected that empowering leadership has a greater positive impact on identified regulation of individuals within the meaningful life profile than those within engaged and pleasurable life profile (low meaning). This is due to the relation that exists between identified work motivation and the value workers attribute to their work. People that pursue meaning feel empowering leadership as a way to better perform their jobs strengthening the link between work and their values system. Therefore, their identified work motivation becomes stronger. On the other hand, those who don't pursue meaning receive less impact of empowering leadership on their identified work motivation. Those who do not look for happiness through meaning are less sensible to empowering leadership since they disregard the importance and the link of their jobs to their values system. Therefore, we decided to test the following hypothesis:

H₅: Identified work motivation is more increased by Empowering leadership in meaningful life profiles than in the non-meaningful life profiles (i.e., Engaged and Pleasurable Life profile; low meaning).

Even though some scholars (Humphreys & Einstein, 2004; Khuong & Hoang, 2015) have discussed work motivation and its relationship with leadership, no one has considered the different effects of leadership taking into consideration the employee's orientation to happiness yet. This paper contributes to the understanding of the role of the OTH in the influence of empowering and toxic leaderships on work motivation, as defined by the self-determination theory. Thus, another contribution of this paper is the integration of toxic and empowering leadership with motivation and the three different orientations to happiness. The present research is expected to contribute to a more accurate understanding of the relationships between work motivation, leadership and the pursuit of happiness.

Method

Participants

To be eligible to partake in this study, the participants had to be in the workforce currently, have, at least, 6 months of work experience as well as 3 months of contact with a direct supervisor or manager. Retired personnel, self-employed workers or unemployed individuals were within the exclusion criteria.

The participants were Portuguese workers ($N = 850$), being 56% female and 42% male, while 2% did not respond. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 69, and the average age

was 39.42 (please see Table 1 for a description of the sociodemographic variables). They had been working for an average of 11.38 years, and the vast majority had been working in the same position for over a year (77.2%). Only 39.6% of the participants had a college education or higher, while most participants (59.2%) had up to a high school diploma. More than half (70.7%) of the participants worked in the private sector, while only 27.4% worked in the public sector, and 1.1% worked in both sectors. Only 21.6% of those surveyed were in managerial positions, and 74.7% had been working with their current manager for over a year.

Table 1
Sample characteristics

| Sample | <i>n</i> | % | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---|----------|-----|----------|-----------|
| Gender | | | | |
| Male | 357 | 42 | - | - |
| Female | 476 | 56 | - | - |
| No response | 17 | 2 | - | - |
| Age | | | | |
| Age | 844 | - | 39.4 | .41 |
| No response | 6 | | | |
| Years of work | | | | |
| Years of work | 811 | - | 11.38 | .370 |
| No response | 39 | | | |
| 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 | - | - |
| No response | 11 | 1.3 | - | - |
| Types of employment contract | | | | |
| Sole trader (payment by invoice) | 43 | 5.1 | - | - |
| Contractual | 254 | 30 | - | - |
| Tenure | 533 | 63 | - | - |
| No response | 20 | 2.4 | - | - |
| Holding Management / Leadership role | | | | |
| Holding Management / Leadership role | 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 | - | - |

| Sample | <i>n</i> | % | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|----------------------------|----------|-----|----------|-----------|
| Large (500-1000) | 42 | 4.9 | - | - |
| Very large (≥ 1001) | 100 | 12 | - | - |
| No response | 17 | 2 | - | - |

Instruments

Orientation to Happiness Scale (OtHS)

The Orientation to Happiness Scale (OtHS) has 18 items that were designed to measure three different approaches of happiness (or dimensions): pleasure, meaning, and engagement - when one has high scores on all of them, one has a full life; in the case of low scores on all, the individual has an empty life (Peterson et al., 2005). The OtHS has already been used in several studies in the literature proving its reliability (Anic & Tončić, 2013; Chen, Tsai, & Chen, 2009; Gabriele, 2008; Hirschi, 2011; Köse, 2014; Lee, Foo, Adams, Morgan, & Frewen, 2015; Pollock et al., 2015; Terrill et al., 2015).

The Portuguese version of the OtHS was previously made by Siurana, Bosch, Pais, dos Santos and Mónico (2017). That was the version here applied. Participants answered using a 6-point scale from one (very much unlike me) to six (very much like me). An example of a pleasure item: “Life is too short to postpone”; an example of an engagement item: “Regardless of what I am doing, time passes very quickly”; an example of a meaning item: “My life serves a higher purpose”. Through a confirmatory factorial analysis, seven items (1, 2, 3, 9, 11, 16, 18) with factorial loadings $< .50$, as defined by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), were deleted, still maintaining the three dimensions (engaged, pleasure, and meaning). Chen et al. (2009), when validating the OtHS in China, also saw the need to delete an item due to the improvement of model fit. Also, based on the modification indices higher than 12, we correlated the errors

associated with the variables within factors 2 and 3 in model 2. This covariation between the errors showed non-random measurement errors, the similarity of the items, sequential positioning in the instrument, as well as the specific characteristics of the respondents (Aish & Jöreskog, 1990). It can also be referred to as semantic redundancy or items whose content is implicit in other items.

Table 2

Fit indices obtained in the confirmatory factor analysis of Orientation to Happiness Scale (OtHS)

| Model | NFI | SRMR | TLI | CFI | χ^2/df | RMSEA | RMSEA Confidence Interval 90% |
|-------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | .802 | .06 | .798 | .826 | 6.569*** (df=132) | .801 | .076-.086*** |
| 2 | .934 | .04 | .926 | .947 | 4.572*** (df=39) | .065 | .055-.075*** |

*** $p < .001$

The quality of the fit was improved considerably, the indices indicated that the model fitted the data well with good NFI, SRMR, TLI, and CFI indices and acceptable indices for χ^2/df and RMSEA (Table 2). The standardized regression weights of this model ranged from .469 to .738, values that are considered very good as $> .50$ (Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2013)

The Cronbach's alpha for Pleasure was .71, the Cronbach's alpha for Engagement was .62, and the Cronbach's alpha for Meaning was .70. The composite reliability indexes of Factor 1 and Factor 2 were also satisfactory since they were equal to .70 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2008). However, the composite reliability index (please see Table 6) of Factor 3 was not satisfactory ($< .70$). In the average variance extracted, all factors were below .50, indicating a lack of convergent validity between the items of each factor (Fornell & Lacker, 1981), since, according to Bagozzi and Yi (1988), for the average variance extracted to be acceptable, it must be $> .50$.

Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS)

The MWMS has 19 items that assess six distinct motivation types (Amotivation, External Regulation, Introjected Regulation, Identified Regulation, Integrated Regulation, and Intrinsic Motivation). The Portuguese version of the MWMS was previously validated by dos Santos et al. (2016). That was the version applied in the present research. Participants answered why they put efforts into their current job using a 7-point scale from one (nothing) to seven (completely). An example of an amotivation item: “I don’t know why I’m in this job, since it’s useless”; an example of an extrinsic regulation social item: “Because others will respect me more”; an example of an extrinsic regulation material item: “Because others will reward me financially only if I put enough effort in my job”; an example of an introjected regulation item: “Because I have to prove to myself that I can”; an example of identified regulation item: “Because putting efforts in this job has personal significance to me”; and an example of an intrinsic motivation item: “Because I have fun doing my job”.

The scale was validated in many countries (i.e., Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Indonesia, Norway, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Switzerland, and United Kingdom), becoming relevant across all these countries and in the organizational psychology field as well (Gagné et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2016).

Although the MWMS has proved to be a reliable scale, one of its limitations is that there is no integrated regulation subscale due to its conceptual closeness to identified regulation. That conceptual closeness makes it hard to find significant differences between intrinsic motivation and identified subscales (Gagné et al., 2015). Gagné and Deci (2005) have already highlighted that integrated and identified regulations cause people to behave for almost the same reasons,

such as valuing the behavior and having fully accepted its importance for their well-being and goals, making it difficult to separate them.

Despite this inaccuracy of the scale regarding the differences between integrated and identified regulations, the MWMS has shown consistently good psychometric properties across cultures and is the most updated instrument to measure work motivation in the SDT approach. That consistency and validity lead us to expect it is an appropriate instrument to express differential impacts of leadership types on work motivation. Additionally, since the various work motivation dimensions express the three basic needs stated by SDT, the toxic versus empowering leadership types will affect these work motivation dimensions.

After assessing the model fit, based on the modification indices higher than 60, we decided to correlate the errors associated with the variables within factor 3 in model 2, improving the model fit (Table 3); all indices were acceptable.

Table 3

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 | .06 | .917 | .932 | 5.959*** (df=140) | .076 | .071-.081*** |
| 2 | .942 | .05 | .944 | .955 | 4.334*** (df=138) | .063 | .058-.068*** |

*** $p < .001$

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

Composite reliability indices were also satisfactory (please see Table 6). The average variance extracted (AVE) was satisfactory in all factors, except on Introjected Regulation (AVE = .493).

Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ)

The Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ; Arnold et al., 2000) measures five dimensions of the empowering leadership using 38 items: coaching, informing, leading by example, showing concern, and participative decision-making. The ELQ has been used in different studies in the literature and proved to be a valid and reliable measure (Fong & Snape, 2013; Martínez-Córcoles, Gracia, Tomás & Peiró, 2011; Martínez-Córcoles, Gracia, Tomás, Peiró & Schöbel, 2013; Martínez-Córcoles, Schöbel, Gracia, Tomás & Peiró, 2012) and it has also been validated in Portuguese (Salvador & dos Santos, 2018). Participants answered questions about their leader's behavior using a 5-point scale from one (My leader never behaves like that) to five (My leader always behaves like that). An example of a Leading by Example item: "My leader leads by example", an example of a Participative Decision-Making item: "My leader listens to my work group's ideas and suggestions", an example of a Coaching item: "My leader supports my work group's efforts", an example of an Informing item: "My leader explains company goals", and an example of a Showing Concern item: "My leader stays in touch with my work group". After assessing the model fit, we decided to correlate the errors associated with the variables within factors 1, 3, 4 and 5, based on the modification indices above 50; therefore, improving the model fit (Table 4); all indices were acceptable.

Table 4

Fit indices obtained in the confirmatory factor analysis of Empowerment Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ).

| Model | NFI | SRMR | TLI | CFI | χ^2/df | RMSEA | RMSEA Confidence Interval 90% |
|-------|------|------|------|------|-------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | .898 | .04 | .913 | .919 | 4.600*** (df=655) | .065 | .063-.067*** |
| 2 | .932 | .03 | .949 | .953 | 3.102*** (df=648) | .050 | .047-.052*** |

*** $p < .001$

The standardized regression weights for this model ranged from .574 to .921, values that are considered very good (Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2013).

The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .98. All the factors and the overall scale showed good internal consistency (please see Table 6). Composite reliability indexes (please see Table 6) were also satisfactory as well as the average variance extracted, all factors were above .50. For this study, only the overall measure of ELQ was used and not its sub-dimensions.

Toxic Leadership Scale (TLS)

The Toxic Leadership Scale (TLS; Schmidt, 2008) has 29 items and measures the following dimensions of toxic leadership: self-promotion, abusive supervision, unpredictability, narcissism, and authoritarian leadership. The TLS has been used in different studies (Rotarescu, 2014; Gallus et al., 2013) and it was even adapted to Romanian (Popa, Rotărescu, Sulea, & Albulescu, 2013) and Portuguese (Salvador & dos Santos, 2018). Participants answered questions about their leader's behavior using a 6-point scale from one (I disagree completely – my leader isn't like that) to six (I agree completely – my leader is exactly like that). An example of an Abusive Supervision item: “My leader ridicules subordinates”, an example of an Authoritarian Leadership item: “My leader ignores ideas that are contrary to his/her own”, an example of a Narcissism item: “My leader has a sense of personal entitlement”, an example of a Self-promotion item: “My leader accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her”, and an example of an Unpredictability item: “My leader has explosive outbursts”.

After assessing the model fit, based on the modification indices above 101, the errors associated with the observed variables within factor 3 were correlated in model 2 to improve the model fit (Table 5); all indices were acceptable.

Table 5

Fit indices obtained in the confirmatory factor analysis of the Toxic Leadership Scale (TLS)

| Model | NFI | SRMR | TLI | CFI | χ^2/df | RMSEA | RMSEA Confidence Interval 90% |
|-------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | .907 | .04 | .916 | .923 | 5.113*** (df=395) | .070 | .067-.073*** |
| 2 | .912 | .04 | .921 | .947 | 4.854*** (df=394) | .067 | .064-.070*** |

*** $p < .001$

The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .97. The overall scale and all factors showed good internal consistency (Table 5). The standardized regression weights of this model range from .550 to .909, values that are considered very good (Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2013).

The composite reliability indices of all the factors were satisfactory (please see Table 6). In the average variance extracted, all factors were above acceptable, except for the Authoritarian Leadership Factor that presented a value of .49. For this study, only the overall measure of TLS was used and not its sub-dimensions.

Procedures

The data was collected by master's students through a research involving the University of Coimbra and the University of Évora, Portugal. The questionnaires were administered individually by students of Psychology in December 2016 and January 2017, as part of their study program. Appropriate training was provided, both regarding ethical standards and technical procedures (i.e., the task of collecting data), and each student received the informed consent and specific instructions concerning the data collecting process. Each student applied the

questionnaires (please see Annex A) to 5 participants within their network and signed a responsibility form stating they have followed the ethical and technical procedures required.

After reviewing and signing an informed consent, the participants would then answer a questionnaire containing the scales. All participants were informed of the voluntary nature, the possibility to withdraw from the research at any moment as well as the confidentiality and anonymity of the data collected.

Data Analysis

All the analyses were completed using the statistical program SPSS and AMOS 22.0 for Windows operating system (IBM SPSS Inc., 2001). Outliers were analyzed according to Mahalanobis squared distance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), and no relevant values were found. The normality of the variables was assessed by the coefficients of skewness (Sk) and kurtosis (Ku), and no variable presented values violating normal distribution, $|Sk| < 2$ and $|Ku| < 3$.

The confirmatory factorial analysis was performed with AMOS (v. 22.0, IBM SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL; Arbuckle, 2013), estimation method by maximum likelihood (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2004). Goodness of fit was analyzed by the indexes of NFI (Normed of fit index; good fit $> .80$; Schumacker & Lomax, 2010), SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; appropriate fit $< .08$; Brown, 2006), TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index - TLI; appropriate fit $> .90$; Brown, 2006), CFI (Comparative fit index; good fit $> .90$; Bentler, 1990), RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; good fit $< .05$; Kline, 2011; Schumacker & Lomax, 2010), and χ^2/df (acceptable fit < 5 ; good adjustment < 2 ; Marôco, 2011; Schumacker & Lomax, 2010). The fit of the model was improved by modification indices (MI; Bollen, 1989), leading to correlation of the residual variability between variables with $MI > 90$, $p < .001$.

We followed Arbuckle's proposal (2013), which consists in analyzing the MIs by their statistical significance ($p < 0.05$). Reliability was calculated by Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally, 1978). Reliability coefficients higher than .70 were considered acceptable (Hair et al., 2008). In general, the value of .80 was accepted as a good reliability indicator. The composite reliability and the average variance extracted for each factor were evaluated as described in Fornell and Larcker (1981).

After the descriptive statistics and intercorrelation matrix, cluster analyses were performed with the OtHS dimensions, leading to a classification of the participants into groups, through the TwoStep procedure for continuous variables. 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 (Bacher, Wenzing, & Vogler, 2004; IBM SPSS Inc., 2001). The distance measure was calculated by the Log-Likelihood method. The classification of clusters was done by using the Schwarz's Bayesian Criterion (Schwarz, 1978).

The data were subsequently analyzed through a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA, General Linear Model procedure; Hair et al., 2008), fulfilling the required assumptions for the reliable use of this test, namely: a) independence of observations; b) normality of distribution within each group with $n < 30$ observations (we had a normal distribution in all variables of the MWMS except for amotivation); c) homogeneity of error variances; this assumption was evaluated with Levene's test of equality of error variances, showing that the error variance was equal across groups. For the dependent variables Introjected Regulation and Intrinsic Motivation ($p < .001$), we have used the Pillai's Trace because it is a

powerful statistic procedure and very robust to modest violations of normality and equality of the covariance and variance matrix, *Box's M* = 189.26, $F(147, 76469.54) = 1.23, p = .03$.

Post-hoc Tukey HSD tests for multiple comparisons were performed, since the independent variable (profiles of OTH) has eight levels (Alferes, 1997, p. 142). A significance level of $\alpha = .05$ 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). Magnitude of the experimental effect was obtained by calculating eta-squared (η^2) measure (Howell, 2013).

Regression Analyses were performed fulfilling all the assumptions (normality, residues, no multicollinearity) and compared the estimated regression coefficients using a t-test. Gender was measured as a dichotomous variable coded 1 for male and 2 for female. Age was measured in years (ranged 18-69). Level of education was coded as 1 for "Can read and write without first cycle of basic education", 2 for "1st cycle of basic education (primary education)", 3 for "2nd cycle of basic education (6th year)", 4 for "3rd cycle of basic education (9th year)", 5 for "secondary education (12th year)", 6 for "Bachelor's Degree", 7 for "Degree in progress", 8 for "Postgraduate / Master's degree (Post Bologna) / Pre-Bologna Degree", 9 for "Degree completed (post-Bologna)", 10 for "Pre-Bologna Masters", and 11 for "PhD".

Results

All questionnaires were analyzed concerning the descriptive statistics and the correlations between them were assessed as well as their composite reliability, average variance values are presented below (Table 6).

Table 6

Correlation matrix between OtHS, MWMS, TLS, and ELQ dimensions and sociodemographic variables – Pearson correlation coefficient and composite reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE), internal consistency values and descriptive of OtHS, MWMS, TLS, and ELQ (Cronbach's alpha between brackets).

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | CR | AVE | M | SD |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----|-----|------|------|
| Meaning (1) | [.70] | .56** | .60** | -.08* | .02 | .04 | .23** | .31** | .29** | .07* | .10** | .01 | .17** | .03 | .70 | .37 | 3.58 | .76 |
| Pleasure (2) | | [.71] | .66** | .03 | .07* | .15** | .22** | .19** | .21** | .07* | .13** | -.07* | -.09** | .04 | .07 | .37 | 3.51 | .77 |
| Engagement (3) | | | [.62] | -.03 | .03 | .06 | .25** | .26** | .31** | .11** | .10** | -.03 | -.01 | .10** | .57 | .31 | 3.41 | .78 |
| Amotivation (4) | | | | [.88] | .22** | .09* | -.05 | -.24** | -.26** | .19** | -.17** | -.06 | .00 | -.02* | .89 | .72 | 1.55 | 1.09 |
| Social (5) | | | | | [.87] | .50** | .33** | .08* | .03 | .06 | .04 | -.03 | -.02 | -.10** | .87 | .70 | 2.92 | 1.69 |
| Material (6) | | | | | | [.83] | .31** | .05 | .02 | .05 | .12** | -.12** | -.14** | -.17** | .84 | .65 | 3.82 | 1.81 |
| Introjected Regulation (7) | | | | | | | [.81] | .57** | .37** | .02 | .14** | .11** | .08* | .01 | .79 | .49 | 4.65 | 1.54 |
| Identified Regulation (8) | | | | | | | | [.87] | .63** | -.10** | .24** | .14** | .10** | .12** | .88 | .72 | 5.60 | 1.38 |
| Intrinsic Motivation (9) | | | | | | | | | [.92] | -.13** | .30** | .10** | .07 | .14** | .92 | .80 | 4.69 | 1.60 |
| TLS (10) | | | | | | | | | | [.97] | -.65** | -.01 | .06 | -.04 | - | - | 2.53 | 1.15 |
| ELQ (11) | | | | | | | | | | | [.98] | -.01 | -.11** | .01 | - | - | - | - |
| Gender (12) | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .11** | .12** | - | - | 3.40 | .82 |
| Age (13) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | -.20** | - | - | - | - |
| Level of Education (14) ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | - | - | - | - |

Cronbach's alpha between brackets * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$ ^a Spearman correlation used only as level of education is an ordinal variable;

The correlation between the scales of the instruments (OtHS, MWMS, TLS, and ELQ) were positive but low (Table 6). The OtHS subscales had their highest correlations with MWMS subscales: all three correlated with Identified Regulation ($r = .31$ for meaning, $r = .19$ for pleasure, and $r = .26$ for engagement), while Engagement and Pleasure correlated with Introjected Regulation ($r = .22$ for pleasure and $r = .25$ for engagement). It's interesting to observe that between age and material (Extrinsic Motivation) there was a negative correlation; while there's positive correlation with Orientation to Happiness through meaning. Another interesting point is that level of education correlated negatively with social (Extrinsic Motivation) but positively with Identified Regulation and Intrinsic Motivation. Also, as expected, there was high negative correlation between the scales TLS and ELQ, since they are somewhat opposites; empowering leadership positively affects autonomy and competence needs satisfaction, whereas toxic leadership undermines those basic needs.

Creation of OTH profiles

For each dimension of the OtHS, two clusters differentiating high and low values were suggested by the TwoStep Procedure Cluster Analysis (Landau & Everitt, 2004). In Pleasure, we found a low pleasure cluster ($n = 460$, $M = 2.94$) and a high pleasure cluster ($n = 390$, $M = 4.19$). In Engagement, we found a low engagement cluster ($n = 321$, $M = 2.61$) and a high engagement cluster ($n = 529$, $M = 3.89$). In Meaning, we found a low meaning cluster ($n = 444$, $M = 2.99$) and a high meaning cluster ($n = 406$, $M = 4.22$). All clusters showed satisfactory quality, as their silhouette measure of cohesion and separation was higher than .5 (please see Table 7). Then, we analyzed each participant individually to see in which cluster they belonged to, creating profiles through the combination of the clusters (Low and High) in each of the three dimensions of the

OtHS. Since we have individuals that are high in only a certain cluster and low in others (i.e., pleasurable life, composed of works with a high score in orientation to pleasure and low scores in orientation to engagement and meaning, individuals who search for happiness through immediate pleasure and avoidance of pain), we chose to create new clusters to be more accurate (we have opted to call them “profiles”), that led to the creation of eight different profiles which can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7

Clusters Sizes, means, and description of OTH Profiles Clusters.

| | | 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 | Pleasurable Life | High | Low | Low | 26 | 3 | |
| | Engaged Life | Low | High | Low | 104 | 12 | |
| | Meaningful Life | Low | Low | High | 48 | 6 | |
| | Full Life | High | High | High | 243 | 29 | |
| | Empty Life | Low | Low | Low | 220 | 26 | |
| | Meaningful and Engaged Life | Low | High | High | 88 | 10 | |
| | Meaningful and Pleasurable Life | High | Low | High | 27 | 3 | |
| | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | High | High | Low | 94 | 11 | |
| <i>Total:</i> | | | | | 850 | 100.00 | |

The profiles according to different orientation to happiness profiles were: (1) engaged life, composed of workers with a high score in orientation to engagement and low scores in orientation to pleasure and orientation to meaning, individuals who are constantly seeking activities that will allow themselves to be engaged and to enter the state described as flow; (2)

pleasurable high, composed of workers with a high score in orientation to pleasure and low scores in orientation to engagement and orientation to meaning, individuals who search for happiness through immediate pleasure and avoidance of pain; (3) meaningful life, composed of workers with a high score in orientation to meaning and low score in orientation to pleasure and orientation to engagement, individuals who are at their happiest when their activities coincides with their most basic values and are integrated into one's actions and search for meaning in what they do; (4) meaningful and engaged life, composed of workers with a high score in orientation to meaning and orientation to engagement and low scores in orientation to pleasure, individuals who look for meaning and for a state of flow but do not seek immediate pleasure; (5) meaningful and pleasurable life, composed of workers with a high score in orientation to meaning and orientation to pleasure and low scores in orientation to engagement, individuals who look for meaning and immediate pleasure/reward in what they do but do not feel the need to be engaged in the activity; (6) engaged and pleasurable life, composed of workers with a high score in orientation to engagement and orientation to pleasure and low scores in orientation to meaning, individuals who look for immediate pleasure/reward as well as for activities that will engage them, without giving much attention to the value of the activity; (7) full life, composed of workers with high scores in all orientation to happiness, the happiest of all profiles; (8) and empty life, composed of workers with low scores in all orientation to happiness, individuals with lower well-being.

Differences in MWMS between OTH profiles

The *analysis of multivariate test* indicated that the overall effect was statistically significant, with *Pillai's Trace* = .182, $F(147, 76469.54) = 3.76, p < .001$, although with a low effect size, $\eta^2 = 0.03$.

Table 8 - Average Scores and Standard Deviations of the MWMS: Multivariate Analysis of Variance (F Ratios) and Effect Size (η^2)

| | 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 | | | |
| <i>MWMS</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | |

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

When we considered the profiles in their specificity, we found differences between all the dimensions of MWMS, except for external regulation – social: the highest effect size (10.2%) for group differences was for intrinsic motivation and the smallest effect size (2.3%) was for material (external regulation).

By undertaking Tukey HSD multiple comparison tests, we noticed 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 9).

Table 9 – Differences between MWMS according to OTH Profiles: Post Hoc – Tukey HSD

| Dependent Variable | (I) Profile | (J) Profile | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Amotivation | Pleasurable Life | Engaged Life | .83* | .24 | .11 | 1.55 |
| | | Full Life | .97* | .22 | .29 | 1.64 |
| | | Empty Life | .86 ^c | .22 | .18 | 1.54 |
| | | Meaningful and Engaged Life | .99* | .24 | .26 | 1.75 |
| Material | Pleasurable Life | Full Life | -.74* | .22 | -1.42 | -.06 |
| | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | -.82* | .27 | -1.63 | -.01 |
| Introjected Regulation | Empty Life | Full Life | -1.01* | .14 | -1.43 | -.59 |
| | | Meaningful and Engaged Life | -.64* | .19 | -1.21 | -.07 |
| | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | -.69* | .18 | -1.25 | -.13 |
| Identified Regulation | Meaningful and Engaged Life | Pleasurable Life | .96* | .30 | .06 | 1.86 |
| | | Empty Life | .73* | .17 | .22 | 1.24 |
| | Full Life | Engaged Life | .57* | .16 | .09 | 1.03 |
| | | Pleasurable Life | 1.20* | .27 | .37 | 2.03 |
| | | Empty Life | .97* | .12 | .59 | 1.35 |
| | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | .74* | .16 | .25 | 1.23 |
| Intrinsic Motivation | Full Life | Engaged Life | .77* | .18 | .23 | 1.32 |
| | | Meaningful Life | 1.02* | .24 | .29 | 1.75 |
| | | Pleasurable Life | 1.58* | .31 | .63 | 2.54 |
| | | Empty Life | 1.25* | .14 | .82 | 1.69 |
| | Meaningful and Engaged Life | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | .90* | .19 | .34 | 1.46 |
| | | Pleasurable Life | 1.17* | .34 | .14 | 2.21 |
| | | Empty Life | .84* | .19 | .26 | 1.43 |

* $p \leq .05$

MWMS predicted by Leadership

We controlled the demographic variables gender, age and level of education in the hierarchical regression analysis, considering the correlations that were statistically significant, based on previous research (Howard, Gagné, Morin & Van den Broeck, 2016; Teo, Lim & Lai, 1999). A regression analysis was made with each profile to analyze the impact of toxic and empowering leadership on each type of work motivation, considering as criteria the eight profiles created using the OtHS (Table 10).

Amotivation did not correlate with any of the demographic variables. Therefore, no variable was controlled. The model for toxic leadership predicting amotivation proved to be significant when positively predicting amotivation for the profiles of Engaged Life (6%), Meaningful Life (12%), Pleasurable Life (18%), Full Life (2%), and Engaged and Pleasurable Life (17%). In the second model, empowering leadership explained 18% of the variation (decrease) of amotivation in workers of the Engaged and Pleasurable Life, 23% in workers of the Pleasurable Life, and 8% in workers of the Engaged and Meaningful Life Profiles. Thus, the more empowering leadership, the less amotivated workers are.

Social (external regulation) did not correlate with age nor with gender, however, it correlated negatively with level of education. In other words, the higher the level of education of the individual, the lower one's motivation will be by social (external regulation). Therefore, we controlled that variable. Toxic leadership explained 8% of the variation (increase) of social (external regulation) in workers in the Engaged and Pleasurable Life. Empowering Leadership, on the other hand, did not predict social (external regulation) in any profile.

Material (external regulation) correlated negatively with gender, age, and level of education. That means that the higher the age and level of education, the lower the material

(external regulation). Moreover, there's a tendency of men to be more motivated by material (external regulation) than women. Consequently, we controlled those variables. Toxic leadership did not predict material (external regulation) in any of the profiles. Empowering leadership explained only 3% of the variation (increase) of material (external regulation) in workers of the Full Life Profile. In other words, for workers in the Full Life Profile, the more empowering leadership, the more materially motivated they feel.

Since introjected regulation correlated positively with gender and age, we controlled those variables. Those positive correlations imply that the older an individual is, the more motivated by introject regulation one will be and, also, that there's a tendency of women being more motivated by introject regulation than men. Toxic leadership predicted 6% of the variation (decrease) of introjected regulation in workers of the Full Life profile; it also predicted 3% of the variation (increase) of introjected regulation in workers of the Empty Life Profile. Empowering leadership is responsible for 15% of the variance of introjected regulation in workers of the Engaged Life profile and 8% of the variance in workers of Full Life, positively predicting said work motivation dimension in both profiles. Therefore, the higher the empowering leadership, the higher the introjected regulation.

As there was a positive correlation between identified regulation with gender, age, and level of education, we have controlled those variables in Table 10. Those correlations imply that the higher the age and level of education of an individual, the more intrinsic motivated one is. Moreover, according to the positive correlation, women tend to more intrinsic motivated than men. In the model presented on Table 10, toxic leadership explained 10% of the variance (decrease) of identified regulation in workers of the Engaged Life Profile and 5% in workers of the Full Life Profile. Thus, for workers from both profiles, the more toxic leadership, the less

identified regulation motivation they feel. Empowering leadership is a positive predictor of identified regulation in workers of the Engaged Life, Full Life, Empty Life, and Engaged and Pleasurable Life profiles. Empowering leadership explained 18% of the variance (increase) of identified regulation in workers of the Engaged and Pleasurable Life profile, 12% in workers of the Engaged Life, 10% in workers of Empty Life, and 6% in workers of the Full Life profile.

Intrinsic motivation was positively correlated with gender and education. Therefore, we controlled those demographic variables. Intrinsic motivation is negatively affected by toxic leadership especially in workers in profiles of Engaged Life and Engaged and Pleasurable Life. Toxic leadership explains 14% of the decrease in intrinsic motivation in workers of the Engaged Life profile and 13% of the decline in Intrinsic Motivation in workers of the Engaged and Pleasurable Life profile. In the last regression model, empowering leadership explained 26% of the variation (increase) in intrinsic motivation in workers of the profile of Engaged Life, 32% in workers of the Pleasurable Life profile, 8% in workers of the Full Life profile, 13% of the Empty Life Profile, and 18% in workers of the Engaged and Pleasurable Life profile. Therefore, we can conclude that empowering leadership predicts intrinsic motivation.

Table 10

Results of Linear Regression of Work Motivation predicted by Toxic Leadership and Empowering Leadership.

| Amotivation | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|-----------------------|--|----------|--|----------|--|----------|---|----------|--|----------|---|----------|---|----------|---|----------|
| | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | B | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> |
| Toxic Leadership | .25 | 2.62** | .24 | 2.52* | .34 | 2.44* | .42 | 2.27* | .06 | .93 | .32 | 1.72 | .13 | 1.22 | .41 | 4.27*** |
| | <i>R</i> = .242, <i>R</i> ² = .059, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .049, <i>SE</i> = 1.029, <i>F</i> (1,102) = 6.35* | | <i>R</i> = .339, <i>R</i> ² = .115, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .095, <i>SE</i> = 1.077, <i>F</i> (1,46) = 5.958* | | <i>R</i> = .421, <i>R</i> ² = .177, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .143, <i>SE</i> = 1.360, <i>F</i> (1,24) = 5.179* | | <i>R</i> = .149, <i>R</i> ² = .022, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .018, <i>SE</i> = 1.014, <i>F</i> (1,241) = 5.467* | | <i>R</i> = .063, <i>R</i> ² = .004, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.001, <i>SE</i> = 1.065, <i>F</i> (1,218) = .859 | | <i>R</i> = .324, <i>R</i> ² = .105, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .069, <i>SE</i> = 1.166, <i>F</i> (1,25) = 2.940 | | <i>R</i> = .130, <i>R</i> ² = .017, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .006, <i>SE</i> = 1.052, <i>F</i> (1,86) = 1.488 | | <i>R</i> = .407, <i>R</i> ² = .165, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .156, <i>SE</i> = 1.025, <i>F</i> (1,92) = 18.215** * | |
| Empowering Leadership | B | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | B | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> |
| | -.194 | -1.98* | -.22 | -1.52 | -.48 | -2.57* | -.05 | -.73 | -.13 | -1.89 | -.14 | -.62 | -.25 | -2.33* | -.43 | -4.50*** |
| | <i>R</i> = .186, <i>R</i> ² = .057, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .025, <i>SE</i> = 1.042, <i>F</i> (1,102) = 3.647 | | <i>R</i> = .217, <i>R</i> ² = .047, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .027, <i>SE</i> = 1.118, <i>F</i> (1,46) = 2.280 | | <i>R</i> = .483, <i>R</i> ² = .233, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .202, <i>SE</i> = 1.313, <i>F</i> (1,24) = 7.309* | | <i>R</i> = .049, <i>R</i> ² = .002, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.002, <i>SE</i> = 1.024, <i>F</i> (1,241) = .590 | | <i>R</i> = .128, <i>R</i> ² = .016, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .012, <i>SE</i> = 1.058, <i>F</i> (1,218) = 3.627 | | <i>R</i> = .007, <i>R</i> ² = .000, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.040, <i>SE</i> = 1.232, <i>F</i> (1,25) = .001 | | <i>R</i> = .273, <i>R</i> ² = .075, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .064, <i>SE</i> = 1.020, <i>F</i> (1,86) = 6.947** | | <i>R</i> = .421, <i>R</i> ² = .178, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .169, <i>SE</i> = 1.017, <i>F</i> (1,92) = 19.876** * | |

| Social | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|--------------------|--|----------|--|----------|--|----------|---|----------|---|----------|---|----------|--|----------|---|----------|
| | B | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> | β | <i>t</i> |
| Level of Education | -.10 | -1.02 | -.27 | -1.84 | .15 | .71 | -.22 | -3.39*** | -.10 | -1.54 | -.38 | -2.16 | .74 | .46 | .03 | .25 |
| Toxic Leadership | -.03 | -.28 | .03 | .20 | .12 | .58 | -.03 | -.42 | .10 | 1.42 | .317 | 1.78 | -1.19 | .24 | .28 | 2.80* |
| | <i>R</i> = .106, <i>R</i> ² = .011, ΔR^2 = .001, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.009, <i>SE</i> = 1.661, <i>F</i> (2,99) = .563 | | <i>R</i> = .272, <i>R</i> ² = .074, ΔR^2 = .001, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .033, <i>SE</i> = 1.692, <i>F</i> (2,45) = 1.798 | | <i>R</i> = .194, <i>R</i> ² = .038, ΔR^2 = .015, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = -.050, <i>SE</i> = 1.476, <i>F</i> (2,22) = .432 | | <i>R</i> = .216, <i>R</i> ² = .047, ΔR^2 = .001, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .039, <i>SE</i> = 1.835, <i>F</i> (2,235) = 5.768** | | <i>R</i> = .142, <i>R</i> ² = .020, ΔR^2 = .009, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .011, <i>SE</i> = 1.548, <i>F</i> (2,216) = 2.214 | | <i>R</i> = .490, <i>R</i> ² = .240, ΔR^2 = .100, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .177, <i>SE</i> = 1.402, <i>F</i> (2,24) = 3.787* | | <i>R</i> = .159, <i>R</i> ² = .025, ΔR^2 = .017, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .002, <i>SE</i> = 1.522, <i>F</i> (2,83) = 1.081 | | <i>R</i> = .283, <i>R</i> ² = .080, ΔR^2 = .079, <i>R</i> ² _{aj} = .060, <i>SE</i> = 1.712, <i>F</i> (2,91) = 3.950* | |
| Level of Education | -.10 | -.97 | -.27 | -1.88 | .17 | .81 | -.22 | -3.40** | -.11 | -1.55 | -.33 | -1.56 | .09 | .80 | .02 | .17 |

| Social | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|-----------------------|---|-------|---|-----|---|-------|---|------|--|------|---|-----|---|-----|---|-------|
| Empowering Leadership | .20 | 2.00* | .01 | .06 | -.23 | -1.14 | .07 | 1.12 | -.01 | -.20 | .11 | .53 | .03 | .27 | -.14 | -1.35 |
| | $R = .221, R^2 = .049, \Delta R^2 = .039, R^2_{aj} = .030, SE = 1.629, F(2,99) = 2.553$ | | $R = .271, R^2 = .073, \Delta R^2 = .000, R^2_{aj} = .032, SE = .1693, F(2,45) = 1.778$ | | $R = .278, R^2 = .077, \Delta R^2 = .054, R^2_{aj} = -.007, SE = 1.445, F(2,22) = .919$ | | $R = .226, R^2 = .051, \Delta R^2 = .005, R^2_{aj} = .043, SE = 1.831, F(2,235) = 6.329^{**}$ | | $R = .106, R^2 = .011, \Delta R^2 = .000, R^2_{aj} = .002, SE = .1555, F(2,216) = 1.220$ | | $R = .386, R^2 = .149, \Delta R^2 = .010, R^2_{aj} = .078, SE = 1.483, F(2,24) = 2.107$ | | $R = .098, R^2 = .010, \Delta R^2 = .001, R^2_{aj} = -.014, SE = 1.535, F(2,83) = .402$ | | $R = .142, R^2 = .020, \Delta R^2 = .020, R^2_{aj} = -.001, SE = 1.767, F(2,91) = .935$ | |

| Material | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|--------------------|--|-------|---|---------|--|-------|---|-------|--|-------|---|---------|---|---------|---|-------|
| | B | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t |
| Gender | -.02 | -.20 | -.03 | -.23 | .00 | .01 | -.15 | -2.28 | -.06 | -.89 | -.03 | -.16 | -.03 | -.26 | -.04 | -.37 |
| Age | -.21 | -2.01 | -.30 | -2.23* | -.73 | - | -.09 | -1.35 | -.13 | -1.86 | -.16 | -.94 | -.28 | -2.53** | -.13 | -1.18 |
| Level of Education | -.25 | -2.44 | -.45 | -3.14** | -.21 | -1.26 | -.25 | - | -.11 | -1.51 | -.60 | -3.48** | -.11 | -1.00 | -.11 | -1.03 |
| Toxic Leadership | .19 | 1.89 | .05 | .33 | .14 | .81 | -.05 | -.71 | .10 | 1.44 | .30 | 1.78 | .11 | 1.01 | .08 | .73 |
| | $R = .319, R^2 = .102, \Delta R^2 = .035, R^2_{aj} = .062, SE = 1.555, F(4,92) = 2.599^{**}$ | | $R = .499, R^2 = .249, \Delta R^2 = .002, R^2_{aj} = .179, SE = 1.481, F(4,43) = 3.566^*$ | | $R = .719, R^2 = .517, \Delta R^2 = .017, R^2_{aj} = .415, SE = 1.097, F(4,19) = 5.075^{**}$ | | $R = .314, R^2 = .099, \Delta R^2 = .002, R^2_{aj} = .083, SE = 1.923, F(4,232) = 6.365^{**}$ | | $R = .189, R^2 = .036, \Delta R^2 = .010, R^2_{aj} = .017, SE = 1.684, F(4,211) = 1.945$ | | $R = .642, R^2 = .413, \Delta R^2 = .085, R^2_{aj} = .306, SE = 1.592, F(4,22) = 3.865$ | | $R = .296, R^2 = .087, \Delta R^2 = .012, R^2_{aj} = .039, SE = 1.821, F(4,76) = 1.819$ | | $R = .202, R^2 = .041, \Delta R^2 = .006, R^2_{aj} = -.003, SE = 1.761, F(4,88) = .938$ | |

| Material | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------------|-------|------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-------------|-------|---------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|
| | B | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t |
| Gender | -.02 | -.23 | -.01 | -.05 | .08 | .43 | -.16 | -2.45* | -.06 | -.90 | -.07 | -.42 | -.02 | -.15 | -.04 | -.40 |
| Age | -.18 | -1.68 | -.30 | -2.14 | -.79 | -3.92** | -.05 | -.75 | -.10 | -1.50 | -.17 | -.90 | -.27 | -2.45 | -.15 | -1.35 |
| Level of Education | -.24 | -2.29* | -.46 | -3.28 | -.22 | -1.29 | -.24 | - | -.10 | -1.48 | -.63 | -3.18** | -.05 | -.42 | -.11 | -1.04 |
| Empowering Leadership | .02 | .20 | .06 | .40 | .05 | .30 | .18 | 2.77** | .10 | 1.44 | -.07 | -.38 | .10 | .84 | .022 | .21 |
| | $R = .259,$ | | $R = .500,$ | | $R = .709,$ | | $R = .355,$ | | $R = .188,$ | | $R = .576,$ | | $R = .289,$ | | $R = .189,$ | |

| Materia l | Engaged Life | Meaningful Life | Pleasurable Life | Full Life | Empty Life | Meaningful and pleasurable life | Engaged and meaningful life | Engaged and Pleasurable Life |
|-----------|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | $R^2 = .067,$ $\Delta R^2 = .000$ $R^2_{aj} = .026,$ $SE = 1.585$ $F(4,92) = 1.651$ | $R^2 = .250,$ $\Delta R^2 = .003$ $R^2_{aj} = .180,$ $SE = .1480$ $F(4,43) = 3.584^*$ | $R^2 = .502,$ $\Delta R^2 = .002$ $R^2_{aj} = .397,$ $SE = 1.113$ $F(4,19) = 4.792^{**}$ | $R^2 = .029,$ $\Delta R^2 = .020$ $R^2_{aj} = .111,$ $SE = 1.894$ $F(4,232) = 8.351^{**}$ * | $R^2 = .036,$ $\Delta R^2 = .009$ $R^2_{aj} = .017,$ $SE = .1684$ $F(4,211) = 1.943$ | $R^2 = .332,$ $\Delta R^2 = .004$ $R^2_{aj} = .210,$ $SE = 1.698$ $F(4,22) = 2.733$ | $R^2 = .084,$ $\Delta R^2 = .008$ $R^2_{aj} = .036,$ $SE = 1.825$ $F(4,76) = 1.737$ | $R^2 = .036,$ $\Delta R^2 = .000$ $R^2_{aj} = -.008,$ $SE = 1.766$ $F(4,88) = .811$ |

| Int. Reg. | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|------------|--------|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|------|
| | B | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t |
| Gender | .27 | 2.80 | -.04 | -.25 | .04 | .15 | -.01 | -.08 | .11 | 1.62 | -.22 | -1.08 | .33 | 3.04^{**} | .19 | 1.75 |
| Age | .17 | 1.68 | -.04 | -.28 | -.26 | -1.10 | .22 | 3.41^{**} | -.06 | -.92 | .08 | .42 | .09 | .88 | .07 | .69 |
| Toxic Leadership | -.02 | -.15 | -.04 | -.23 | .20 | .88 | -.14 | -2.24^* | .15 | 2.15^* | -.14 | -.68 | -.01 | -.08 | .01 | .11 |
| | $R = .327,$ $R^2 = .107,$ $\Delta R^2 = .000$ $R^2_{aj} = .078,$ $SE = 1.377$ $F(4,92) = 3.752^*$ | $R = .069,$ $R^2 = .005,$ $\Delta R^2 = .001$ $R^2_{aj} = -.063,$ $SE = .1500$ $F(4,43) = .071$ | $R = .341,$ $R^2 = .116,$ $\Delta R^2 = .032$ $R^2_{aj} = -.010,$ $SE = 1.318$ $F(4,19) = .923$ | $R = .241,$ $R^2 = .058,$ $\Delta R^2 = .020$ $R^2_{aj} = .046,$ $SE = 1.511$ $F(4,232) = 4.884^{**}$ | $R = .192,$ $R^2 = .037,$ $\Delta R^2 = .021$ $R^2_{aj} = .023,$ $SE = .1528$ $F(4,211) = 2.714^*$ | $R = .252,$ $R^2 = .063,$ $\Delta R^2 = .019$ $R^2_{aj} = -.059,$ $SE = 1.307$ $F(4,22) = .519$ | $R = .333,$ $R^2 = .111,$ $\Delta R^2 = .000$ $R^2_{aj} = .077,$ $SE = 1.415$ $F(4,76) = 3.252^*$ | $R = .214,$ $R^2 = .046,$ $\Delta R^2 = .000$ $R^2_{aj} = .014,$ $SE = 1.471$ $F(4,88) = 1.421$ | | | | | | | | |
| | B | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t |
| Gender | .26 | 2.71^{**} | .01 | .09 | .16 | .65 | .00 | -.00 | .11 | 1.65 | -.20 | -1.01 | .33 | 3.05^{**} | .18 | 1.74 |
| Age | .18 | 1.86 | .00 | .02 | -.35 | -1.44 | .25 | 3.77^{***} | -.04 | -.51 | .00 | .01 | .09 | .89 | .06 | .57 |
| Empowering Leadership | .19 | 2.04^* | .23 | 1.51 | .09 | .39 | .21 | 3.22^{***} | .09 | 1.34 | .28 | 1.32 | .04 | .34 | .08 | .73 |
| | $R = .381,$ $R^2 = .145,$ $\Delta R^2 = .038$ $R^2_{aj} = .118,$ $SE = 1.348$ $F(3,94) = 5.306^{**}$ | $R = .231,$ $R^2 = .053,$ $\Delta R^2 = .050$ $R^2_{aj} = -.011,$ $SE = 1.463$ $F(3,44) = .825$ | $R = .301,$ $R^2 = .091,$ $\Delta R^2 = .007$ $R^2_{aj} = -.039,$ $SE = 1.337$ $F(3,21) = .700$ | $R = .281,$ $R^2 = .079,$ $\Delta R^2 = .040$ $R^2_{aj} = .067,$ $SE = 1.495$ $F(3,237) = 6.752^{**}$ * | $R = .155,$ $R^2 = .024,$ $\Delta R^2 = .008$ $R^2_{aj} = .010,$ $SE = .1538$ $F(3,213) = 1.757$ | $R = .335,$ $R^2 = .112,$ $\Delta R^2 = .068$ $R^2_{aj} = -.003,$ $SE = 1.272$ $F(3,23) = .971$ | $R = .335,$ $R^2 = .112,$ $\Delta R^2 = .001$ $R^2_{aj} = .078,$ $SE = 1.057$ $F(3,78) = 3.292^*$ | $R = .227,$ $R^2 = .051,$ $\Delta R^2 = .006$ $R^2_{aj} = .019,$ $SE = 1.467$ $F(3,89) = 1.605$ | | | | | | | | |

| Id. Reg. | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|--------------------|--------------|---------|-----------------|-------|------------------|------|-----------|------------|------------|--------|---------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|
| | B | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t |
| Gender | .19 | 1.92 | -.07 | -.43 | -.03 | -.01 | .05 | .68 | .15 | 2.13^* | .34 | 1.70 | .27 | 2.71^{**} | .15 | 1.45 |
| Age | .04 | .39 | .09 | .57 | -.08 | -.30 | .15 | 2.21 | -.010 | -.15 | .04 | .20 | .35 | 3.60^{***} | .13 | 1.20 |
| Level of Education | .08 | .80 | .21 | 1.37 | -.00 | -.01 | .12 | 1.76 | .11 | 1.65 | -.11 | -.52 | .22 | 2.28^* | .09 | .88 |
| Toxic | -.25 | -2.45^* | -.17 | -1.12 | -.22 | -.86 | -.17 | -2.62^{**} | .03 | .39 | -.07 | -.37 | -.12 | -1.20 | -.19 | -1.88 |

| Id. Reg. | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|-----------------------|---|---------|--|------|--|------|--|--------|--|---------|---|-------|--|---------|---|---------|
| Leadership | $R = .318,$ $R^2 = .101,$ $\Delta R^2 = .059$ $R^2_{aj} = .062,$ $SE = 1.333$ $F(4,92) = 2.587^*$ | | $R = .292,$ $R^2 = .085,$ $\Delta R^2 = .027$ $R^2_{aj} = .000,$ $SE = .1070$ $F(4,43) = 1.002$ | | $R = .231,$ $R^2 = .053,$ $\Delta R^2 = .039$ $R^2_{aj} = -.146,$ $SE = 1.413$ $F(4,19) = .268$ | | $R = .242,$ $R^2 = .058,$ $\Delta R^2 = .028$ $R^2_{aj} = .042,$ $SE = 1.182$ $F(4,232) = 3.597^{**}$ | | $R = .201,$ $R^2 = .040,$ $\Delta R^2 = .001$ $R^2_{aj} = .022,$ $SE = 1.448$ $F(4,211) = 2.225$ | | $R = .399,$ $R^2 = .159,$ $\Delta R^2 = .005$ $R^2_{aj} = .006,$ $SE = .899$ $F(4,22) = 1.039$ | | $R = .532,$ $R^2 = .283,$ $\Delta R^2 = .014$ $R^2_{aj} = .245,$ $SE = 1.228$ $F(4,76) = 7.488^{***}$ | | $R = .331,$ $R^2 = .110,$ $\Delta R^2 = .036$ $R^2_{aj} = .069,$ $SE = 1.380$ $F(4,88) = 2.713^*$ | |
| | B | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t |
| Gender | .16 | 1.71 | -.03 | -.18 | .07 | .28 | .05 | .76 | .13 | 1.97 | .36 | 2.02 | .29 | 2.93** | .15 | 1.48 |
| Age | .03 | .25 | .14 | .95 | -.19 | -.73 | .17 | 2.41* | .03 | .40 | -.06 | -.28 | .36 | 3.75*** | .13 | 1.23 |
| Level of Education | .08 | .88 | .22 | 1.47 | -.04 | -.17 | .13 | 1.95 | .12 | 1.77 | .06 | .27 | .21 | 2.08* | .12 | 1.18 |
| Empowering Leadership | .35 | 3.66*** | .27 | 1.81 | .42 | 1.78 | .18 | 2.72** | .24 | 3.63*** | .44 | 2.16* | .16 | 1.59 | .33 | 3.31*** |
| Leadership | $R = .405,$ $R^2 = .164,$ $\Delta R^2 = .121$ $R^2_{aj} = .128,$ $SE = 1.286$ $F(4,92) = 4.508^{**}$ | | $R = .354,$ $R^2 = .125,$ $\Delta R^2 = .067$ $R^2_{aj} = .044,$ $SE = .1046$ $F(4,43) = 1.538$ | | $R = .394,$ $R^2 = .156,$ $\Delta R^2 = .141$ $R^2_{aj} = -.022,$ $SE = 1.335$ $F(4,19) = .875$ | | $R = .246,$ $R^2 = .061,$ $\Delta R^2 = .030$ $R^2_{aj} = .044,$ $SE = 1.181$ $F(4,232) = 3.737^{**}$ | | $R = .310,$ $R^2 = .096,$ $\Delta R^2 = .057$ $R^2_{aj} = .079,$ $SE = 1.405$ $F(4,211) = 5.627^{**}$ | | $R = .549,$ $R^2 = .301,$ $\Delta R^2 = .148$ $R^2_{aj} = .174,$ $SE = .820$ $F(4,22) = 2.372$ | | $R = .541,$ $R^2 = .293,$ $\Delta R^2 = .024$ $R^2_{aj} = .255,$ $SE = 1.219$ $F(4,76) = 7.859^{***}$ | | $R = .420,$ $R^2 = .177,$ $\Delta R^2 = .103$ $R^2_{aj} = .139,$ $SE = 1.327$ $F(4,88) = 4.725^{**}$ | |

| Int. Mot. | Engaged Life | | Meaningful Life | | Pleasurable Life | | Full Life | | Empty Life | | Meaningful and pleasurable life | | Engaged and meaningful life | | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | |
|--------------------|---|----------|--|-------|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------|--|------|---|--------|---|--------|
| | B | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t | β | t |
| Gender | .14 | 1.50 | -.08 | -.58 | -.25 | -1.11 | .09 | 1.36 | .05 | .74 | .15 | .75 | .28 | 2.71** | .12 | 1.22 |
| Level of Education | .09 | .89 | .34 | 2.24* | .05 | .23 | .13 | 1.95 | .09 | 1.25 | -.07 | -.35 | .18 | 1.76 | .21 | 2.09* |
| Toxic Leadership | -.33 | -3.44*** | -.04 | -.23 | -.15 | -.68 | -.11 | -1.76 | -.09 | -1.29 | -.18 | -.89 | -.17 | -1.69 | -.24 | -2.40* |
| | $R = .370,$ $R^2 = .137,$ $\Delta R^2 = .109$ $R^2_{aj} = .109,$ $SE = 1.380$ $F(3,94) = 4.958^{**}$ | | $R = .332,$ $R^2 = .110,$ $\Delta R^2 = .001$ $R^2_{aj} = .049,$ $SE = 1.393$ $F(3,44) = 1.811$ | | $R = .330,$ $R^2 = .109,$ $\Delta R^2 = .021$ $R^2_{aj} = -.025,$ $SE = 1.760$ $F(3,20) = 814$ | | $R = .210,$ $R^2 = .044,$ $\Delta R^2 = .013$ $R^2_{aj} = .032,$ $SE = 1.473$ $F(3,233) = 3.578^*$ | | $R = .136,$ $R^2 = .018,$ $\Delta R^2 = .008$ $R^2_{aj} = .010,$ $SE = .1538$ $F(3,212) = 1.324$ | | $R = .271,$ $R^2 = .074,$ $\Delta R^2 = .032$ $R^2_{aj} = -.047,$ $SE = 1.573$ $F(3,23) = .609$ | | $R = .396,$ $R^2 = .157,$ $\Delta R^2 = .031$ $R^2_{aj} = .125,$ $SE = 1.415$ $F(3,78) = 4.847^{**}$ | | $R = .358,$ $R^2 = .128,$ $\Delta R^2 = .056$ $R^2_{aj} = .099,$ $SE = 1.604$ $F(3,89) = 4.374^{**}$ | |
| Gender | .10 | 1.17 | -.03 | -.22 | -.15 | -.78 | .09 | 1.45 | .03 | .38 | .18 | .95 | .32 | 2.94** | .12 | 1.26 |
| Level of Education | .10 | 1.14 | .31 | 2.16* | .05 | .28 | .13 | 2.05* | .08 | 1.30 | .09 | .42 | .16 | 1.53 | .24 | 2.42* |

| Int. Mot. | Engaged Life | Meaningful Life | Pleasurable Life | Full Life | Empty Life | Meaningful and pleasurable life | Engaged and meaningful life | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|-----|---------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|---------|
| n | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Empowering Leadership | .49 | 5.53*** | .22 | 1.58 | .50 | 2.62* | .22 | 3.43*** | .35 | 5.45*** | .38 | 1.78 | .19 | 1.83 | .33 | 3.43*** |
| | $R = .517,$ $R^2 = .267,$ $\Delta R^2 = .239$ $R^2_{aj} = .243,$ $SE = 1.271$ $F(3,94) = 11.405^{**}$ * | $R = .396,$ $R^2 = .157,$ $\Delta R^2 = .048$ $R^2_{aj} = .099,$ $SE = 1.356$ $F(3,44) = 2.725$ | $R = .567,$ $R^2 = .321,$ $\Delta R^2 = .233$ $R^2_{aj} = .220,$ $SE = 1.536$ $F(3,20) = 3.156^*$ | $R = .279,$ $R^2 = .078,$ $\Delta R^2 = .047$ $R^2_{aj} = .066,$ $SE = 1.446$ $F(3,233) = 6.555^{**}$ * | $R = .364,$ $R^2 = .133,$ $\Delta R^2 = .122$ $R^2_{aj} = .120,$ $SE = 1.434$ $F(3,212) = 10.795^*$ ** | $R = .397,$ $R^2 = .158,$ $\Delta R^2 = .116$ $R^2_{aj} = -.048,$ $SE = 1.500$ $F(3,23) = 1.435$ | $R = .403,$ $R^2 = .162,$ $\Delta R^2 = .036$ $R^2_{aj} = .130,$ $SE = 1.411$ $F(3,78) = 5.036^{**}$ | $R = .425,$ $R^2 = .181,$ $\Delta R^2 = .109$ $R^2_{aj} = .153,$ $SE = 1.555$ $F(3,89) = 6.551^{***}$ | | | | | | | | |

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Hypotheses testing - Comparing Regression Coefficients

After doing a hierarchical regression analysis, to test the hypotheses, we have compared the estimated regression coefficients to analyze if the differences among them are significant (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

The results presented in Table 11 partially support our H₁ and H₂. Workers in the Full Life profile feel a stronger effect of toxic leadership especially in the dimensions material, social, introjected regulation, and identified regulation than workers in the Empty Life. The differences between the two profiles in amotivation and intrinsic motivation were not statistically significant. Empowering leadership had a stronger effect on the dimensions of work motivation in workers in the Full Life profile than in workers in the Empty Life profile as expected (material, social, introjected regulation, and intrinsic motivation). The effect on amotivation was not statistically significant, and identified regulation was stronger in workers of the Empty Life; therefore, the hypothesis was only partially supported. We were not able to support our H₃ since none of the differences were statistically significant. However, H₄ was supported since empowering leadership proved to have a stronger effect on intrinsic work motivation in the Pleasurable Life Profile than in Meaningful and Engaged Life Profiles. H₅ was not supported as the differences were not statistically significant.

Table 11

Contrast between profiles: T-test of the difference between regression coefficients

| Regression Coefficient Full Life X Empty Life | M | | B | | <i>t</i> | <i>df</i> |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|
| | Full Life | Empty Life | Full Life | Empty Life | | |
| | Toxic Leadership - Amotivation | 2.6199 | 2.3431 | .119 | | |
| Toxic Leadership - Social | 2.6199 | 2.3431 | -.039 | .144 | -2.78** | 455 |
| Toxic Leadership - Material | 2.6265 | 2.3320 | -.071 | .162 | -3.77*** | 451 |

| Regression Coefficient | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|-------|-------|----------|-----|
| Toxic Leadership – Introjected Reg. | 2.6143 | 2.3330 | -.175 | .219 | -5.47*** | 456 |
| Toxic Leadership – Identified Reg. | 2.6265 | 2.3320 | -.161 | .038 | -2.35** | 451 |
| Toxic Leadership – Int. Mot. | 2.6265 | 2.3320 | -.133 | -.130 | -0.04 | 451 |
| Empowering Leadership - Amotivation | 3.4968 | 3.2775 | -.056 | -.170 | 1.49 | 461 |
| Empowering Leadership - Social | 3.4968 | 3.2775 | .147 | -.026 | 3.60*** | 455 |
| Empowering Leadership – Material | 3.4920 | 3.2662 | .393 | .209 | 4.06*** | 451 |
| Empowering Leadership – Introjected Reg. | 3.4889 | 3.2655 | .358 | .178 | 3.42*** | 456 |
| Empowering Leadership – Identified Reg. | 3.4920 | 3.2662 | .241 | .440 | -3.17*** | 451 |
| Empowering Leadership – Int. Mot. | 3.4920 | 3.2662 | .668 | .359 | -5.53*** | 451 |

| Pleasurable Life X Meaningful and Engaged Life | M | | B | | <i>t</i> | <i>df</i> |
|--|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | Pleasurable Life | Meaningful and Engaged Life | Pleasurable Life | Meaningful and Engaged Life | | |
| Toxic Leadership - Social | 2.6947 | 2.6690 | .162 | -.169 | 1.05 | 109 |
| Toxic Leadership – Introjected Reg. | 2.6627 | 2.6143 | .235 | -.011 | 1.24 | 105 |
| Toxic Leadership – Intrinsic Mot. | 2.7042 | 2.6422 | -.235 | -.231 | -0.02 | 104 |
| Empowering Leadership – Intrinsic Mot. | 3.3323 | 3.3285 | 1.042 | .379 | 5.28*** | 105 |

| Meaningful Life X Engaged and Pleasurable Life | M | | B | | <i>t</i> | <i>df</i> |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | Meaningful Life | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | Meaningful Life | Engaged and Pleasurable Life | | |
| Empowering Leadership – Identified Reg. | 3.4576 | 3.4205 | .360 | .584 | -0.81 | 139 |

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

Discussion

The objective of the present study was to analyze in what extent the OTH influences the effect of empowering leadership and toxic leadership on work motivation. As previously mentioned, it is evident in the literature that the type of leadership and the leader's behaviors affect work

motivation or, at least, correlate with it (Deci et al., 2017; Hetland et al., 2011; Machin et al., 2015; Salvador & dos Santos, 2018) but results are generalized. Dividing workers into different profiles according to their similarities and differences (acknowledging that all workers are not affected in the same way) enables us to better understand such effects on individuals and not only on a big group with only one outcome, and that is what differentiates the present research from others.

In the present research, all instruments have shown good internal consistency and good adjustment. As a prelude to testing our hypotheses, we assessed the significance variance of the work motivation dimensions between all eight profiles. We found that there were significant differences in five out of the six dependent variables. Then we conducted a regression analysis to analyze the effect of toxic and empowering leaderships on the dimensions of work motivation in each profile, in order to verify our general hypothesis that the effect of toxic and empowering leadership in work motivation is differentiated according to different profiles of OTH.

To test our hypotheses, we compared the estimated regression coefficients, and our findings have partially supported our hypotheses, as presented below.

H₁: Results show that overall those in the Full Life profile are indeed more affected by Toxic Leadership than those in the Empty Life profile, supporting our hypothesis. Such results are in line Schmidt's (2008) idea that subordinates with low self-esteem (Empty Life profile) can be more tolerant to negative behavior since it reinforces their low opinion of themselves. Individuals in the Full life profile are on the opposite side of the spectrum and are, therefore, expected to suffer more the effects of a toxic leader.

H₂: Results partially support our hypothesis; although, overall, the effect of Empowering Leadership in Work Motivation is stronger in workers of the Full Life profile (as individuals in

this profile may feel more comfortable and enjoy being empowered). The effect of Empowering Leadership on Identified Regulation is stronger in workers of the Empty Life profile than in workers of the Full Life Profile. One of the possible reasons for that result may be because individuals in the Empty Life Profile could have identified with the value of empowering themselves for work as a way to develop in their career (possibly as a result of a positive experience with a leader), having a strong Identified Regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000), and, therefore, being more affected by such type of leadership.

H₃: This hypothesis was not supported by the evidence since none of the differences were statistically significant. That is, although the negative effect of Toxic Leadership seemed to be stronger on Introjected Regulation, External Regulation (Social), and Intrinsic Motivation of Workers within the pleasurable life profile than in workers within non-pleasurable life profile, as the differences were not statistically significant, we were not able to reject the null hypothesis.

H₄: Results support the hypothesis showing the effect of Empowering Leadership in Intrinsic Motivation is much stronger in workers of the Pleasurable Life profile than in workers of the Meaningful and Engaged Life profile. These results align with the idea that as individuals in the Pleasurable Life profile will look for immediate pleasure, they are inclined to be intrinsic motivated as intrinsic motivation refers to doing something that is inherently enjoyable or interesting and the “person is moved to act for fun or challenge entailed” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 56).

H₅: This hypothesis was not supported by the evidence since the differences were not statistically significant. Therefore, we are not able to reject the null hypothesis and confirm whether identified work motivation is more increased by Empowering leadership in meaningful life profiles than in the non-meaningful life profiles.

Our findings confirm that (1) in general work motivation is negatively predicted by toxic leadership; (2) in general work motivation is positively predicted by empowering leadership, being higher where empowering leadership increases (3) the effect of those relationships is different in each orientation to happiness profile (groups). In other words, the workers will be less motivated under toxic leadership and more motivated under an empowering leadership. However, how motivated (or amotivated) an individual is will depend on their orientation to happiness profile.

Toxic leadership presented a positive relationship with amotivation in the Engaged Life, Meaningful Life, Pleasurable Life, Full Life, and Engaged and Pleasurable Life. The degree of the relationship was different in each of the profiles; while toxic leadership raised amotivation (lack of motivation) in the five groups, its effect in workers of the Engaged and Pleasurable Life profile is higher than in the other profiles; whereas the lower effect was seen in workers of the Full Life profile. Empowering leadership presented a negative relationship with amotivation in the Engaged and Pleasurable Life, Pleasurable Life, and Engaged and Meaningful Life profiles; it had the stronger effect in the Engaged and Pleasurable Life profiles and lower effect in Engaged and Meaningful Life.

Toxic leadership presented an unexpected positive relationship with social (external regulation) in workers of the Engaged and Pleasurable Life. A possible explanation for this would be that when considering the *continuum* proposed by the SDT the less support of the three basic psychological needs, the more controlled motivated an individual is, the more support of the needs, the more autonomously motivated is the individual. As mentioned before, any activity that is not intrinsically motivating requires extrinsic motivation, when toxic leadership

undermines intrinsic motivation, the individual will then be extrinsic motivated. Empowering leadership did not present a relationship with social (external regulation).

Toxic leadership did not present any relationship with material (external regulation), Empowering leadership, however, presented a positive relationship (although low) with material (external regulation) only in workers of the Full Life profile.

Toxic leadership presented a negative relationship with introjected regulation in workers of the Full life profile and a positive relationship in workers of the Empty Life profile. A possible explanation for this result is that those are opposing profiles; therefore, a higher effect is expected on individuals in the Full Life profile than on individuals in the Empty Life profile (Peterson et al., 2005). Empowering leadership presented a positive relationship with introjected regulation in workers of the Engaged Life and Full Life profiles.

Toxic leadership showed a negative relationship with identified regulation in workers of the Engaged Life and Full Life profiles, being stronger in workers of the Engaged Life profile. Empowering leadership presented a positive relationship with identified regulation in Engaged Life, Full Life, Empty life, and Engaged and Pleasurable Life profiles. The effect of empowering leadership was stronger in workers of the Engaged and Pleasurable Life profile and weaker in workers of the Full Life profile.

Toxic leadership presented a negative relationship with intrinsic motivation being statistically significant in workers of the Engaged Life and the Engaged and Pleasurable Life. Empowering leadership presented a positive relationship with intrinsic motivation in Engaged Life, Pleasurable Life, Full Life, Empty Life, and Engaged and Pleasurable Life profiles, having a stronger effect in workers of the Pleasurable Life profile.

The results of our tests are not only in line with previous research: empowering leadership is a significant negative predictor of amotivation and a significant positive predictor of identified regulation and intrinsic motivation (Machin et al., 2015); empowering leadership is negatively correlated to amotivation and positively correlated to both extrinsic regulation (social and material), introjected regulation, identified regulation, and intrinsic motivation, whereas toxic leadership is positively correlated to amotivation and negatively correlated to identified regulation and intrinsic motivation (Salvador & dos Santos, 2018) – but they shed a light on how other factors influence people’s work motivation and why not every employee in the same team is affected by a toxic or empowering leader on the same way (i.e., different orientation to happiness profiles). Moreover, our results are relevant to the organizational area, especially when designing interventions, given that leadership practices that increase employee satisfaction may increase profit for companies (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002) and performance standards of motivated employees is greater (Gagné & Deci, 2005).

It is important to mention the context of the sample and the economic situation of the country where the questionnaires were applied before discussing the results. As mentioned previously, participants were Portuguese workers in the workforce at the time of the data collection. Portugal is known for having the highest emigration rate in the European Union and, although the unemployment rate has decreased, there is still job insecurity, labor market deterioration, and poor working conditions due to the financial crisis that is still affecting the country (OECD, 2008). However, Portugal is slowly recovering and has shown signs of improvement (PORDATA, 2018).

Conclusion

As mentioned before, leadership processes serve as a notable contribution to work motivation. The characteristics and traits of a leader are the most compelling factors when creating work motivation (Khuong & Hoang, 2015). Thus, interpersonal style of leaders and work climates that promote the satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs enhance employees' intrinsic motivation (Gagné & Deci, 2005).

Measuring the way one perceives happiness allows us to distinguish individuals according to their preferences and what is worthy of them; therefore, in the present study, we chose to understand the effect of leadership on work motivation more accurately by considering worker's OTH.

Creating profiles that separate individuals as per their OTH showed that different types of leadership (toxic and empowering) affect work motivation differently (i.e., even though there is proof that toxic leadership diminishes work motivation, how badly workers are affected will depend on their way to perceive happiness: a worker in the full life profile will suffer more in the hands of a toxic leader than a worker in the empty life profile).

We concluded that the results presented provide partial support for the hypotheses; the effects of toxic and empowering leadership are distinct in each profile. We not only demonstrated the same as Kavčič and Avsec (2013) that profiles are different, and they illustrate the importance of the multiplicative influences of the different orientation to happiness; but that the way the leadership affects individuals are different according to their different profiles of orientation to happiness (i.e., one leader will affect people from the same team differently). Therefore, the results can be useful for managers to better design interventions and to consider the best approach to work with their subordinates and motivate them.

Implications, Limitations, and Further Studies

The presented study can have important implications for organizations. Although every individual seeks happiness, the meaning of this varies depending on the individual and therefore what they expect and desire to have in their work and what they are best adapted is different among workers. It is important to understand the personal characteristics which prevent negative impacts of toxic leadership and foster positive impact of empowering leadership since such knowledge could help in designing interventions and define Human Resources Management strategies. Strengthening the idea that it is important to take into account the orientation towards happiness and paying attention to this aspect of interpersonal variability is undoubtedly one of the contributions of our results to Human Resources Management. Therefore, managers can use the results to tailor ways to motivate their workers taking into consideration that each person is affected by leadership differently. Managing people directly implies decisions that may be more or less sensitive to this variability around the OTH concept. Each manager, given these results, can be more sensitive and attentive and make decisions in the day to day that consider the impact of leadership on work motivation due to this interpersonal variation regarding OTH.

Therefore, we suggest that to better motivate employees of the Full Life profile, the manager can do so by delegating responsibilities, providing opportunities for subordinates to give their opinion and participate in decisions. While for employees of the Empty Life profile, the manager should be a bit more cautious since people with this profile do not feel so comfortable having autonomy.

As for workers of the Pleasurable Life profile, since they tend to prefer immediate satisfaction, besides offering opportunities for empowerment, managers can find in job crafting a

solution so that workers can enrich their tasks and thus feel more pleasure while executing their tasks at work and be more competent to carry them out. Thus, the motivation for work in these workers will tend to increase.

In addition, our results stimulate leaders' self-awareness in order to better understand their own OTH and the degree to which they are in each dimension of empowerment leadership and toxic leadership. This consciousness has the potential to be transformative in itself. Therefore, another contribution is that our research facilitates a more accurate understanding of the relationships between leadership, work motivation, and the orientation to happiness by integrating toxic and empowering leadership with work motivation (as per the SDT theory) and the profiles of orientation to happiness. Our results can also act as a mirror to a toxic leader who gets in touch with our work. Even without any assessment of their own profile, simple contact with the dimensions of toxic leadership (and the "opposite" dimensions of empowering leadership) can facilitate their self-knowledge and consequently generate internal change in leadership. Realizing how they perform their role as a leader and ascertaining the impact they have on the employees can make them decide to change their behavior and start looking for ways to motivate their subordinates. After all, according to the literature (e.g., Chowdhury, 2007; Gagné & Deci, 2005; Kuvaas, 2006), motivation for work correlates with performance at work: the higher the motivation for work, the better is the performance at work. Therefore, the results of our study can be used as a tool for toxic managers to change their behavior in order to achieve the objectives of the organization. In addition, the Human Resources team, inspired by our results, can identify toxic leaders in the organization and reassign their subordinates according to their OTH (e.g., a toxic leader who nonetheless is very important to the company may occupy a position where toxicity is less problematic because the respective contributors are more immune

to it, or fewer in number). Reducing the damages of being under a toxic leader may solve an issue, such as diminishing turnover and raising employee retention.

Moreover, managers can use the results to consider how to best provide the four cognitions needed to increase the psychological empowerment of their employees (Spreitzer, 1995). Future research may focus on finding which of the four cognitions an empowering leader is providing, that will also improve the knowledge of managers on how to be more efficient when trying to act as empowering leaders.

There are some limitations in the present study which could be addressed in future studies. One limitation of this study is that the participants are from several areas in mainland Portugal, there were no participants from the islands; therefore, although we have a representative sample, we cannot say that the results represent the entire Portuguese population. Another limitation is that it is somewhat difficult to determine the direction of causality for the observed relationship since this study has a cross-sectional design; therefore, longitudinal studies are necessary to explain deeper the direction of causality. Also, the OTHS had a limited amount of reliability on the engagement scale presenting a low Cronbach Alpha. Another limitation is the number of participants; when divided into clusters/profiles, we had two small profiles (pleasurable life and meaningful and pleasurable life had less than 30 participants) what could have biased the results. Finally, another limitation is that the results are based on self-report data; self-report data can be affected by response set biases and unreliability. On the other hand, such report is frequently used in social science research.

The present study presents opportunities for future research. As workers were divided into profiles according to OTH, it would be interesting if future research aimed to find different profiles to identify categories of workers (e.g., seeing if it is possible to create clusters combining

orientation to happiness and work motivation, with a profile of workers with a meaningful life and intrinsic motivated). It would also be interesting if the study were replicated in different countries to compare differences among the cultures or even to study the different impact of the sub-dimensions of TLS and ELQ.

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.
- Ali, A., Ambler, G., Strydom, A., Rai, D., Cooper, C., McManus, S., Weich, S., Meltzer, H., Dein, S., & Hassiotis, A. (2013). The relationship between happiness and intelligent quotient: The contribution of socio-economic and clinical factors. *Psychological Medicine, 43*(6), 1303-1312. doi: 10.1017/S0033291712002139
- Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. (2014a). Empowering leadership: Construct clarification, conceptualization, and validation of a new scale. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(3), 487-511. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.009
- Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. (2014b). Self–other agreement in empowering leadership: Relationships with leader effectiveness and subordinates' job satisfaction and turnover intention. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(4), 784-800. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.04.007
- Anic, P., & Tončić, M. (2013). Orientations to happiness, subjective well-being and life goals. *Psihologijske teme, 22*(1), 135-153.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2013) *Amos 22 user's guide*. Chicago: IBM SPSS Inc.
- Arnold, J., Arad, S., Rhoades, J., & Drasgow, F. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: the construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(3), 249-269. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(200005)21:33.0.co;2-#

- Ashkanasy, N. (2011). International Happiness: A Multilevel Perspective. *Academy Of Management Perspectives*, 25(1), 23-29. doi: 10.5465/amp.2011.59198446
- Bacher, J., K. Wenzing, M., & Vogler, M. (2004). *SPSS Two Cluster: A first evaluation*. Universitat Erlangen – Nurnberg (pp. 1-20). Retrieved from <https://www.statisticalinnovations.com/wp-content/uploads/Bacher2004.pdf>
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16, 74-94.
- Bakker, L., & Van Brakel, W. I. M. H. (2012). Empowerment Assessment tools in People with Disabilities in Developing Countries. A systematic. *Leprosy Review*, 83, 129-153.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A cognitive view* (1st ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Banks, G., McCauley, K., Gardner, W., & Guler, C. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(4), 634-652. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.02.006
- Baumeister, R., Campbell, J., Krueger, J., & Vohs, K. (2003). Does High Self-Esteem Cause Better Performance, Interpersonal Success, Happiness, or Healthier Lifestyles? *Psychological Science In The Public Interest*, 4(1), 1-44. doi: 10.1111/1529-1006.01431
- Bekhet, A., Zauszniewski, J., & Nakhla, W. (2008). Happiness: Theoretical and Empirical Considerations. *Nursing Forum*, 43(1), 12-23. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6198.2008.00091.x
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bentler, P.M. (1990). Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(2), 238-46.

- Biemann, T., Kearney, E., & Marggraf, K. (2015). Empowering leadership and managers' career perceptions: Examining effects at both the individual and the team level. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(5), 775-789. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.03.003
- 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.
- Ceci, M., & Kumar, V. (2015). A Correlational Study of Creativity, Happiness, Motivation, and Stress from Creative Pursuits. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(2), 609-626. doi: 10.1007/s10902-015-9615-y
- Chen, A., & Hou, Y. (2016). The effects of ethical leadership, voice behavior and climates for innovation on creativity: A moderated mediation examination. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 1-13. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.10.007
- Chen, C., & Bozeman, B. (2013). Understanding Public and Nonprofit Managers' Motivation Through the Lens of Self-Determination Theory. *Public Management Review*, 15(4), 584-607. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2012.698853
- Chen, L., Tsai, Y., & Chen, M. (2009). Psychometric Analysis of the Orientations to Happiness Questionnaire in Taiwanese Undergraduate Students. *Social Indicators Research*, 98(2), 239-249. doi: 10.1007/s11205-009-9473-2
- Cheong, M., Spain, S., Yammarino, F., & Yun, S. (2016). Two faces of empowering leadership: Enabling and burdening. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(4), 602-616. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.01.006

- Chowdhury, M. (2007). Enhancing motivation and work performance of the salespeople: The impact of supervisors' behavior. *African Journal of Business Management*, 1(9).
- Cianci, A. M., Hannah, S. T., Roberts, R. P., & Tsakumis, G. T. (2014). The effects of authentic leadership on followers ethical decision-making in the face of temptation: An experimental study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(3), 581-594. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.12.001
- Cicolini, G., Comparcini, D., & Simonetti, V. (2013). Workplace empowerment and nurses' job satisfaction: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 22(7), 855-871. doi: 10.1111/jonm.12028
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). If we are so rich, why aren't we happy? *American Psychologist*, 54(10), 821-827. doi: 10.1037/0003-066x.54.10.821
- Cuñado, J. & de Gracia, F. (2012). Environment and Happiness: New Evidence for Spain. *Social Indicators Research*, 112(3), 549-567. doi: 10.1007/s11205-012-0038-4
- Deci, E., Connell, J., & Ryan, R. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 580-590. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.74.4.580
- Deci, E., Olafsen, A., & Ryan, R. (2017). Self-Determination Theory in Work Organizations: The State of a Science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology And Organizational Behavior*, 4(1), 19-43. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108

- Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (2000). The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227-268. doi: 10.1207/s15327965pli1104_01
- DeHaan, C., & Ryan, R. M. (2014). Symptoms of wellness: Happiness and eudaimonia from a self-determination perspective. In K. M. Sheldon, & R. E. Lucas (Eds.), *Stability of happiness: Theories and evidence on whether happiness can change* (pp. 37-55). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/b978-0-12-411478-4.00003-5
- Demir, M., & Özdemir, M. (2010). Friendship, need satisfaction and happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *11*(2), 243-259. doi: 10.1007/s10902-009-9138-5
- Dillon, C., & Carr, J. (2007). Assessing indices of happiness and unhappiness in individuals with developmental disabilities: a review. *Behavioral Interventions*, *22*(3), 229-244. doi: 10.1002/bin.240
- do Paço, A., & Nave, A. C. (2013). Corporate volunteering: A case study centred on the motivations, satisfaction and happiness of company employees. *Employee Relations*, *35*(5), 547-559. doi: 10.1108/er-12-2012-0089
- Dobewall, H., Realo, A., Allik, J., Esko, T., & Metspalu, A. (2013). Self-other agreement in happiness and life-satisfaction: The role of personality traits. *Social Indicators Research*, *114*(2), 479-492. doi: 10.1007/s11205-012-0157-y
- Dos Santos, N. R., Mónico, L., Pais, L., Gagné, M., Forest, J., Cabral, P. F., & Ferraro, T. (2016). Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Psychometric studies in Portugal and Brazil. *Manuscript submitted for publication.*

- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(3), 207-216. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002
- Erkutlu, H. & Chafra, J. (2015). Empowering Leadership and Organizational Job Embeddedness: The Moderating Roles of Task Interdependence and Organizational Politics. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *210*, 3-10. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.321
- Fallatah, F., Laschinger, H., & Read, E. (2016). The effects of authentic leadership, organizational identification, and occupational coping self-efficacy on new graduate nurses' job turnover intentions in Canada. *Nursing Outlook*, *65*(3). doi: 10.1016/j.outlook.2016.11.020
- Fernet, C., Gagné, M., & Austin, S. (2010). When does quality of relationships with coworkers predict burnout over time? The moderating role of work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(8), 1163-1180. doi: 10.1002/job.673
- Fong, K. & Snape, E. (2013). Empowering Leadership, Psychological Empowerment and Employee Outcomes: Testing a Multi-level Mediating Model. *British Journal of Management*, *26*(1), 126-138. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.12048
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39-50.
- Gabriele, R. (2008). Orientations to Happiness: Do They Make a Difference in a Student's Educational Life? *American Secondary Education*, *36*(2), 88-101.
- Gagné, M. & Deci, E. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(4), 331-362. doi: 10.1002/job.322

- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Van Den Broeck, A., Aspley, A. K., ... & Westbye, C. (2015). The multidimensional work motivation scale: validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 24*(2), 178-196. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2013.877892
- Gallus, J., Walsh, B., van Driel, M., Gouge, M., & Antolic, E. (2013). Intolerable cruelty: A multilevel examination of the impact of toxic leadership on U.S. military units and service members. *Military Psychology, 25*(6), 588-601. doi: 10.1037/mil0000022
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (2008). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). USA: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
- Harter, J., Schmidt, F., & Hayes, T. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 268-279. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.2.268
- Hetland, H., Hetland, J., Schou Andreassen, C., Pallesen, S., & Notelaers, G. (2011). Leadership and fulfillment of the three basic psychological needs at work. *Career Development International, 16*(5), 507-523. doi: 10.1108/13620431111168903
- Hirschi, A. (2011). Effects of Orientations to Happiness on Vocational Identity Achievement. *The Career Development Quarterly, 59*(4), 367-378. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2011.tb00075.x
- Howard, J., Gagné, M., Morin, A., & Van den Broeck, A. (2016). Motivation profiles at work: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 95-96*, 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.
- Howell, R. T. (2005). Models of happiness: The role of personality traits and daily experience in understanding life satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation) University of California.

- Humphreys, J., & Einstein, W. (2004). Leadership and Temperament Congruence: Extending the Expectancy Model of Work Motivation. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 58-79. doi: 10.1177/107179190401000405
- IBM SPSS Inc. (2001). *The SPSS TwoStep Cluster Component: A scalable component enabling more efficient customer segmentation*. White paper – technical report. Retrieved from http://www.spssch/upload/1122644952_The%20SPSS%20TwoStep%20Cluster%20Component.pdf
- Johnson, R., Venus, M., Lanaj, K., Mao, C., & Chang, C. (2012). Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1262-1272. doi: 10.1037/a0029043
- Jöreskog, K.G. & Sörbom, D. (2004). *LISREL 8.7 for Windows*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.
- Joshanloo, M., & Weijers, D. (2014). Aversion to happiness across cultures: A review of where and why people are averse to happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(3), 717-735. doi: 10.1007/s10902-013-9489-9
- Kark, R., & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: the role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 500-528. doi: 10.5465/amr.2007.24351846
- Kavčič, T., & Avsec, A. (2013). Happiness and Pathways to Reach It: Dimension-Centred Versus Person-Centred Approach. *Social Indicators Research*, 118(1), 141-156. doi: 10.1007/s11205-013-0411-y

- Khuong, M., & Hoang, D. (2015). The Effects of Leadership Styles on Employee Motivation in Auditing Companies in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 6(4), 210-217. doi: 10.7763/ijtef.2015.v6.471
- Kline, R. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Krishnan, V. (2012). Transformational leadership and personal outcomes: empowerment as mediator. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33(6), 550-563. doi: 10.1108/01437731211253019
- Köse, İ. A. (2014). Psychometric Properties of the Orientations to Happiness Scale and Measurement Invariance Between Samples of Turkish and Russian University Students. *Social Indicators Research*, 122(3), 945-959. doi: 10.1007/s11205-014-0721-8
- Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: Mediating and moderating roles of work motivation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(3), 504-522. doi:10.1080/09585190500521581
- Landau, S., & Everitt, B. (2004). *Handbook of Statistical Analysis using SPSS*. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman & Hall/CRC PRESS.
- Lawler, E. E. (1986). *High-Involvement Management: Participative Strategies for Improving Organizational Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, J., Foo, K., Adams, A., Morgan, R., & Frewen, A. (2015). Strengths of character, orientations to happiness, life satisfaction and purpose in Singapore. *Journal of Tropical Psychology*, 5(2), 1-21. doi: 10.1017/jtp.2015.2

- Liden, R. C., & Tewksbury, T. W. (1995). Empowerment and work teams. In G. R. Ferris, S. D. Rosen, & D. T. Barnum (Eds.), *Handbook of human resources management* (pp. 386-403). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. *Leader to Leader*, 2005(36), 29-36.
- Machin, M., James, M., & Silcox, A. (2015). Relations between dimensions of empowering leadership and multidimensional work motivation. In *1th International Conference on Occupational Stress and Health: Sustainable Work, Sustainable Health, Sustainable Organizations*. Atlanta, GA.
- MacKerron, G. (2011). Happiness Economics from 35 000 feet. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 26(4), 705-735. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6419.2010.00672.x
- Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1987). Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 106-128.
- Marôco, J. (2011). *Análise Estatística com o SPSS Statistics* (5^a ed.). Lisboa: Report Number.
- Martínez-Córcoles, M., Gracia, F., Tomás, I., & Peiró, J. (2011). Leadership and employees' perceived safety behaviours in a nuclear power plant: A structural equation model. *Safety Science*, 49(8-9), 1118-1129. doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2011.03.002
- Martínez-Córcoles, M., Gracia, F., Tomás, I., Peiró, J., & Schöbel, M. (2013). Empowering team leadership and safety performance in nuclear power plants: A multilevel approach. *Safety Science*, 51(1), 293-301. doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2012.08.001
- Martínez-Córcoles, M., Schöbel, M., Gracia, F., Tomás, I., & Peiró, J. (2012). Linking empowering leadership to safety participation in nuclear power plants: A structural equation model. *Journal of Safety Research*, 43(3), 215-221. doi: 10.1016/j.jsr.2012.07.002

- Miron, A., Parkinson, S., & Brehm, J. (2007). Does happiness function like a motivational state? *Cognition & Emotion, 21*(2), 248-267. doi: 10.1080/02699930600551493
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- OECD, Gross domestic product (GDP) (indicator) (2018). Retrieved from <https://data.oecd.org/gdp/gross-domestic-product-gdp.htm>
- Olafsen, A., Halvari, H., Forest, J., & Deci, E. (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), 447-457. doi: 10.1111/sjop.12211
- Özbağ, G. (2016). The Role of Personality in Leadership: Five Factor Personality Traits and Ethical Leadership. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 235*, 235-242. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.11.019
- 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
- Pelletier, K. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership, 6*(4), 373-389. doi: 10.1177/1742715010379308
- Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. (2005). Orientations to happiness and life satisfaction: the full life versus the empty life. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 6*(1), 25-41. doi: 10.1007/s10902-004-1278-z
- Pollock, N., Noser, A., Holden, C., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). Do Orientations to Happiness Mediate the Associations Between Personality Traits and Subjective Well-Being?. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 17*(2), 713-729. doi: 10.1007/s10902-015-9617-9

- Popa, M., Rotărescu, V., Sulea, C., & Albulescu, P. (2013). Toxic Leadership Scale-Romanian adaptation. *Psihologia Resurselor Umane, 11*(2), 57.
- PORDATA - Taxa de desemprego: total e por sexo (%). (2018). Retrieved from [https://www.pordata.pt/Portugal/Taxa+de+desemprego+total+e+por+sexo+\(percentagem\)-550](https://www.pordata.pt/Portugal/Taxa+de+desemprego+total+e+por+sexo+(percentagem)-550)
- Proyer, R., Annen, H., Eggimann, N., Schneider, A., & Ruch, W. (2011). Assessing the “Good Life” in a Military Context: How Does Life and Work-Satisfaction Relate to Orientations to Happiness and Career-Success Among Swiss Professional Officers? *Social Indicators Research, 106*(3), 577-590. doi: 10.1007/s11205-011-9823-8
- Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*(1/2), 52-63.
- Rotarescu, V. (2014). The Psychometric Qualities of a Narcissistic Inventory Designed for HR Screening. *SGEM2014 1 International Multidisciplinary Scientific Geoconference*. doi: 10.5593/sgemsocial2014/b11/s1.065
- Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 54-67. doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1020
- Ryan, R. & Deci, E. (2001). On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 141-166. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141

- Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2013). Living Well: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Eudaimonia. *Happiness Studies Book Series The Exploration of Happiness*, 117-139. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-5702-8_7
- Salvador, A., & dos Santos, N. R. (2018). Liderança Tóxica e Liderança de Empoderamento: Relações com a motivação para o trabalho (Unpublished Master Thesis). Universidade de Évora.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). *Development and validation of the toxic leadership scale*. (Doctorate Thesis). University of Maryland.
- Schubert, C. (2012). Pursuing Happiness. *Kyklos*, 65(2), 245-261. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6435.2012.00537.x
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2010). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the Dimension of a Model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(2), 461-464. doi:10.1214/aos/1176344136
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138-158. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001
- Scorsolini-Comin, F. & Santos, M. (2010). The scientific study of happiness and health promotion: an integrative literature review. *Revista Latino-Americana De Enfermagem*, 18(3), 472-479. doi: 10.1590/s0104-11692010000300025
- 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.
- Smircich, L., & Stubbart, C. (1985). Strategic Management in an Enacted World. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 724-736. doi: 10.5465/amr.1985.4279096
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465. doi:10.5465/256865
- Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Shapiro, D. (2004). The future of Work Motivation Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 379-387. doi: 10.5465/amr.2004.13670978
- Stewart, G. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Review of Relationships Between Team Design Features and Team Performance. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 29-55. doi: 10.1177/0149206305277792
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Tay, L. & Kuykendall, L. (2013). Promoting happiness: The malleability of individual and societal subjective wellbeing. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(3), 159-176. doi: 10.1080/00207594.2013.779379
- 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
- Terrill, A., Müller, R., Jensen, M., Molton, I., Ipsen, C., & Ravesloot, C. (2015). Association between age, distress, and orientations to happiness in individuals with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 60(1), 27-35. doi: 10.1037/rep0000016
- Thingujam, N. (2015). Orientations to happiness and Big Five personality factor among business students. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(3), 309-310.

- Thompson, A. & Riggio, R. (2010). Introduction to special issue on defining and measuring character in leadership. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(4), 211-215. doi: 10.1037/a0022285
- Thorpe, S., VanderEnde, K., Peters, C., Bardin, L., & Yount, K. (2015). The Influence of Women's Empowerment on Child Immunization Coverage in Low, Lower-Middle, and Upper-Middle Income Countries: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 20(1), 172-186. doi: 10.1007/s10995-015-1817-8
- Tietjen, M., & Myers, R. (1998). Motivation and job satisfaction. *Management Decision*, 36(4), 226-231. doi: 10.1108/00251749810211027
- Walumbwa, F., Hartnell, C., & Misati, E. (2017). Does ethical leadership enhance group learning behavior? Examining the mediating influence of group ethical conduct, justice climate, and peer justice. *Journal of Business Research*, 72, 14-23. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.11.013
- Waterman, A. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality And Social Psychology*, 64(4), 678-691. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.64.4.678
- Waterman, A., Schwartz, S., & Conti, R. (2006). The Implications of Two Conceptions of Happiness (Hedonic Enjoyment and Eudaimonia) for the Understanding of Intrinsic Motivation. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(1), 41-79. doi: 10.1007/s10902-006-9020-7
- Whicker, M. L. (1996). *Toxic leaders: When organizations go bad*. Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books.
- Wiggins, N. (2011). Popular education for health promotion and community empowerment: a review of the literature. *Health Promotion International*, 27(3), 356-371. doi: 10.1093/heapro/dar046

- Wu, C. & Chen, T. (2015). Psychological contract fulfillment in the hotel workplace: Empowering leadership, knowledge exchange, and service performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 48, 27-38. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.04.008
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289. doi: 10.1177/014920638901500207
- Zhang, X. & Zhou, J. (2014). Empowering leadership, uncertainty avoidance, trust, and employee creativity: Interaction effects and a mediating mechanism. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 124(2), 150-164. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.02.002

Annex A – Questionnaire

Liderança e Trabalho

O presente conjunto de questões visa estudar alguns aspetos da liderança e do trabalho e da vida das pessoas. Não há respostas certas ou erradas. Cada resposta é válida se expressar com sinceridade o que o(a) respondente sente e percebe. Para responder basta colocar uma cruz sobre a opção escolhida. Caso se engane, risque a cruz errada e coloque a nova cruz na sua real resposta, colocando depois um círculo sobre a nova cruz. Cada conjunto de questões tem uma breve apresentação. Deve ler cuidadosamente a mesma para entender a que se referem. Se tiver alguma dúvida no entendimento das questões, por favor peça esclarecimento ao aplicador dos questionários. Muito obrigado.

MWMS (Gagné & Forest et al, 2015)

O presente questionário refere-se ao modo como sente e percebe o seu trabalho. A palavra “trabalho” significando tanto as situações de exercício de uma profissão por conta própria, como as situações de emprego por conta de outrem. Responda **conforme se aplique à sua situação**. Considere que não há respostas certas ou erradas. Interessa que responda **conforme se aplica mais ou menos à sua situação**. Utilize a seguinte escala de respostas:

1=Nada; 2=Muito pouco; 3=Um pouco; 4=Moderadamente;
5=Fortemente; 6=Muito fortemente; 7=Completamente

Responda em todas as afirmações considerando a seguinte questão:

Por que motivo você se esforça ou se esforçaria no seu trabalho/emprego atual?

| Afirmações: | Respostas | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1-Não me esforço porque na verdade sinto que o meu trabalho é uma perda de tempo | | | | | | | |
| 2-Eu faço pouco porque penso que este trabalho não é merecedor de esforços | | | | | | | |
| 3-Eu não sei porque estou neste trabalho, já que é um trabalho inútil | | | | | | | |
| 4-Para obter a aprovação de outras pessoas (por exemplo, os meus superiores, os meus colegas, a minha família, os clientes...) | | | | | | | |
| 5-Porque outras pessoas me respeitarão mais (por exemplo, os meus superiores, os meus colegas, a minha família, os clientes...) | | | | | | | |
| 6-Para evitar ser criticado por outras pessoas (por exemplo, os meus superiores, os meus colegas, a minha família, os clientes...) | | | | | | | |
| 7-Porque somente se me esforçar o suficiente no meu trabalho conseguirei recompensas financeiras (por exemplo, do meu empregador, dos meus superiores hierárquicos...) | | | | | | | |
| 8-Porque somente se me esforçar o suficiente no meu trabalho me poderão oferecer mais estabilidade no trabalho (por exemplo, o meu empregador, os meus superiores hierárquicos...) | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 9- Porque me arrisco a perder o meu trabalho se não me esforçar o suficiente | | | | | | | | | |
| 10- Porque preciso de provar a mim mesmo(a) que consigo | | | | | | | | | |
| 11- Porque me faz sentir orgulho de mim mesmo(a) | | | | | | | | | |
| 12- Porque senão eu vou sentir vergonha de mim mesmo(a) | | | | | | | | | |
| 13- Porque senão me sinto mal comigo mesmo(a) | | | | | | | | | |
| 14- Porque pessoalmente considero importante esforçar-me neste trabalho | | | | | | | | | |
| 15- Porque esforçar-me neste trabalho está alinhado com os meus valores pessoais | | | | | | | | | |
| 16- Porque esforçar-me neste trabalho tem um significado pessoal para mim | | | | | | | | | |
| 17- Porque fazer o meu trabalho me diverte | | | | | | | | | |
| 18- Porque o que faço no meu trabalho é estimulante | | | | | | | | | |
| 19- Porque o trabalho que faço é interessante | | | | | | | | | |

ELQ (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000)

As questões que se seguem referem-se **ao seu superior hierárquico** (chefe, coordenador, supervisor, conforme a designação mais utilizada na empresa ou organização onde trabalha). Por favor dê-nos a sua visão sobre o modo como ele/ela exerce a sua função. **Considere o(a) seu(sua) superior hierárquico(a) aquele(a) com quem lida diretamente e que mais determina o seu trabalho.**

A expressão “grupo de trabalho” significa a unidade orgânica onde se enquadra o seu trabalho como equipa, secção, departamento, ou outra designação e a pessoa que considera nas suas respostas deve ser aquele que dirige ou coordena diretamente essa unidade orgânica. Considere que não há respostas certas ou erradas. Interessa que responda com que frequência **o comportamento do(a) seu superior(a) hierárquico(a) ao exercer a sua função corresponde à afirmação feita**. Utilize a seguinte escala de respostas:

1= Nunca (nunca se comporta assim); 2= Raramente; 3= Algumas vezes;

4= Muitas vezes; 5= Sempre (sempre se comporta assim)

Responda em todas as afirmações considerando a seguinte questão:

O/A meu/minha superior(a) hierárquico(a)/chefe:

| Afirmações | Respostas | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Estabelece elevados padrões de desempenho pelo seu próprio comportamento | | | | | |
| 2. Trabalha tanto quanto pode | | | | | |
| 3. Trabalha tão duro como qualquer pessoa no meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 4. Dá um bom exemplo pela forma como ele/ela se comporta | | | | | |
| 5. Lidera pelo exemplo | | | | | |
| 6. Incentiva os membros do grupo (departamento, secção) a expressar ideias / sugestões | | | | | |
| 7. Escuta as ideias e sugestões do meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 8. Utiliza as sugestões do meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) para | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| tomar decisões que nos afetam | | | | | |
| 9. Dá a todos os membros do grupo (departamento, secção) a oportunidade de expressar as suas opiniões | | | | | |
| 10. Tem em conta as ideias do meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) quando não concorda com elas | | | | | |
| 11. Toma decisões que são baseadas apenas nas suas próprias ideias | | | | | |
| 12. Ajuda-nos a ver áreas em que precisamos de mais formação | | | | | |
| 13. Sugere formas de melhorar o desempenho do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 14. Incentiva os membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) a resolver em conjunto os problemas | | | | | |
| 15. Incentiva os membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) a trocar informações entre si | | | | | |
| 16. Ajuda os membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 17. Explica aos membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) como resolver problemas por si próprios | | | | | |
| 18. Presta atenção aos esforços do meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 19. Informa o meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) quando fazemos algo bem feito | | | | | |
| 20. Apoia os esforços do meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 21. Ajuda o meu grupo e trabalho (departamento, secção) a focar-se nos nossos objetivos | | | | | |
| 22. Ajuda a desenvolver boas relações entre os membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 23. Explica as decisões da organização | | | | | |
| 24. Explica os objetivos da organização | | | | | |
| 25. Explica como o meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) se encaixa na organização | | | | | |
| 26. Explica ao meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) o propósito das políticas da organização | | | | | |
| 27. Explica ao meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) as regras e as expectativas | | | | | |
| 28. Explica as suas decisões e ações ao meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 29. Preocupa-se com os problemas pessoais dos membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 30. Mostra preocupação pelo bem-estar dos membros do grupo (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 31. Trata como iguais os membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 32. Toma o tempo necessário a discutir as preocupações dos membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) com paciência | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 33. Demonstra preocupação pelo sucesso dos membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 34. Mantém o contacto com o meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 35. Entende-se bem com os membros do meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 36. Dá respostas honestas e justas aos membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 37. Sabe que trabalho está a ser feito no meu grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |
| 38. Encontra tempo para conversar com os membros do grupo de trabalho (departamento, secção) | | | | | |

TLS (Schmidt, 2008)

As questões que se seguem referem-se uma vez mais **ao seu superior hierárquico** o mesmo a que se referiu nas questões do bloco anterior. Por favor dê-nos a sua visão sobre o modo como ele/ela exerce a sua função. Utilize a seguinte escala de respostas:

1= Discordo totalmente (ele/ela não é nada assim); 2= Discordo; 3= Discordo ligeiramente;
4= Concordo ligeiramente; 5= Concordo; 6= Concordo totalmente (ele/ela é mesmo assim)

Responda em todas as afirmações considerando a seguinte questão:

O/A meu/minha superior(a) hierárquico(a)/chefe:

| Afirmações | Respostas | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Ridiculariza os subordinados | | | | | | |
| 2. Atribui responsabilidade aos subordinados por coisas que não fazem parte das suas funções | | | | | | |
| 3. Não tem consideração pelos compromissos dos subordinados fora do trabalho | | | | | | |
| 4. Fala com desconsideração sobre os seus subordinados a outras pessoas no local de trabalho | | | | | | |
| 5. Rebaixa publicamente os subordinados | | | | | | |
| 6. Relembra os subordinados das suas falhas e erros do passado | | | | | | |
| 7. Diz aos subordinados que eles são incompetentes | | | | | | |
| 8. Controla o modo como os subordinados realizam as suas tarefas | | | | | | |
| 9. Invade a privacidade dos subordinados | | | | | | |
| 10. Não permite que os subordinados prossigam os objetivos através de novas formas de trabalho | | | | | | |
| 11. Ignora ideias que sejam contrárias às suas | | | | | | |
| 12. É inflexível quanto às políticas da empresa/organização mesmo em circunstâncias especiais | | | | | | |
| 13. Toma todas as decisões do departamento/secção/unidade orgânica que dirige, sejam ou não importantes | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 14. Sente-se com direitos especiais | | | | | | |
| 15. Acha que está destinado(a) a chegar às posições mais elevadas da empresa/organização | | | | | | |
| 16. Pensa que é mais capaz do que os(as) outros(as) | | | | | | |
| 17. Considera que é uma pessoa extraordinária | | | | | | |
| 18. Sente-se a engrandecer com elogios e homenagens pessoais | | | | | | |
| 19. Muda drasticamente o seu comportamento quando o(a) seu(sua) superior(a) hierárquico(a) está presente | | | | | | |
| 20. Nega responsabilidade por erros cometidos no departamento/secção/unidade orgânica que dirige | | | | | | |
| 21. Só oferece ajuda às pessoas que lhe possam trazer vantagens | | | | | | |
| 22. Aceita créditos por sucessos que não lhe pertencem | | | | | | |
| 23. Atua a pensar na sua próxima promoção | | | | | | |
| 24. Tem grandes explosões de humor | | | | | | |
| 25. Permite que a sua disposição de momento determine o clima no local de trabalho | | | | | | |
| 26. Expressa raiva aos subordinados sem razão aparente | | | | | | |
| 27. Permite que a sua disposição afete o tom e o volume da sua voz | | | | | | |
| 28. Varia no quanto é acessível | | | | | | |
| 29. Os seus subordinados são obrigados a tentar descobrir o seu estado de espírito | | | | | | |
| 30. Afeta as emoções dos subordinados quando está exaltado | | | | | | |

OHQ – versão portuguesa - (Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005)

Pedimos-lhe que indique em que medida cada uma das seguintes afirmações corresponde à sua própria experiência pessoal. Assinale com uma cruz a opção que corresponde à resposta que pretende dar. Utilize a seguinte escala de respostas:

1= Não corresponde nada à minha experiência; 2= Corresponde pouco à minha experiência;

3= Corresponde à minha experiência; 4= Corresponde bastante à minha experiência;

5= Corresponde muitíssimo à minha experiência.

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. A minha vida tem um propósito mais elevado | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. A vida é muito curta para se adiarem os prazeres que nos pode proporcionar | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Independentemente do que estou a fazer, o tempo passa muito depressa | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Ao escolher o que faço, tenho sempre em conta se isso irá beneficiar outras pessoas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Saio da minha rotina para me sentir estimulado | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Procuo situações que desafiem as minhas competências e capacidades | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Tenho a responsabilidade de fazer do mundo um lugar melhor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. Ao escolher o que fazer tenho sempre em conta se será prazeroso | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Tanto no trabalho como no lazer, costumo ficar completamente imerso(a) e esqueço-me de mim próprio(a) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. A minha vida tem um significado permanente | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Concordo com a seguinte afirmação: “a vida é curta - come primeiro a sobremesa” | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Fico sempre absorvido(a) por aquilo que faço | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. O que faço tem importância para a sociedade | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Adoro fazer coisas que me estimulem os sentidos | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Ao escolher o que faço tenho sempre em conta se posso ficar completamente absorvido(a) nisso | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Tenho passado muito tempo a pensar sobre o significado da vida e como me encaixo no todo | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Para mim, uma vida boa é uma vida prazerosa | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Raramente me distraio com o que acontece à minha volta | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Dados para fins exclusivamente estatísticos:

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 1 Sexo <input type="checkbox"/> Masculino <input type="checkbox"/> Feminino | 2 Idade: _____ anos | 3 Há quantos anos trabalha na empresa/organização? _____ anos |
| 4 Situação(ões) profissional(ais) (pode assinalar mais do que 1 situação) <input type="checkbox"/> Trabalhador do Estado <input type="checkbox"/> Trabalhador no setor privado | 5 Qual o vínculo que mantém com a organização? <input type="checkbox"/> Prestador de serviços (recibos verdes) <input type="checkbox"/> Contrato a termo (certo ou incerto) <input type="checkbox"/> Contrato sem termo /efetivo(a) | 6 No seu local de trabalho desempenha alguma função de chefia? <input type="checkbox"/> Sim <input type="checkbox"/> Não |
| 7 Grau de Escolaridade <input type="checkbox"/> Sabe ler e escrever sem possuir a 4ª classe <input type="checkbox"/> 1º ciclo do ensino básico (ensino primário) <input type="checkbox"/> 2º ciclo do ensino básico (6º ano) <input type="checkbox"/> 3º ciclo do ensino básico (9º ano) <input type="checkbox"/> Ensino Secundário (12º ano) <input type="checkbox"/> Bacharelato <input type="checkbox"/> Licenciatura em curso <input type="checkbox"/> Pós-Graduação/Mestrado (pós Bolonha)/ Licenciatura Pré Bolonha <input type="checkbox"/> Licenciatura concluída (pós-Bolonha) <input type="checkbox"/> Mestrado Pré-Bolonha <input type="checkbox"/> Doutoramento | 8 Setor de atividade da organização onde trabalha <input type="checkbox"/> Indústria Transformadora <input type="checkbox"/> Indústria Extrativa <input type="checkbox"/> Comércio por grosso e a retalho <input type="checkbox"/> Alojamento e restauração <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultura, pecuária, pescas <input type="checkbox"/> Construção <input type="checkbox"/> Produção e distribuição de eletricidade, gás e água <input type="checkbox"/> Transportes e armazenagem <input type="checkbox"/> Educação e ciência <input type="checkbox"/> Saúde humana e apoio social <input type="checkbox"/> Atividades imobiliárias, alugueres e serviços prestados às empresas <input type="checkbox"/> Artes e indústrias criativas <input type="checkbox"/> Tecnologia de informação e comunicações <input type="checkbox"/> Outra. | 9 Dimensão da organização onde trabalha <input type="checkbox"/> Tem até 9 colaboradores <input type="checkbox"/> Tem entre 10 e 50 colaboradores <input type="checkbox"/> Tem entre 51 e 250 colaboradores <input type="checkbox"/> Tem entre 251 e 500 colaboradores <input type="checkbox"/> Tem entre 501 e 1000 colaboradores <input type="checkbox"/> Tem mais de 1001 colaboradores 10 Tempo de trabalho na função atual <input type="checkbox"/> 3 meses <input type="checkbox"/> Mais de 3 e até 6 meses <input type="checkbox"/> Mais de 6 meses e até 1 ano <input type="checkbox"/> Mais de um ano |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Qual? _____ | |
| 11 Indique, por favor, o seu vencimento líquido mensal (aquilo que recebe em média por mês) | 12 Há quanto tempo trabalha com o superior hierárquico a quem se referiu nos questionários? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Até 500 € | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 meses | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Entre 501 e 1000 € | <input type="checkbox"/> Mais de 3 e até 6 meses | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Entre 1001 e 1500 € | <input type="checkbox"/> Mais de 6 meses e até 1 ano | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Entre 1501 e 2000 € | <input type="checkbox"/> Mais de um ano | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Entre 2001 e 2500 € | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Entre 2501 e 3000 € | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Entre 3001 e 3500 € | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Entre 3501 e 4000 € | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mais de 4000 € | | |

Muito obrigado(a) pela sua colaboração