



4-2017

When Job Performance is All Relative: How Family Motivation Energizes Effort and Compensates for Intrinsic Motivation

Jochen I. Menges

Danielle V. Tussing
University of Pennsylvania

Andreas Wihler

Adam M. Grant
University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/mgmt_papers



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Business Intelligence Commons](#), [Human Resources Management Commons](#), [Labor Relations Commons](#), [Management Information Systems Commons](#), and the [Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Menges, J. I., Tussing, D. V., Wihler, A., & Grant, A. M. (2017). When Job Performance is All Relative: How Family Motivation Energizes Effort and Compensates for Intrinsic Motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60 (2), 695-719. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0898>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/mgmt_papers/332
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

When Job Performance is All Relative: How Family Motivation Energizes Effort and Compensates for Intrinsic Motivation

Abstract

Supporting one's family is a major reason why many people work, yet surprisingly little research has examined the implications of family motivation. Drawing on theories of prosocial motivation and action identification, we propose that family motivation increases job performance by enhancing energy and reducing stress, and it is especially important when intrinsic motivation is lacking. Survey and diary data collected across multiple time points in a Mexican maquiladora generally support our model. Specifically, we find that family motivation enhances job performance when intrinsic motivation is low—in part by providing energy, but not by reducing stress. We conclude that supporting a family provides a powerful source of motivation that can boost performance in the workplace, offering meaningful implications for research on motivation and the dynamics of work and family engagement.

Keywords

action identification, energy, family, intrinsic motivation, job performance, monotonous jobs, prosocial motivation, stress

Disciplines

Business Administration, Management, and Operations | Business Intelligence | Human Resources Management | Labor Relations | Management Information Systems | Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

When Job Performance is All Relative: How Family Motivation Energizes Effort and Compensates for Intrinsic Motivation

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Jochen I. Menges

WHU – Otto Beisheim School of Management
Erkrather Str. 224a
40233 Düsseldorf
Germany
jochen.menges@whu.edu

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Danielle V. Tussing

University of Pennsylvania
2000 Steinberg Hall – Dietrich Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6370
USA
dvtuss@wharton.upenn.edu

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Andreas Wihler

University of Bonn
Kaiser-Karl-Ring 9
53111 Bonn
Germany
wihler@uni-bonn.de

Adam M. Grant

University of Pennsylvania
2000 Steinberg Hall – Dietrich Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6370
USA
grantad@wharton.upenn.edu

Acknowledgements

We thank Associate Editor Carol Kulik and three anonymous reviewers for insightful comments, and Justin Berg, Andrew Carton, Hengchen Dai, Jon Jachimowicz, Brian Little, Nicholas Lobuglio, Samir Nurmohamed, Julianna Pillemer, Jaime Potter, Nancy Rothbard, Basima Tewfik, and Chia-Jung Tsay for helpful feedback.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**When Job Performance is All Relative:
How Family Motivation Energizes Effort and Compensates for Intrinsic Motivation**

ABSTRACT

Supporting one's family is a major reason why many people work, yet surprisingly little research has examined the implications of family motivation. Drawing on theories of prosocial motivation and action identification, we propose that family motivation increases job performance by enhancing energy and reducing stress, and it is especially important when intrinsic motivation is lacking. Survey and diary data collected across multiple time points in a Mexican maquiladora generally support our model. Specifically, we find that family motivation enhances job performance when intrinsic motivation is low—in part by providing energy, but not by reducing stress. We conclude that supporting a family provides a powerful source of motivation that can boost performance in the workplace, offering meaningful implications for research on motivation and the dynamics of work and family engagement.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

When work is interesting, employees are motivated to perform better. Considerable research has linked intrinsic motivation, the desire to invest effort due to enjoyment of the work itself (Ryan & Deci, 2000), to higher job performance (e.g., Grant, 2008a; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010). Intrinsic motivation makes effort less aversive, leading employees to work harder, smarter, longer, and more productively (Amabile, 1993; Gagne & Deci, 2005).

However, many jobs are not designed to enable intrinsic motivation. Across the manufacturing, service, and agricultural sectors, it is common for employees to have little discretion in tasks, decisions, work methods, and schedules (Davis, 2010; Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006), especially in developing countries (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2003). This deprives them of autonomy, which is the most widely studied contributor to intrinsic motivation in both psychological research on self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) and organizational research on the job characteristics model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976, 1980). In addition, the emphasis on routine, repetitive tasks provides little skill variety and few opportunities to develop a sense of competence, which is another central antecedent of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). In jobs on assembly lines, fast food restaurants, and retail stores, for example, the work itself remains devoid of the conditions that foster intrinsic motivation for many employees (Davis, 2010; Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012).

When the process of doing work is not intrinsically motivating, scholars have long recognized that valued outcomes can serve as a substitute (Vroom, 1964). According to action identification theory (Vallacher & Wegner, 1987, 1989), individuals can mentally construct a given activity according to the activity's lower-level process or its higher-order purpose. When pure intrinsic motivation is not tenable, rather than attending to the monotonous aspects of a job,

1
2
3 individuals may find meaning by focusing on how the outcomes of work align with their values.
4

5
6 Although one of the values that drives many employees to work is the desire to support
7
8 their families (Bernard, 1981; Brief, Brett, Raskas, & Stein, 1997; Brief & Nord, 1990; George
9
10 & Brief, 1990; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997), surprisingly little theory
11
12 and research has examined the family as a source of motivation. As Rosso, Dekas, and
13
14 Wrzesniewski (2010: 102) lament, “few have directly studied the influence of family on the
15
16 *meaning* of one’s work.” Existing research often portrays having a family as a distraction from
17
18 work, a source of interference that weakens performance. Such depletion accounts suggest that
19
20 families draw employees away from work, diluting employees’ work focus by diverting attention
21
22 to those at home and demanding time for activities with family that could otherwise be spent at
23
24 work (e.g., Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Lapierre, Hammer, Truxillo, & Murphy, 2012). In
25
26 contrast, enrichment accounts acknowledge that family life may enhance work life and that
27
28 having a family may provide additional impetus to get work done (e.g., Greenhaus & Powell,
29
30 2006; Rothbard, 2001).
31
32
33
34
35

36 We address this debate by suggesting that families matter for job performance to the
37
38 extent that employees derive motivation from seeing their jobs as benefitting their families.
39
40 Family motivation is a special case of prosocial motivation—the desire to benefit others (Grant,
41
42 2008a)—where employees are driven to expend effort in order to take care of their spouses and
43
44 dependents. Building on theories of action identification and prosocial motivation, we propose
45
46 that providing for a family can serve as a potent source of meaning that drives performance by
47
48 fostering energy that is needed to get work done and by buffering against stress that interferes
49
50 with one’s job. More specifically, as depicted in Figure 1, we suggest that family motivation
51
52 becomes *especially* consequential when employees lack intrinsic motivation, mitigating the costs
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of low intrinsic motivation for job performance by serving as an alternative source of energy
4 external to the work itself and reducing stress. We test these hypotheses in a field study with
5 factory workers in Mexico, using objective daily measures of performance, survey measures of
6 intrinsic and family motivations, and daily diary measures of the mediating mechanisms of
7 energy and stress.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Our research offers four key contributions to research on motivation and work-family
16 dynamics. First, we answer calls to examine the family as a source of meaning and motivation
17 (George & Brief, 1996; Rosso et al., 2010). Second, we challenge the assumption that prosocial
18 and intrinsic motivations will always interact positively (Grant, 2008a; Grant & Berry, 2011).
19
20 Third, in demonstrating the compensatory role of family motivation, we extend knowledge about
21 the psychological forces that fuel performance when intrinsic motivation is lacking. Fourth, we
22 advance work-family research by identifying a novel psychological path through which family
23 can enrich emotional experiences and effectiveness at work.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 -----
35 Insert Figure 1 about here
36 -----
37

38 **FAMILY MOTIVATION**

39
40
41 In recent years, organizational scholars have devoted growing attention to prosocial
42 motivation, the desire to expend effort to benefit other people (Grant, 2007, 2008a). Research on
43 prosocial motivation builds on a tradition of examining concern for others as a driver of
44 motivation (Meglino & Korsgaard, 2004). When employees are prosocially motivated, they are
45 typically focused on helping a particular group of beneficiaries (Grant, 2007; McNeely &
46 Meglino, 1994). Whereas existing studies have examined coworkers and customers as
47 beneficiaries (e.g., Bellé, 2012; Grant & Berry, 2011; Hu & Liden, 2015), we study the family as
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 an important beneficiary of work.
4

5 We define family motivation as the desire to expend effort to benefit one's family.
6
7 Hence, it is a form of prosocial motivation for which the beneficiary is specifically the family.
8
9 Family motivation is likely to be most relevant when an employee has dependents at home, but
10
11 "family" need not only refer to spouses and children; it may also extend to parents and
12
13 grandparents, aunts and uncles, cousins, or other kin (Burnstein, Crandall, & Kitayama, 1994).
14
15 As Edwards and Rothbard (2000: 179) define it, family consists of people "related by biological
16
17 ties, marriage, social custom, or adoption."
18
19
20
21

22 It is widely recognized that supporting one's family is a fundamental reason that many
23
24 people work, from North America (Brief et al., 1997; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997) to Southeast
25
26 Asia (Morling & Kitayama, 2008). In one study, for example, when Amway employees shared
27
28 their dreams, 86 percent emphasized "being a good family member" (Pratt, 2000: 465). Further,
29
30 research on boundary management suggests that working to support the family is one way that
31
32 employees psychologically integrate their families into work, connecting different identities
33
34 (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Lambert, 1990). However, the
35
36 family as a source of work motivation has received little theoretical or empirical attention (Brief
37
38 & Nord, 1990; Rosso et al., 2010).
39
40
41
42

43 Family motivation differs from traditional forms of prosocial motivation in that it focuses
44
45 on beneficiaries outside the workplace, who are not affected directly by employees' task
46
47 contributions, products, or services, but rather by employment itself and its affordances. Thus,
48
49 whereas prosocial motivation directed toward coworkers and customers depends on high task
50
51 significance (Grant, 2007), family motivation can be strong even when the job does not have a
52
53 meaningful positive impact on others. Further, whereas other forms of prosocial motivation are
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 often dependent on the job and the organization (Grant, 2007), family motivation should be more
4
5 consistent across different contexts, as employees can take their families with them from one job
6
7 and organization to another. Although family motivation belongs to the wider construct of
8
9 prosocial motivation, it is also likely to be more intense than general forms of prosocial
10
11 motivation, making it a special case. “Intensity of motivation,” Brehm and Self (1989: 110)
12
13 explain, is the “magnitude of motivational arousal.”
14
15

16
17
18 Family motivation is likely to involve intense motivational arousal because of its deep
19
20 connection with one of the most fundamental values in society. Of the 58 guiding principles
21
22 covered in surveys of values across cultures (Schwartz et al., 2012), caring for the family ranks
23
24 as the second most important priority in life, trailing only behind avoiding sickness. This
25
26 devotion to family members not only trumps priorities related to independence, influence,
27
28 recognition, enjoying life through leisure, and a world at peace, but also concern for all other
29
30 groups of people (Schwartz, 2015). When employees are motivated to work for their families,
31
32 because they have an especially rich and deep relationship with their beneficiaries, their
33
34 willingness to work long and hard on the job should be strengthened (Grant, 2007).
35
36
37

38
39 Building on this evidence, there are at least five other reasons for which family
40
41 motivation is likely to be a uniquely potent source of effort at work. First, employees are likely
42
43 to care more about assisting their family members than other groups of beneficiaries by the sheer
44
45 nature of kinship (Burnstein et al., 1994). Research has established that kinship is a powerful
46
47 driver of emotional closeness (Korchmaros & Kenny, 2001), which in turn influences the degree
48
49 to which employees expend effort on behalf of a beneficiary (Grant, Campbell, Chen, Cottone,
50
51 Lapedis, & Lee, 2007). Second, in the special case of family motivation, employees typically
52
53 have a substantive past history with their beneficiaries (family members), and a relationship with
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 those beneficiaries is likely to extend well into the future. The frequency of contact with
4
5 beneficiaries is also often higher in the case of family motivation than for other forms of
6
7 prosocial motivation. That is, because family members typically live together, family members
8
9 should be encountered more often than other types of beneficiaries, motivating employees to be
10
11 ever more committed to helping their families (Grant, 2007; Schoenrade, Batson, Brandt, &
12
13 Loud, 1986).
14
15

16
17 Third, when the family is the beneficiary, the nature of prosocial motivation is likely to
18
19 be especially powerful because employees can directly see the consequences of their work for
20
21 their families. This awareness of impact is one of the driving forces behind the desire to expend
22
23 effort to benefit others (Grant, 2008b, 2012; Grant et al., 2007). Fourth, employees are likely to
24
25 feel a greater sense of responsibility for supporting their families than other beneficiaries. When
26
27 the beneficiary is coworkers or end users, there are usually other employees in the organization
28
29 with similar jobs and similar skills who can help, which can lead to diffusion of responsibility
30
31 and social loafing (Harkins & Petty, 1982). When the beneficiary is the family, employees may
32
33 feel that their spouses and children are dependent only on them, experiencing the feeling of
34
35 personal responsibility that is known to motivate effort (Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Pearce &
36
37 Gregersen, 1991; Weiner, 1985).
38
39
40
41
42

43 Fifth, whereas prosocial motivation toward other beneficiaries often focuses on large
44
45 groups of colleagues, the beneficiary pool is often more concentrated in the case of family
46
47 motivation. An employee working to support a nuclear family only needs to focus on a handful
48
49 of individuals, as compared to a teacher working to help dozens of students or a lawyer
50
51 defending a large number of clients. Research shows that people are typically more motivated to
52
53 help smaller groups than larger groups, which is conducive to greater perceived identification
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and impact (Slovic, 2007; Small, Loewenstein, & Slovic, 2007). Further, since the family unit is
4
5 a bounded entity, it is easier to focus on how one's actions will have a common impact on a
6
7 coherent group (Smith, Faro, & Burson, 2013).
8
9

10 In summary, following Grant's (2007) theoretical model, the desire to support one's
11 family should be more intense than other forms of prosocial motivation due to heightened
12 perceived impact (for example, because of the enduring, visible effect employees often have on
13 their families and their sense of personal responsibility for their families). The resulting
14 motivation is further strengthened by the stronger affective commitment between employees and
15 their beneficiaries (for example, because of the frequent, physically proximate contact employees
16 have with their families). Due to this intensity, we expect family motivation to have a greater
17 influence on employees' attention, effort, and persistence than other forms of prosocial
18 motivation (Brehm & Self, 1989; Mitchell & Daniels, 2003).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Finally, as a powerful form of prosocial motivation, family motivation is likely to be
33 more autonomously regulated than extrinsic motivation. According to self-determination theory
34 (Gagne & Deci, 2005), whereas extrinsic motivation involves working solely to obtain rewards
35 or avoid punishments, family motivation involves identifying work as attached to a core value or
36 integrating it into an entire value system. Interestingly, family motivation nonetheless shares
37 similarities with having a job orientation toward work, which involves viewing work as a means
38 to other ends, such as supporting one's family, lifestyle, and leisure time (Wrzesniewski et al.,
39 1997). However, it differs in that having a job orientation is negatively correlated with having a
40 calling orientation, which involves viewing work as an enjoyable, meaningful end in and of itself
41 (Elangovan, Pinder, & McLean, 2010). When employees experience strong family motivation,
42 this does not preclude them from finding work enjoyable and meaningful. In fact, as we argue,
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 family motivation can coexist with enjoyment, but serves as a particularly important source of
4
5 meaning when enjoyment is lacking.
6
7

8 As such, family motivation should be an important source of work identity and a driver of
9
10 job performance. Job performance is the effectiveness of employees' contributions toward
11
12 organizational goals (Motowidlo, 2003). In the following sections, we examine the role of family
13
14 motivation in shaping job performance, both directly and in tandem with intrinsic motivation.
15
16

17 We hypothesize that when family motivation is strong, employees will connect their
18
19 work to the important value of supporting the people who matter most to them, enhancing the
20
21 valence of work (Vroom, 1964). This will give them the grit (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, &
22
23 Kelly, 2007) to work harder and longer for both utilitarian and identity reasons (Rothbard &
24
25 Edwards, 2003). From a utilitarian perspective, achieving high performance can increase job
26
27 security, prevent pay cuts, and provide additional income to support one's family. From an
28
29 identity perspective, when employees perform well, they reinforce their self-concepts as
30
31 responsible breadwinners and good role models. Indeed, research shows that when employees
32
33 view family roles as an important part of their identities, they invest more time in work
34
35 (Rothbard & Edwards, 2003), and that men and women with children are more productive at
36
37 work than those who do not have dependents (Krapf, Ursprung, & Zimmermann, 2014). As such,
38
39 we expect that family motivation will drive employees to attain higher performance.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 *Hypothesis 1. Family motivation is positively associated with job performance.*
47

48 **Family Motivation, Intrinsic Motivation, and Job Performance**

49

50 However, the impact of family motivation on performance is likely to vary as a function
51
52 of intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation, as mentioned above, is the desire to invest effort
53
54 based on interest in the work itself (Ryan & Deci, 2000). When intrinsic motivation is high,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 employees do not need to exercise self-regulation to “push” themselves to work; they are
4
5 naturally “pulled” into the work (Grant, 2008a). Since the work is enjoyable rather than aversive,
6
7 employees are more likely to focus their attention, invest considerable effort, and persist in the
8
9 face of obstacles (Mitchell & Daniels, 2003).
10
11

12
13 It is not realistic, though, for high levels of intrinsic motivation to exist in every job or for
14
15 every employee (Frese & Fay, 2001). For example, research suggests that intrinsic motivation is
16
17 often impoverished in lower-level jobs (Deal, Stawiski, Graves, Gentry, Weber, & Ruderman,
18
19 2013) and developing countries (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2003). In the absence of intrinsic
20
21 motivation, the quality and quantity of performance tend to suffer (e.g., Grant, 2008a; Piccolo &
22
23 Colquitt, 2006; Rich et al., 2010).
24
25
26

27 We propose that family motivation can compensate for a lack of intrinsic motivation. The
28
29 fundamental difference between intrinsic motivation and family motivation is rooted in a
30
31 distinction first introduced by Aristotle (350 BCE/1985) between hedonic and eudaimonic
32
33 pursuits. Hedonic aspirations involve seeking pleasure and avoiding pain; eudaimonic aspirations
34
35 focus on seeking meaning and expressing important values (McGregor & Little, 1998; Ryan &
36
37 Deci, 2001; Waterman, 1993, 2007). Intrinsic motivation is hedonic, as it is governed by a desire
38
39 to experience enjoyment and pleasure in one’s activities. Family motivation is eudaimonic, as it
40
41 is concerned not with affective experiences for oneself, but with the important responsibility of
42
43 providing for one’s dependents. Research has established that family is a central source of
44
45 meaning in life (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Singer, 1998), and that it is a universal value prized by the
46
47 majority of people in the majority of the world’s cultures (Pew Research Center, 2010; Schwartz,
48
49 1994; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987; Schwartz et al., 2012; World Values Survey, 2010-2014).
50
51
52

53
54
55 According to action identification theory (Vallacher & Wegner, 1987, 1989), any task
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 can be identified psychologically at different levels of analysis. At a low level of analysis,
4 employees focus on *how* the task is being performed, directing their attention to the process for
5 carrying it out. At a high level of analysis, they focus on *why* the task is being performed,
6 focusing on the purpose for doing it. For example, consider the act of unlocking a door. A low-
7 level identification would be “I turned the key.” A high-level identification would be “I let my
8 spouse into our new home.” Although any task can be identified in terms of lower processes and
9 higher purposes, Vallacher and Wegner (1987: 5) argued that in general, “when both a lower and
10 a higher level act identity are available, there is a tendency for the higher level identity to
11 become prepotent. The idea here is simply that people are always sensitive to the larger
12 meanings, effects, and implications of what they are doing.”

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Family motivation facilitates higher-level identifications, which are likely to be
28 especially attractive when intrinsic motivation is lacking. By definition, employees do not enjoy
29 the process of doing tasks that are devoid of intrinsic motivation. Under these circumstances, the
30 motivation to support one’s family can provide a purpose that changes the psychological
31 experience of work. Although family motivation offers an important reason for effort regardless
32 of whether or not employees enjoy their work, in the absence of intrinsic motivation, family
33 motivation can transform a task from uninteresting to worthwhile. Thus, when intrinsic
34 motivation is high, family motivation can still be beneficial, but family motivation becomes
35 especially consequential when intrinsic motivation is low. In line with this logic, a recent series
36 of studies with high school and college students demonstrated that when learning tasks are
37 inherently boring, a prosocial, self-transcendent purpose for learning can effectively increase
38 students’ diligence and persistence on those tasks (Yeager et al., 2014). For many employees,
39 there is no purpose more significant than caring for their families. When employees lack interest
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the work itself, they can nevertheless perceive it as meaningful because it gives them the
4
5 opportunity to express core values of providing for their families. Thus, we predict that when
6
7 intrinsic motivation is lacking, family motivation can compensate to enhance job performance.¹
8
9

10 *Hypothesis 2. Intrinsic motivation moderates the relationship between family motivation*
11 *and job performance, such that family motivation is more positively associated with*
12 *performance when intrinsic motivation is low rather than high.*
13
14

15 To provide further insight into the moderating role of intrinsic motivation, we examine
16
17 two different psychological processes. When psychologists have explained the performance
18
19 effects of intrinsic motivation, they have turned their attention to the key processes of energy and
20
21 stress. According to self-determination theory, autonomous regulation has an energizing effect
22
23 and a stress-reducing effect (Gagne & Deci, 2005; Ryan & Frederick, 1997). When the work
24
25 itself is interesting, employees are excited to engage and less likely to experience stress, which
26
27 leads them to work harder, longer, and smarter (Amabile, 1993; Grant, 2008a). As such, we
28
29 focus on energy and stress as the key psychological processes through which family motivation
30
31 will operate. We predict that family motivation will enhance performance by providing a sense
32
33 of meaning that boosts energy and reduces stress, and that these effects will be more pronounced
34
35 when intrinsic motivation is low.
36
37
38
39

40 *Energy.* First, we expect that family motivation will enhance energy, particularly when
41
42 intrinsic motivation is absent. Energy is a form of high-arousal positive affect, reflecting the
43
44 extent to which an employee feels a sense of vitality—psychologically vigorous and alert (Reis,
45
46 Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Frederick, 1997). Extensive research has shown
47
48 that intrinsic motivation confers energy: when people choose to work on tasks because they find
49
50
51
52

53
54 ¹ This compensation effect does not preclude the possibility that employees will fare best when they have high
55 intrinsic motivation *and* high family motivation. Rather, we suggest that the positive relationship between family
56 motivation and job performance is stronger when employees do not enjoy their work, because the relative
57 importance of family motivation in driving performance increases in such instances.
58
59
60

1
2
3 them interesting, they experience greater vitality, enthusiasm, and excitement (Nix, Ryan,
4 Manly, & Deci, 1999; Saavedra & Kwun, 2000; Sheldon & Kasser, 1995). People also
5
6 experience greater energy if intrinsic goals are more central in their lives than extrinsic goals
7
8 (Kasser & Ryan, 1996).
9
10

11
12 In the absence of intrinsic motivation, energy is likely to falter: when the process of
13 carrying out tasks is not interesting, employees lack enthusiasm for their work and have to push
14 themselves to work, which is often exhausting (Grant & Sonnentag, 2010). However, a
15 meaningful purpose can render energy. When employees work to benefit their families, the job
16 becomes a vessel to express personal values, resulting in more engagement at work (Kahn,
17 1990). This is a reason to focus attention and concentrate on work, as opposed to becoming
18 distracted (Rothbard, 2001). Further, energy spills over to increase task-related effort (Brown &
19 Leigh, 1996), and because energized employees feel more mentally refreshed than their
20 counterparts, they have enhanced resources for persevering on the job. For example, several
21 studies have shown that people with a strong other-orientation were energized to persist longer
22 than their peers on tedious tasks after being depleted (Seeley & Gardner, 2003; see also Balliet &
23 Joireman, 2010). In another study, when students were able to connect tedious tasks to a purpose
24 of benefiting others, they reported stronger enthusiasm about doing their schoolwork (Yeager et
25 al., 2014). Whereas perceiving a task as boring is unlikely to fuel energy, viewing it as “boring
26 but important” is more energizing, enabling employees to work harder.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 From an action identification standpoint (Vallacher & Wegner, 1987, 1989), employees
49 are likely to be energized by framing their tasks in terms of the meaningful purpose of providing
50 for their families. For example, when working on an uninteresting task like stuffing envelopes,
51 instead of focusing on the repetitive process of folding papers and sealing flaps, employees can
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reflect on the important purpose of how doing the job helps caring for their families, which may
4 rejuvenate their energy. Indeed, there is evidence that reminding people of their romantic
5 partners is enough to energize them to work harder on tasks that benefit these partners (Shah,
6 2003). Employees often post family photographs in their workspaces, which provide them with
7 salient reminders of why they are working (Elsbach, 2003; George & Brief, 1996).

8
9
10
11
12
13 “Meaningfulness connects present to future” (Baumeister, Vohs, Aaker, & Garbinsky, 2013:
14 512), and even if the present tasks are not interesting, employees can shift their focus to why
15 effort will be valuable down the road in creating a better future for their families.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22 In turn, energy is likely to enhance job performance. The burnout and engagement
23 literatures provide extensive evidence that when employees lack emotional energy, their
24 performance suffers (Rich et al., 2010; Taris, 2006). Without energy, employees struggle to
25 focus their attention, expend effort, and persist to overcome barriers. For example, Goldberg and
26 Grandey (2007) found that when participants were depleted of energy, they made more errors in
27 a customer service interaction. When employees are energized, on the other hand, they tend to be
28 more effective (Quinn, Spreitzer, & Lam, 2012). Additionally, energy is an indicator of well-
29 being (Ryan & Frederick, 1997), which has been linked to improved job performance (Wright &
30 Cropanzano, 1998).

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 To summarize, we predict that family motivation energizes employees to carry out their
44 work, enhancing performance. When employees are intrinsically motivated, they already
45 experience energy stemming from enjoyment in the work itself. When intrinsic motivation is
46 low, family motivation becomes all the more important, as it serves as a primary source of
47 energy external to the job. Thus, we predict that the strength of the relationship between family
48 motivation and energy is contingent upon an employee’s level of intrinsic motivation.

49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Particularly among those who are low in intrinsic motivation, employees high in family
4
5 motivation will experience greater energy, yielding improved performance.
6
7

8 *Hypothesis 3a. Intrinsic motivation moderates the relationship between family motivation*
9 *and energy, such that family motivation is more positively associated with energy when*
10 *intrinsic motivation is low rather than high.*
11

12 *Hypothesis 3b. Energy is positively related to job performance.*
13

14 *Hypothesis 3c. The indirect effect of family motivation on job performance through*
15 *energy is moderated by intrinsic motivation.*
16
17

18 **Stress.** Along with providing energy, we predict that family motivation is likely to reduce
19
20 feelings of stress. Although employees experience stress at work for a variety of reasons, it is
21
22 especially pronounced when intrinsic motivation is low. When employees lack intrinsic
23
24 motivation, they are more prone to burnout, emotional exhaustion, and stress (Grant &
25
26 Sonnentag, 2010; Houkes, Janssen, de Jonge, & Nijhuis, 2001). They experience a sense of
27
28 pressure, and are likely to view their work as externally controlled and less congruous with the
29
30 self (Gagne & Deci, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Moreover, monotonous work, often associated
31
32 with low levels of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Hackman & Oldham, 1980), is
33
34 associated with increased stress (Kahn & Byosiere, 1992), risk for heart attack (Alfredsson,
35
36 Karasek, & Theorell, 1982), and even mortality (Britton & Shipley, 2010).
37
38
39
40
41

42 There is a wealth of evidence that other-oriented motivation can provide a sense of
43
44 meaning that reduces stress and enhances health (Ferrari, Luhrs, & Lyman, 2007; Konrath,
45
46 Fuhrel-Forbis, Lou, & Brown, 2012). As Konrath et al. (2012: 88) explain, “other-oriented
47
48 motives may buffer... against potential stressors that occur in daily life,” as “these motives may
49
50 help to promote a sense of deep and lasting well-being originating from service to something
51
52 bigger than the self.” Further, when employees have strong family motivation, they will view the
53
54 job as serving the purpose of benefiting their families. This is a form of cognitive job crafting
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), whereby employees imbue the work with greater meaning by
4 connecting it to their identities as breadwinners, good providers, and caregivers. In the words of
5
6 Sherman and Cohen (2006: 229), “In a difficult situation, reminders of these core qualities can
7
8 provide people with perspective on who they are and anchor their sense of self-integrity.” As a
9
10 result, employees may experience a stronger fit between the work and their personal values and
11
12 goals, increasing relatedness and reducing stress (Ryan & Deci, 2000).
13
14
15
16

17
18 We posit that this negative relationship between family motivation and stress is especially
19
20 pronounced when employees lack intrinsic motivation. When employees can find meaning in
21
22 unpleasant or difficult events, they experience less stress (Davis, Nolen-Hoeksema, & Larson,
23
24 1998; Park & Folkman, 1997; Pennebaker & Seagal, 1999). Using the lens of action
25
26 identification theory (Vallacher & Wegner, 1987, 1989), a strong motivation to take care of
27
28 one’s family provides a justification for doing unpleasant work. When employees are finding the
29
30 process uninteresting, they can turn their attention to the purpose. Indeed, employees report
31
32 looking at photos and other family-related objects while at work to be reminded of what they are
33
34 working for and to reduce stress (Belk & Watson, 1998), and making family relationships salient
35
36 can reduce blood pressure (Carlisle et al., 2011), increase resilience in the face of threats
37
38 (Kumashiro & Sedikides, 2005; Murray, Bellavia, Feeney, Holmes, & Rose, 2001), and restore
39
40 confidence and self-esteem (Chen & Boucher, 2008; Gabriel, Renaud, & Tippin, 2007). As
41
42 Sherman and Cohen (2006: 229) observe, “personal relationships seem to be an important
43
44 affirmational resource that people draw on in times of stress.”
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Furthermore, a substantial body of research indicates that stress is linked to reduced
52
53 productivity (Abramis, 1994; Cooper & Cartwright, 1994; Jamal, 1984; Motowidlo, Packard, &
54
55 Manning, 1986; Westman & Eden, 1996), including several meta-analyses and reviews (Fried,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Shirom, Gilboa, & Cooper, 2008; Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper, 2008; Kahn & Byosiere,
4
5 1992).² Stress can undermine the quality and quantity of performance by distracting attention
6
7 away from work (Cohen, 1980; Jex, 1998) and generating feelings of depression (Motowidlo et
8
9 al., 1986), making effort more onerous.

10
11
12 Thus, we propose that family motivation will enhance performance by decreasing stress
13
14 levels. Paralleling the aforementioned hypotheses related to energy, this stress-reducing effect
15
16 will be more important and pronounced when intrinsic motivation is low, as intrinsically
17
18 motivated employees experience less stress in the first place, regardless of family motivation.
19
20

21
22 *Hypothesis 4a. Intrinsic motivation moderates the relationship between family motivation*
23 *and stress, such that family motivation is more negatively associated with stress when*
24 *intrinsic motivation is low rather than high.*

25
26
27 *Hypothesis 4b. Stress is negatively related to job performance.*

28
29
30 *Hypothesis 4c. The indirect effect of family motivation on job performance through stress*
31 *is moderated by intrinsic motivation.*

32
33 In summary, we propose that family motivation compensates when intrinsic motivation is
34
35 low, providing an alternative route to the energy needed to get work done and buffering the
36
37 stress that interferes with performance.
38
39

40 METHOD

41 Participants and Procedures

42
43
44 The study was conducted in a Mexican company that specializes in processing coupons.
45
46

47
48 ² We recognize that other researchers have found a curvilinear relationship between stress and job performance,
49 stemming back to the Yerkes-Dodson law (Yerkes & Dodson, 1908). This and subsequent models about activation
50 (Scott, 1966) suggest that moderate amounts of stress yield optimal job performance by “activating” employees,
51 who can then divert these energies to work (whereas at higher levels of stress, energy is deployed to coping with the
52 stress, hindering performance). Although the U-shaped relationship has been found in the field (e.g., Anderson,
53 1976; Chen, Silverthorne, & Hung, 2006), in general, more empirical support has been found for a negative
54 relationship between stress and performance (e.g., Abramis, 1994; Fried et al., 2008; Gilboa et al., 2008; Kahn &
55 Byosiere, 1992; Jamal, 1984; Motowidlo et al., 1986; Westman & Eden, 1996). We also recognize that challenge
56 stressors have been shown to positively relate to job performance (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005), but we
57 believe that the challenges associated with low intrinsic motivation are more directly related to hindrance stressors.
58
59
60

1
2
3 The company is one of several thousand so-called *maquiladoras* that are located along the
4 Mexico-United States border. These companies operate under a tax-free agreement with the
5 United States and provide cheap labor for jobs involving assembly, processing or manufacturing.
6
7
8
9
10 In this company, employees spend their working day scanning discount coupons that are shipped
11 to Mexico from U.S. retailers for accounting purposes. The scanning is a standardized manual
12 process that involves taking each coupon out of its shipping container, scanning the barcode, and
13 checking that the system counted and categorized the coupon correctly.
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 Depending on the individual circumstances of employees at home, some are doing this
21 job primarily to support their family, whereas others do the job for other reasons. Therefore,
22 there are likely to be differences in employees' family motivation levels. Furthermore, even
23 though the work does not provide skill variety or autonomy, we expect that some employees
24 perceive their jobs as intrinsically motivating because the work gives them a limited opportunity
25 for growth and skill development. This can confer a sense of competence, which is one of the
26 fundamental drivers of intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Thus, employees who find it
27 gratifying to gain speed and accuracy in scanning coupons are likely to be intrinsically motivated
28 even in this monotonous work environment.³
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 The company runs four working shifts, and for this study we invited the 151 employees
42 from one shift to participate. We collected the data at multiple measurement points and from
43
44
45
46

47
48 ³ Differences in extrinsic motivation are likely limited, because the actual payments that employees receive depend
49 on the number of hours that they work, not on the number of coupons that they scan. Nonetheless, there are a few
50 incentives for high job performance that may serve to raise some employees' extrinsic motivation. Specifically,
51 every three months, employees' performance is evaluated by the company. The 15% best employees are then
52 considered for a change in their assignment and a promotion to a higher salary level. Such promotions depend on the
53 availability of positions at a higher salary levels, and in practice do not seem to occur frequently: only 6 out of 23
54 supervisor positions were filled with employees that previously scanned coupons. Beyond pay, there are some
55 benefits of working for the company (as opposed to being unemployed) that are guaranteed by law. These benefits
56 include medical services for employees and their dependants, access to child care, and the possibility to apply for a
57 mortgage to buy a house.
58
59
60

1
2
3 several sources. First, we ran a survey to measure employees' motivations. Then, a two-week
4 period followed during which employees were asked each morning of the ten working days to
5 fill out a diary prior to starting their jobs. In addition, we collected from the performance
6 monitoring system of the company an objective job performance score for each employee for
7 every day during the two-week period.
8
9

10
11 Of the 151 invited employees, 97 provided complete data for the survey and at least three
12 diary entries, and were thus included in our analyses (response rate: 64.2%). On average,
13 participants provided 9 diary entries ($SD = 2$ days).⁴ All employees of the company, except for
14 some managers, are women, and so the participants of the study were exclusively women.⁵ Their
15 mean age was 31 years ($SD = 8.98$) and they had worked for the company on average for 6.43
16 years ($SD = 6.15$).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Measures**

30
31 The items were translated from English to Spanish, following the common back-
32 translation procedure to check for semantic equivalence with the original items (Brislin, 1986;
33 Schaffer & Riordan, 2003).
34
35
36
37

38
39 ***Family and intrinsic motivations.*** Motivation can be viewed hierarchically at three levels
40 (Vallerand, 1997, 2001): global (dispositional, trait-like reasons for action that employees carry
41 across time and situations), contextual (reasons for action that employees bring to a particular
42 role or life domain), and situational (reasons for action that employees experience at a specific
43 moment in time). As we were interested in how family and intrinsic motivations affect overall
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 ⁴ We ran our model at different cutoffs. The results did not change in direction or significance when we included
53 data from employees with one or more diary entries ($N = 98$). The results also did not change in direction when we
54 raised the cutoff to include data only from employees with at least four ($N = 95$) diary entries, but some probabilities
55 dropped to marginal significance, likely because of the reduced sample size and the attendant loss of statistical
56 power.

57 ⁵ This gender composition of the workforce is representative for most maquiladoras (Sklair, 2011).
58
59
60

1
2
3 job performance, we focused on motivation at the contextual level—why employees expend
4 effort at work. Whereas daily measures would be appropriate for the situational level, a survey is
5 better suited to the contextual level (Vallerand, 1997). Thus we assessed both family and
6 intrinsic motivations in a survey by adapting existing measures (Grant, 2008a; Ryan & Connell,
7 1989). The items used a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 =
8 *strongly agree*. An introductory question asked, “Why are you motivated to do your work?,” and
9 items were preceded by “I do this job because.”

10
11 For the family motivation measure, although the family typically refers to a domestic
12 group of people, it technically involves whomever employees consider to be their kin (Burnstein
13 et al., 1994). In our sample, employees were working to support a variety of different
14 beneficiaries, including spouses, children, parents, and extended family members. Thus, we treat
15 the family as a perceptual entity, based on each individual’s unique circumstances, as in much of
16 the work-family literature. The family motivation items were “I care about supporting my
17 family,” “I want to help my family,” “I want to have a positive impact on my family,” “it is
18 important for me to do good for my family,” and “my family benefits from my job” ($\alpha = .86$).
19 For intrinsic motivation, the items were “I enjoy the work itself,” “I find the work engaging,”
20 and “I find the work interesting” ($\alpha = .90$).
21
22

23
24 ***Energy and stress.*** Energy and stress are naturally fluctuating variables that vary on a
25 day-to-day basis. Thus we assessed energy and stress with a diary, using items from existing
26 measures (Cohen, Kessler, & Gordon, 1995; Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector & Kelloway, 2000).
27 Participants answered the items each morning during the two-week period before starting their
28 work on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 7 = *very much*. The items were
29 preceded by “This morning I feel.” We used four items for energy: “energetic,” “mentally
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 refreshed,” “enthusiastic,” and “satisfied” ($\alpha = .85$); and three items for stress: “stressed,”
4
5
6 “exhausted,” and “strained” ($\alpha = .81$).
7

8 **Job performance.** Each employee’s performance was measured objectively through the
9
10 company’s automated performance monitoring system. The system records for each employee
11
12 the number of coupons processed per day. This value is then divided by the target number of
13
14 coupons expected for each employee. The expected value differs depending on the experience
15
16 level of the employee and the relative difficulty of processing certain types of coupons. The final
17
18 job performance score indicates the extent to which the employee has met, failed to meet or
19
20 exceeded the target score. For ease of interpretation, we multiplied the job performance score by
21
22 100. For example, if an employee has a target of 800 coupons and processes 800 coupons, then
23
24 she receives a job performance score of 100. If the employee fails to meet the target and
25
26 processes 720 coupons only, her score drops to 90, but if she exceeds the target and processes
27
28 880 coupons, her score increases to 110. The job performance scores are automatically generated
29
30 at the end of each day, and we gauged them from the system during the two-week period to
31
32 measure participant’s daily job performance ($\alpha = .84$).
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Control variables.** To avoid spurious relationships, we included external motivation as a
39
40 control variable, using items adapted from Ryan and Connell (1989) to measure motivation
41
42 regulated by rewards and punishments. This allowed us to examine the possibility that working
43
44 because of need would influence both family motivation and performance. The items were listed
45
46 in the survey with the other motivation items described above and assessed on a 7-point Likert-
47
48 type scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. After the introductory
49
50 question, “Why are you motivated to do your work?” and the statement, “I do this job because,”
51
52 the items included “it allows me to buy things I need,” “I will get in trouble if I don’t have a job,”
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and “I can earn money to buy things for myself” ($\alpha = .61$).
4
5

6 **Analyses**

7
8 The proposed model consists of a 2-1-1 multilevel moderated mediation model with
9
10 multiple mediators. The dependent variable (job performance) and the mediator variables
11
12 (energy, stress) were nested within participants, thus we used multilevel analysis to test
13
14 Hypotheses 1 and 2, and multilevel structural equation modelling (*MSEM*, Preacher, Zang, &
15
16 Zyphur, 2011; Preacher, Zyphur, & Zang, 2010) with manifest variables and maximum
17
18 likelihood estimation with robust standard errors (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012) to test
19
20 Hypotheses 3 and 4. As part of these analyses, the variances in the daily measures (energy,
21
22 stress, and job performance) are partitioned into two components: a stable component that
23
24 captures individual differences *between* employees, and a variable component that captures
25
26 fluctuations *within* employees across time. We were interested in whether the stable components
27
28 of energy, stress, and job performance will be affected by family motivation and intrinsic
29
30 motivation as hypothesized. The stable components of the variances in all daily measures were
31
32 sufficiently large (energy: 60%, stress: 70%, job performance: 36%) to examine differences in
33
34 energy, stress, and job performance between employees. Thus in the analyses, we used
35
36 employees’ motivations to predict the stable components in energy, stress, and job performance
37
38 between different employees, while controlling for the variable components in energy, stress,
39
40 and job performance within employees.⁶ Prior to the analysis, the independent, moderator, and
41
42 control variables (i.e., family, intrinsic, and external motivation) were centered to avoid
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 ⁶ This approach to measuring and analyzing constructs with different degrees of daily fluctuations is superior to
52 approaches that involve the disaggregation of relatively stable constructs or the aggregation of relatively variable
53 constructs, because this approach does not involve information loss or reduced statistical power (Cohen, Cohen,
54 West & Aiken, 2003; Hox, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Another advantage of this approach is that it avoids
55 common method bias, which can result from assessing constructs at a single point in time and can inflate
56 relationships between the predictor and the outcome variables. In robustness checks, we found that the pattern of
57 results remains the same when we use aggregated, rather than daily, data.
58
59
60

1
2
3 multicollinearity (Cohen et al., 2003). We used Mplus 7.0 for all analyses (Muthén & Muthén,
4
5
6 1998-2012).

7 8 RESULTS

9
10 To examine whether family motivation, intrinsic motivation, and external motivation
11
12 were distinct constructs, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis. The fit-indices were good:
13
14 $\chi^2(41) = 57.28$, $RMSEA = .06$, $CFI = .97$, $SRMR = .05$. Following methodological
15
16 recommendations (Farrell, 2010; Fornell & Larcker, 1981), we computed the average variances
17
18 extracted (AVE) for each motivation factor from the respective item indicators, as well as the
19
20 shared variance (SV; i.e., the squared correlation) across the motivation factors. An AVE value
21
22 greater than .50 provides evidence of convergent validity. The AVE values were .62 for family
23
24 motivation, .75 for intrinsic motivation, and .55 for external motivation. AVE values that are
25
26 greater than SV values between two constructs provide evidence of discriminant validity. The
27
28 SV values were .08 for family and intrinsic motivation, .12 for family and external motivation,
29
30 and .21 for external and intrinsic motivation. Thus family motivation, intrinsic motivation, and
31
32 external motivation are distinct constructs with sufficient convergent and discriminant validity.
33
34
35
36
37

38 To assess the distinctiveness of the remaining constructs, we ran multilevel confirmatory
39
40 factor analyses. In the first model, items of each construct loaded onto their respective factor.
41
42 The fit-indices were good: $\chi^2(138) = 185.30$, $RMSEA = .02$, $CFI = .98$, $SRMR$ -within = .04, and
43
44 $SRMR$ -between = .06. In the second model, items for family, intrinsic, and external motivation
45
46 loaded together on one factor and items for daily stress and daily energy loaded together on
47
48 another factor. The fit-indices were worse in this second model: $\chi^2(148) = 811.58$, $RMSEA = .08$,
49
50 $CFI = .68$, $SRMR$ -within = .07, and $SRMR$ -between = .19. Furthermore, the first model exhibited
51
52 a significantly better fit than the second model: $\Delta \chi^2 = 626.28$, $\Delta df = 10$, $p < .001$.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, correlations, and internal consistency
4 reliability estimates for all variables. Job performance correlated significantly with family
5
6 motivation ($r = .13, p < .01$).
7
8
9

10
11 -----
12 Insert Table 1 about here
13 -----
14

15 The results of the hypothesis tests are shown in Tables 2 and 3. We report both
16 unstandardized and standardized estimates (γ), as well as standard errors (SE). All estimates are
17 at the between level, concerning the stable components of energy, stress, or job performance.
18 Estimates at the within level are not reported, because these estimates are irrelevant to our
19 research question and our theory is not concerned with within-person fluctuations of energy,
20 stress, and job performance. Models 1a, 3a, and 4a present the estimates for the average effects,
21 and Models 1b, 2, 3b and 4b present the estimates for the interaction effects. All models were
22 fully saturated for perfect model fit with $\chi^2(0) = 0$ (Preacher et al., 2010).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Hypothesis 1 suggested that family motivation is positively associated with job
35 performance. As indicated in Model 1a of Table 2, the results support this hypothesis. Even
36 when we control for intrinsic and external motivation, we find a significant positive association
37 between family motivation and job performance (estimate = 2.58, $SE = 1.09, \gamma = .24, p < .05$).
38
39
40
41
42

43 Hypothesis 2 stated that intrinsic motivation moderates the relationship between family
44 motivation and job performance, such that family motivation is more positively associated with
45 performance when intrinsic motivation is low rather than high. Model 1b of Table 2 shows that
46 the effect of family motivation on job performance was, indeed, dependent on intrinsic
47 motivation: the interaction term for family motivation and intrinsic motivation was significant
48 and negative (estimate = -2.00, $SE = .56, \gamma = -.32, p < .01$), even when external motivation and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the interaction term of external motivation and intrinsic motivation were entered as control
4
5 variables. In Figure 2 we plotted the values of the moderator at one standard deviation above and
6
7 below the mean. When intrinsic motivation was low, family motivation was positively related to
8
9 job performance ($b = 4.47, p < .01$); but, when intrinsic motivation was high, family motivation
10
11 was unrelated to job performance ($b = -.39, ns$). Thus there was support for Hypothesis 2: the
12
13 relationship between family motivation and job performance depends on intrinsic motivation,
14
15 such that family motivation compensates for low levels of intrinsic motivation,
16
17
18

19
20 -----
21 Insert Tables 2 and 3, and Figure 2, about here
22 -----
23

24 **Energy**

25
26 Hypothesis 3a suggested that the relationship between family motivation and energy
27
28 depends on intrinsic motivation, such that family motivation is more positively associated with
29
30 energy when intrinsic motivation is low rather than high. Model 3b of Table 3 indicates that the
31
32 interaction effect of family motivation and intrinsic motivation on energy was significant and
33
34 negative (estimate = $-.11, SE = .05, \gamma = -.18, p < .05$), even when external motivation and the
35
36 interaction term of external motivation-intrinsic motivation were entered as control variables.
37
38 The corresponding plot is shown in Figure 3. When intrinsic motivation was low, family
39
40 motivation was positively related to energy ($b = .19, p < .05$); when intrinsic motivation was
41
42 high, however, family motivation was unrelated to energy ($b = -.09, ns$). Thus there was support
43
44 for Hypothesis 3a: family motivation spurs energy for those with low intrinsic motivation, but
45
46 not for those with high intrinsic motivation.
47
48
49
50
51

52 -----
53 Insert Figure 3 about here
54 -----
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hypothesis 3b put forth a positive relationship between energy and job performance. The
4 results supported this hypothesis. As evident in Model 2 of Table 2, energy was positively
5 associated with job performance (estimate = 2.69, $SE = 1.14$, $\gamma = .28$, $p < .05$).
6
7

8
9
10 Hypothesis 3c suggested an indirect effect of family motivation on job performance
11 through energy, that is contingent upon intrinsic motivation. To test this hypothesis, we first
12 computed the conditional values of the moderator (i.e., intrinsic motivation) one standard
13 deviation above and below the mean, and then inserted these into the equation of the multilevel
14 mediation model to estimate simple effects of the independent variable (i.e., family motivation)
15 at these conditional values (Bauer, Preacher, & Gil, 2006; Cohen et al., 2003). We used the
16 resulting values to compute the indirect effects of the family motivation-intrinsic motivation
17 interaction at the two different levels of the moderator. We also computed the corresponding
18 confidence intervals for the indirect effects. Since it is not possible to use bootstrapping in
19 multilevel analyses (Preacher et al., 2010), we used a Monte-Carlo simulation with 20,000
20 replications to estimate the confidence intervals of the conditional indirect effects (Selig &
21 Preacher, 2008). This procedure has been demonstrated to produce accurate confidence intervals
22 (Bauer et al., 2006). The results show that the conditional indirect effect of family motivation on
23 performance mediated by energy was significant when intrinsic motivation was low (.51, 95% *CI*
24 [.01;1.28], standardized estimate = .05), but not when intrinsic motivation was high (-.24, 95%
25 *CI* [-1.01; .37], standardized estimate = -.02). These results support Hypothesis 3c, showing that
26 energy partially mediated the moderating effect of intrinsic motivation on the relationship
27 between family motivation and job performance.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Stress

53
54
55 Hypothesis 4a stated that the relationship between family motivation and stress is
56
57
58
59
60

contingent upon intrinsic motivation such that family motivation is more negatively associated with stress when intrinsic motivation is low rather than high. As indicated in Model 4b of Table 3, we found a significant and positive interaction effect for family motivation and intrinsic motivation interaction on stress (estimate = .22, $SE = .07$, $\gamma = .33$, $p < .01$). The form of the interaction is depicted in Figure 4. In contrast to the expected effect, stress increased with increasing family motivation only when intrinsic motivation was high ($b = .40$, $p < .01$), but not when intrinsic motivation was low ($b = -.13$, *ns.*). Thus Hypothesis 4a was not supported. As Model 2 of Table 2 shows, stress was also not a significant predictor of job performance, which fails to support Hypothesis 4b⁷, and rules out Hypothesis 4c.⁸

Insert Figure 4 about here

DISCUSSION

This research suggests that the desire to benefit one's family through work is an important source of motivation that facilitates job performance, especially in the absence of intrinsic motivation. We theorized that when monotonous work is transformed into a vehicle for expressing important values, such as caring for the family, it can take on a new level of meaning

⁷ In post-hoc analyses, we tested for a curvilinear relationship between stress and performance. We found a significant inverted U-shaped relationship between stress and performance for employees at the level of the daily data (i.e., within employees across time), but not between employees. We found no support for a curvilinear mediated moderation. The within-employee effect of stress on performance provides support for models in line with the Yerkes-Dodson law (Yerkes & Dodson, 1908), but is of limited interest for this research because our theory is about the effects of family motivation, and family motivation differs between and not within employees. The curvilinear relationship between stress and performance does not affect the results reported above.

⁸ In further robustness analyses, we entered additional control variables. Including segmentation of work and family life (Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005), the personality traits conscientiousness, extraversion and neuroticism (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998), or task significance (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006) as control variables in the analyses does not change the results. Including employees' number of children and relationship status (with vs. without partner) as control variables does not change the pattern of results, but significance sometimes drops from $p < .05$ to $p < .10$, likely due to a lower response rates on those questions and attendant loss of statistical power. Overall, these findings demonstrate the robustness of the role of family motivation. Finally, we tested possible effects of a three-way-interaction of intrinsic motivation x family motivation x external motivation on energy, stress, and performance. Results showed that this interaction had no effect on any of the outcome variables.

1
2
3 even though the inherent interest in the work remains unchanged. Survey, daily diary, and
4
5 objective performance measures suggest that family motivation compensates for uninteresting
6
7 work by enhancing energy, but not by reducing stress. These findings have important
8
9 implications for theory and research on motivation and work-family dynamics.
10
11

12 **Theoretical Contributions**

13
14
15 Our research identifies the desire to support the family as an important, and heretofore
16
17 neglected, source of meaning and work motivation. Although scholars have established that
18
19 families are a primary reason for working (Bernard, 1981; Brief et al., 1997; Brief & Nord, 1990;
20
21 Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), they have paid scant theoretical and empirical attention to the role of
22
23 this motivation in shaping job performance. The majority of existing studies on prosocial
24
25 motivation in the workplace have focused on the desire to help beneficiaries such as the
26
27 organization (Rioux & Penner, 2001), other members of one's workplace such as coworkers
28
29 (McNeely & Meglino, 1994), and—as originally designated by Blau and Scott (1962)—the end
30
31 users of the organization's products and services, such as clients, patients, citizens, or students
32
33 (Bellé, 2012; Grant, 2008a; Hu & Liden, 2015). We present family motivation as a special case
34
35 of prosocial motivation due to the higher level of identification employees have with their
36
37 beneficiaries as compared to more distal contacts in other research, and provide fresh evidence
38
39 about how the motivation to help the family through work relates to objective performance.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Our research thus adds to a growing conversation about the meaning of work. Even
47
48 though family motivation is unlikely to make tedious work itself more interesting, it gives
49
50 meaning to work such that employees see work as a way of supporting and sustaining those who
51
52 are most important to them (Rosso et al., 2010). When people ask themselves why they do a job
53
54 that does not provide intrinsic motivation, those high on family motivation are likely to answer,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they do the job to provide for their family. As Weiss (1985: 50) observed in an interview study
4 of occupationally successful men, for most “having a family made work meaningful.” Family
5 motivation enables employees to attach a sense of volition and meaning to their otherwise
6 mundane jobs; in the terms of action identification theory, executing simple tasks is viewed as
7 caring for the family. As Wrzesniewski, Schwartz, Cong, Kane, Omar, & Kolditz (2014: 10990)
8 put it, “the desired outcome is intimately, intrinsically connected to the activity itself.”
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Moreover, our research contributes to an expanding body of knowledge about prosocial motivation. As shown previously, the absence of both intrinsic and other-oriented motivation proves detrimental to job performance. Our research extends this literature by introducing a new form of interaction with intrinsic motivation. Five previous studies have identified a synergistic interaction between prosocial and intrinsic motivations, indicating that the quality and quantity of performance is highest when both motivations are strong (Grant, 2008a; Grant & Berry, 2011). In contrast, we found a compensatory interaction, suggesting that when intrinsic motivation is lacking, employees with high family motivation perform just as effectively as their intrinsically motivated peers. Our research hence suggests that when the beneficiary in question is one’s own family—rather than strangers or student scholarship recipients—prosocial motivation may be sufficient to drive performance. In doing so, we challenge Grant’s (2008a: 54) speculation that “In the absence of intrinsic motivation... prosocial motivation may not be sufficient to enhance persistence, performance, and productivity.” Our study thus contributes to a larger body of work anchored in self-determination theory indicating that in some contexts, values-based motivation may be an alternative route to the same ends as intrinsic motivation (e.g., Green-Demers, Pelletier & Menard, 1997; Losier & Koestner, 1999).

This compensatory effect introduces a fresh lens on the drivers of job performance when

1
2
3 intrinsic motivation is lacking. Traditionally, researchers have attempted to substitute for
4
5 intrinsic motivation with extrinsic rewards, particularly monetary incentives (Calder & Staw,
6
7 1975), which has not consistently been shown to compensate for low intrinsic motivation (Grant
8
9 & Berry, 2011; Grant, Nurmohamed, Ashford, & Dekas, 2011; Vansteenkiste, Sierens, Soenens,
10
11 Luyckx, & Lens, 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 2014). Although they often boost performance
12
13 (Gerhart, Rynes, & Fulmer, 2009), such incentives can have the side effects of overjustifying
14
15 tasks (Sandelands, Ashford, & Dutton, 1983) and crowding out other reasons to work (Deci,
16
17 Koestner, & Ryan, 1999), and thus reducing performance (Bareket-Bojmel, Hochman & Ariely,
18
19 in press; Weibel, Rost, & Osterloh, 2010). In contrast, family motivation, which we empirically
20
21 show matters over and above external motivation, is unlikely to carry these risks, as it is a core
22
23 principle that employees are likely to internalize into their value systems. Therefore, strategies to
24
25 boost family motivation may increase worker performance without detrimental side effects.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Our research also contributes to the work-family literature, demonstrating a novel way in
33
34 which the family can enhance functioning at work. Extant work describes the family either as a
35
36 source of potential conflict with work that can pull employees away from work, or as a source of
37
38 enrichment that can improve employees' work life. We address this tension around work-family
39
40 conflict versus enrichment by presenting family motivation as a neglected way that the family
41
42 can enrich work. The relationship between work and family has traditionally been studied in
43
44 terms of segmentation (e.g., trying to keep work and personal activities separate), compensation
45
46 (e.g., spending more time at work when one is dissatisfied with family life), and spillover (e.g.,
47
48 emotions, attitudes, skills, and behaviors that travel from one domain to the other; Edwards &
49
50 Rothbard, 1999; Lambert, 1990). While our findings very much relate to spillover by
51
52 demonstrating how attitudes about one's family influence work behaviors, researchers have not
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 specifically investigated the family as a source of energy and its objective performance
4
5 consequences. Also, research tends to emphasize how work experiences influence family life,
6
7 whereas we answer calls to examine the other direction of family influencing work behaviors
8
9 (Rothbard & Wilk, 2011). Feelings related to home life that likely underlie family motivation,
10
11 such as concern for one's family, a sense of pride in one's family, and the desire to provide for
12
13 one's family, can have an energizing function at work, bolstering effort and performance.
14
15
16

17 **Limitations and Future Directions**

19
20 The nomological network of family motivation needs to be explored. In the present work,
21
22 we did not examine the antecedents of family motivation. In addition to values, we expect that
23
24 family motivation is underpinned by dispositional factors such as communal orientation, and it
25
26 would be interesting to explore its relationship with employees' work orientation. Because our
27
28 study took place in one organization, we also could not observe structural antecedents of family
29
30 motivation, including family benefits offered by employers like college support, adoption
31
32 support, childcare, eldercare, employee assistance programs, and mentoring opportunities for
33
34 employees' children. We suspect that these offerings may help employees to mentally link their
35
36 work to their families, strengthening family motivation. Relatedly, we encourage scholars to
37
38 examine antecedents of family motivation related to organizational culture, such as the extent to
39
40 which an organization is imbued with family values (e.g., Pratt, 2000) or responds to employee
41
42 tragedies with compassion (Dutton, Worline, Frost, & Lilius, 2006).
43
44
45
46
47

48 In terms of the consequences of family motivation, we encourage future researchers to
49
50 examine factors beyond job performance, such as organizational commitment and turnover
51
52 intentions. In most cases, we expect that family motivation would increase the cost of switching
53
54 one's job, and thus, according to research on job embeddedness (Lee, Mitchell, Sablinski,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Burton, & Holtom, 2004) we would expect lower turnover among employees working for their
4 families. We also predict lower counterproductive work behaviors among employees with high
5 family motivation, not only because of job security concerns (Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989), but
6 also because employees may want to serve as a role model for their children.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 Future research should also explore the downsides of strong family motivation. To the
14 extent that family motivation increases concerns about job security, it may reduce instances of
15 voice. Interestingly, prosocial motivation typically predicts greater voice (Grant & Mayer, 2009),
16 as employees who care about the organization are more likely to feel that the collective benefits
17 of speaking up outweigh the personal costs. This may be an important outcome on which family
18 motivation and prosocial motivation differ. Family motivation may also limit organizational
19 citizenship behaviors to those that are particularly instrumental for obtaining rewards or
20 increasing job security. At extreme levels, family motivation could even cause unethical
21 behavior if employees will stop at no end to support their families. For example, in a series of
22 experiments, participants cheated more if the “spoils” were split with another (versus kept for the
23 self), revealing how some use important ends to justify immoral means (Wiltermuth, 2011).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Countering our predictions, we did not find that family motivation lowered stress levels
40 when intrinsic motivation was lacking; instead family motivation actually amplified stress levels
41 for employees with high levels of intrinsic motivation. We assumed that family motivation is
42 generally integrated into employees’ value systems, which would reduce stress according to self-
43 determination theory (Gagne & Deci, 2005). But the leap from caring about helping one’s family
44 to knowing that the family depends on the job may mean that prosocial motivation could add
45 some pressure to the pleasure that intrinsic motivation imbues (Gebauer, Riketta, Broemer, &
46 Maio, 2008). Hence, our hypotheses should be tested against the alternative notion that family
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 motivation could simultaneously be a source of energy *and* stress. Even when family motivation
4 is identified or integrated, employees may feel an inherent sense of pressure because the impact
5 of their work extends beyond the organization's walls to those who matter most in their lives.
6
7 This is consistent with the notion of meaning-manageability tradeoffs, whereby the roles that
8 give us the most meaning are often the most stressful—not in spite of their significance, but
9 because of it (McGregor & Little, 1998). And this raises an important question for self-
10 determination theorists to explore: can motivation be simultaneously identified or integrated
11 (“Supporting my family is a guiding principle in my life, and I see myself as a breadwinner and
12 good provider”) and introjected (“My self-esteem depends on supporting my family, and I will
13 feel guilty if I don't serve them well”)?
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The positive relationship between family motivation and work stress may further be due
28 to the unique nature of our sample, as most maquiladora workers live below the poverty line.
29 When family motivation is largely driven by financial need, the pressure to perform well in order
30 to provide for the family may be stressful. When family motivation is decoupled from monetary
31 concerns, it may instead buffer against feelings of stress, especially when intrinsic motivation is
32 low. Due to the potential interplay between financial pressure and family motivation, our study is
33 limited in that we did not measure the level of financial need experienced by each participant.
34 Although our control variables included a measure of external regulation, which is the form of
35 regulation most driven by financial need according to self-determination theory, the precise
36 nature of these items captured participants' individual level of need more than their family's
37 financial need. This measure did not squarely measure extrinsic motivation or financial need, and
38 it is further limited by its low alpha (.61). Controlling for marital status and number of children,
39 which heavily influence financial pressure (Lino, 2014; Rector, 2012), did not change the pattern
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of results (see footnote 9). The sample had relatively little variance in employees' financial need,
4
5 and harder work was not a viable way to better meet financial needs (because employees were
6
7 paid hourly regardless of performance). And yet, we still found considerable variance in family
8
9 motivation, suggesting that although money may play an instrumental role, family motivation
10
11 likely operates above and beyond economic pressures. Nonetheless, we suggest future research
12
13 should include a more direct examination of how financial pressure and rewards relate to caring
14
15 for one's family, especially in regards to stress. In doing so, researchers will need to carefully
16
17 tease apart extrinsic motivation from family motivation, as existing extrinsic motivation scales
18
19 often reference financial need without examining whether the family is a beneficiary (Ryan &
20
21 Connell, 1989).
22
23
24
25
26

27 In a related sense, we recognize that family motivation may occur indirectly, reflecting
28
29 when employees work harder because they want to keep their jobs and earn money that will
30
31 allow them to sustain their family. That is, for some employees, income may be instrumental for
32
33 experiencing family motivation. Although family motivation may entail more external regulation
34
35 in such instances due to the salience of earnings, we still expect that it will lead to enhanced job
36
37 performance and also well-being, as research has shown that spending money on others promotes
38
39 happiness (Dunn, Aknin, & Norton, 2008). And if the employee's performance comes with any
40
41 incentives, then family motivation should specifically increase the valence of earning income,
42
43 increasing motivation (Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996; Vroom, 1964). The extrinsic factor of money
44
45 is a key factor in a scenario involving financial pressure from home, but the resulting motivation
46
47 is not inherently extrinsic (Amabile, 1993), which is supported by the notion that money takes on
48
49 different meanings to different employees (Mitchell & Mickel, 1999).
50
51
52
53
54

55 Further research is also necessary to explore the conditions under which the form of the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interaction between family and intrinsic motivations might change. In our data, the mean for
4 family motivation was quite high, with one standard deviation above the mean reaching the
5 ceiling of the scale. In samples of employees with fewer family responsibilities and more
6 enriched tasks, intrinsic motivation may be more powerful. We also encourage scholars to take a
7 more dynamic perspective on intrinsic and family motivations. We examined motivation at the
8 contextual level to capture the reasons for action that individuals bring to the domain of work
9 (Vallerand, 1997, 2001); it would also be interesting to examine how family motivation is
10 affected by task or day-level fluctuations in intrinsic motivation, and subsequently how
11 performance changes as a result. Indeed, since tasks often change on a daily basis, intrinsic
12 motivation is likely to fluctuate more frequently than family motivation.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The generalizability of our findings may be limited by the fact that the sample was
28 completely comprised of women. Given sex and gender differences around work-family issues
29 (Hochschild, 1989; Senécal, Vallerand, & Guay, 2001), family motivation may interact with
30 intrinsic motivation differently for men versus women. For example, despite the increase of
31 women in the workforce, the breadwinner role is still attached to men (George & Brief, 1990),
32 who are implicitly expected to work hard to be a good provider for their families (Bernard, 1981;
33 Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2001). As such, family motivation for men may center more heavily
34 around earning income than for women. Additionally, enrichment from family to work has been
35 found for women more so than for men, who tend to experience fewer family-to-work spillovers
36 (Rothbard, 2001). Cultural factors may also limit the generalizability of our results. For example,
37 the meaning of family and sense of responsibility for family are likely to be influenced by
38 employees' cultural backgrounds, even though caring for the family is a universal value
39 (Schwartz et al., 2012).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Family motivation may manifest itself differently depending on the family structure of
4 the focal employee, and a fruitful avenue for future research is to consider how the unique types
5 of relationships employees hold with their family members and different mental models of the
6 family influence family motivation, including the relative extent to which employees identify
7 with their beneficiaries. Because parenthood influences work experiences (Eby, Casper,
8 Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005), family motivation may be a more potent energizing
9 source when the beneficiary is a child versus a less-dependent family member (such as a sibling).
10 Contingent upon the employee's life stage, the motivating forces stemming from the family may
11 differ (Erikson, 1950). For example, in early adulthood, employees may feel motivated to please
12 their parents by living up to the parents' expectations. When employees become parents
13 themselves, their motivation is likely to derive from the need to provide for the family and to
14 foster their children's development (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992; Peterson & Stewart, 1996).
15 Beyond financial motivators, at this stage, family motivation may be underpinned by a desire to
16 maintain employment and prevent moving the entire family elsewhere. In later life stages,
17 employees may be motivated by the generative concern of leaving for their family (Wade-
18 Benzoni, Sondak, & Galinsky, 2009; Zacher, Rosing, & Frese, 2011). Hence, family motivation
19 may be underpinned by a variety of factors, monetary and beyond, and further exploration of
20 how different family structures and life stages relate to our hypotheses would enhance our
21 understanding of family motivation.

22 **Practical Implications and Conclusion**

23 Many jobs stifle intrinsic motivation and lack opportunities for employees to work on
24 products and services that make a meaningful difference in the lives of coworkers and customers
25 (Grant, 2007; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Leana et al., 2012). Especially in impoverished areas,
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 employees face rough working conditions (Davis, 2010). We have explored here a form of
4
5 motivation that does not change employees' enjoyment of their work per se, but nonetheless
6
7 makes their work feel important. For employees, one benefit of family motivation is that it is
8
9 conducive to cognitive job crafting (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) without demanding a great
10
11 deal of effort or extensive resources. By reminding themselves of how their work contributes to
12
13 their family lives, employees can reframe it as more meaningful and motivating. Interestingly,
14
15 because family motivation is less dependent on the nature and context of one's work than other
16
17 forms of prosocial motivation, it may foster more consistency in effort across jobs within and
18
19 between organizations. For leaders, our findings suggest that they may be able to facilitate higher
20
21 levels of job performance by creating opportunities for employees to experience family
22
23 motivation, for example, by making the family more salient for employees while at work.
24
25 Moreover, our results encourage employers to make structural changes to job design and pay to
26
27 increase the benefits of the job to the family, which is likely to boost performance by enhancing
28
29 family motivation.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 At the same time, we found that family motivation does not interact with intrinsic
38
39 motivation in such a way that reduces stress, and thus we caution that family motivation can be
40
41 wrongly exploited. If employers create an environment in which employees' work is linked to
42
43 family outcomes, there is the possibility that burnout and additional stress will follow, which
44
45 could have negative ramifications for performance and turnover along with crippling effects on
46
47 well-being, potentially causing depression or withdrawal from loved ones (Cordes & Dougherty,
48
49 1993). Threats of sanctions at work or of job loss are likely to hurt employees more to the extent
50
51 that they fear the consequences for their families.
52
53

54
55 Given that maquiladora work is similar to many other settings around the globe involving
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 vulnerable populations working for low pay, we expect our findings to apply to many contexts.
4
5 Due to recent economic changes, numerous employees lack the resources they need; of the
6
7 working population with children in the United States, 25% do not earn enough to maintain a
8
9 reasonable standard of living (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014; Meuris & Leana, 2015). Despite
10
11 the prevalence of these individuals, scholars have noted that the working poor is an understudied
12
13 population (Meuris & Leana, 2015). Further, the negative cognitive, psychological, and
14
15 interpersonal consequences of financial scarcity are likely to be especially pronounced when
16
17 people have others at home depending on them (Leana & Meuris, 2015).
18
19
20
21

22 Our findings may also offer preliminary insights for other working populations across
23
24 income strata and job conditions. The motivation to serve the family through one's work is likely
25
26 to hold performance benefits in a variety of jobs, thus also companies offering more complex
27
28 jobs could profit from appealing to employees' family motivation. For example, family events
29
30 like company picnics and "bring your child to work day" allow employees to bring their home
31
32 lives into the workplace more clearly. Managers may also be able to help by understanding the
33
34 nature of their employees' family motivation and offering employees opportunities to meet their
35
36 families' needs. For example, those with high family motivation may especially benefit from
37
38 flextime by enabling them to better manage their work and family demands.
39
40
41
42

43 In conclusion, the poet Maya Angelou wrote, "I sustain myself with the love of family."
44
45 Our research suggests that the love of family plays a critical role in sustaining employees' energy
46
47 and effectiveness at work.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Abramis, D. J. 1994. Relationship of job stressors to job performance: Linear or an inverted-U?
7 *Psychological Reports*, 75: 547–558.
- 8
9 Alfredsson, L., Karasek, R., & Theorell, T. 1982. Myocardial infarction risk and psychosocial
10 work environment: An analysis of the male Swedish working force. *Social Science and*
11 *Medicine*, 16: 463–467.
- 12
13
14 Amabile, T. M. 1993. Motivational synergy: Toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and
15 extrinsic motivation in the workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3: 185–
16 201.
- 17
18
19 Anderson, C. R. 1976. Coping behaviors as intervening mechanisms in the inverted-U stress-
20 performance relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61: 30–34.
- 21
22 Aristotle. 350 BCE/1985. *The Nichomachean ethics*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing
23 Company.
- 24
25
26 Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. 1989. Content, cause, and consequences of job insecurity: A
27 theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32: 803–
28 829.
- 29
30
31 Balliet, D., & Joireman, J. 2010. Ego depletion reduces proselves' concern with the well-being of
32 others. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 13: 227–239.
- 33
34
35 Bauer, D. J., Preacher, K. J., & Gil, K. M. 2006. Conceptualizing and testing random indirect
36 effects and moderated mediation in multilevel models: New procedures and
37 recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 11: 142–163.
- 38
39 Bareket-Bojmel, L., Hochman, G., & Ariely, D. (in press). It's (not) all about the Jacksons:
40 Testing different types of short-term bonuses in the field. *Journal of Management*.
- 41
42
43 Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., Aaker, J. L., & Garbinsky, E. N. 2013. Some key differences
44 between a happy life and a meaningful life. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 8: 505–
45 516.
- 46
47
48 Belk, R. W., & Watson, J. C. 1998. Material culture and the extended or unextended self in our
49 university offices. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 15: 305–310.
- 50
51
52 Bellé, N. 2012. Experimental evidence on the relationship between public service motivation and
53 job performance. *Public Administration Review*, 73: 143–153.
- 54
55
56 Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. P. 1998. Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups:
57 Multitrait multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of*
58 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 75: 729–750.
- 59
60

- 1
2
3 Bernard, J. 1981. The good-provider role: Its rise and fall. *American Psychologist*, 36: 1–12.
4
5
6 Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. 1962. *Formal organizations*. San Francisco: Chandler.
7
8 Brehm, J. W., & Self, E. A. 1989. The intensity of motivation. *Annual Review of Psychology*,
9 40: 109–131.
10
11 Brief, A. P., Brett, J. F., Raskas, D., & Stein, E. 1997. Feeling economically dependent on one's
12 job: Its origins and functions with regard to worker well-being. *Journal of Applied*
13 *Social Psychology*, 27: 1303–1315.
14
15
16 Brief, A. P., & Nord, W. F. 1990. *Meanings of occupational work*. Lexington, MA: Lexington
17 Books.
18
19
20 Brislin, R. W. 1986. The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J.
21 W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research (Cross-cultural research and*
22 *methodology series, vol. 8)*: 137–164: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
23
24
25 Britton, A., & Shipley, M. J. 2010. Bored to death? *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 39:
26 370–371.
27
28
29 Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. 1996. A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to
30 job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 358–368.
31
32 Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014. *A profile of the working poor, 2012*. Washington, DC: US
33 Department of Labor.
34
35
36 Burnstein, E., Crandall, C., & Kitayama, S. 1994. Some neo-Darwinian decision rules for
37 altruism: Weighing cues for inclusive fitness as a function of the biological importance of
38 the decision. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67: 773–789.
39
40
41 Calder, B. J., & Staw, B. M. 1975. Self-perception of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Journal*
42 *of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31: 599–605.
43
44
45 Carlisle, M., Uchino, B. N., Sanbonmatsu, D. M., Smith, T. W., Cribbet, M. R., Birmingham,
46 W., Light, K. C., & Vaughn, A. A. 2011. Subliminal activation of social ties moderates
47 cardiovascular reactivity during acute stress. *Health Psychology*, 31: 217–225.
48
49
50 Chen, S., & Boucher, H. C. 2008. Relational selves as self-affirmational resources. *Journal of*
51 *Research in Personality*, 42: 716–733.
52
53
54 Chen, J. C., Silverthorne, C., & Hung, J. Y. 2006. Organization communication, job stress,
55 organizational commitment, and job performance of accounting professionals in Taiwan
56 and America. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27: 242–249.
57
58
59
60 Christiansen, S. L., & Palkovitz, R. 2001. Why the “good provider” role still matters: Providing

- 1
2
3 as a form of paternal involvement. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22: 84–106.
- 4
5
6 Cohen, S. 1980. After effects of stress on human performance and social behavior: A review of
7 research and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88: 82–108.
- 8
9
10 Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S., & Aiken, L. 2003. *Applied multiple regression/correlation*
11 *analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 12
13 Cohen, S., Kessler, R. C., & Gordon, L. U. 1995. Strategies for measuring stress in studies of
14 psychiatric and physical disorders. In S. Cohen, R. C. Kessler, & L. U. Gordon (Eds.),
15 *Measuring stress: A guide for health and social scientists*: 3–26. New York: Oxford
16 University Press.
- 17
18
19 Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S. 1994. Healthy mind; healthy organization—A proactive
20 approach to occupational stress. *Human Relations*, 47: 455–471.
- 21
22
23 Cordes, C. L., & Dougherty, T. W. 1993. A review and an integration of research on job burnout.
24 *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 621–656.
- 25
26
27 Davis, G. F. 2010. Job design meets organizational sociology. *Journal of Organizational*
28 *Behavior*, 31: 302–308.
- 29
30
31
32 Davis, C. G., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Larson, J. 1998. Making sense of loss and benefiting from
33 the experience: Two construals of meaning. *Journal of Personality and Social*
34 *Psychology*, 75: 561–574.
- 35
36
37 Deal, J. J., Stawiski, S., Graves, L., Gentry, W. A., Weber, T. J., & Ruderman, M. 2013.
38 Motivation at work: Which matters more, generation or managerial level? *Consulting*
39 *Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 65: 1–16.
- 40
41
42 Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. 1999. A meta-analytic review of experiments
43 examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological*
44 *Bulletin*, 125: 627–668.
- 45
46
47 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. 2000. The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the
48 self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11: 227–268.
- 49
50
51 Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. 2007. Grit: Perseverance and
52 passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92: 1087-
53 1101.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Dunn, E. W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. 2008. Spending money on others promotes
happiness. *Science*, 319: 1687–1688.
- Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. 2006. Explaining compassion organizing.
Administrative Science Quarterly, 51: 59–96.

- 1
2
3
4
5 Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. 2005. Work and family
6 research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *Journal of*
7 *Vocational Behavior*, 66: 124–197.
8
- 9
10 Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. 1999. Work and family stress and well-being: An
11 examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational*
12 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77: 85–129.
13
- 14
15 Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. 2000. Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the
16 relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 2:
17 178–199.
18
- 19
20 Elangovan, A. R., Pinder, C. C., & McLean, M. 2010. Callings and organizational behavior.
21 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76: 428–440.
22
- 23
24 Elsbach, K. D. 2003. Relating physical environment to self-categorizations: Identity threat and
25 affirmation in a non-territorial office space. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48: 622–
26 654.
27
- 28
29 Erikson, E. H. 1950. *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.
30
- 31
32 Farrell, A. M. 2010. Insufficient discriminant validity: A comment on Bove, Pervan, Beatty, and
33 Shiu (2009). *Journal of Business Research*, 63: 324–327.
34
- 35
36 Ferrari, J., Luhrs, T., & Lyman, V. 2007. Eldercare volunteers and employees: Predicting
37 caregiver experiences from service motives and sense of community. *The Journal of*
38 *Primary Prevention*, 28: 467–479.
39
- 40
41 Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. 1981. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable
42 variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18: 39–50.
43
- 44
45 Frese, M., & Fay, D. 2001. Personal initiative (PI): An active performance concept for work in
46 the 21st century. In B. M. Staw & R. M. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in organizational*
47 *behavior*, vol. 23: 133–187. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
48
- 49
50 Fried, Y., Shirom, A., Gilboa, S., & Cooper, C. L. 2008. The mediating effects of job
51 satisfaction and propensity to leave on role stress-job performance relationships:
52 Combining meta-analysis and structural equation modeling. *International Journal of*
53 *Stress Management*, 15: 305–328.
54
- 55
56 Gabriel, S., Renaud, J. M., & Tippin, B. 2007. When I think of you, I feel more confident about
57 me: The relational self and self-confidence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*,
58 43: 772–779.
59
- 60
61 Gagne, M., & Deci, E. L. 2005. Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Organizational Behavior, 26: 331–362.

Gebauer, J. E., Riketta, M., Broemer, P., & Maio, G. R. 2008. Pleasure and pressure based prosocial motivation: Divergent relations to subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42: 399–420.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. 1990. The economic instrumentality of work: An examination of the moderating effects of financial requirements and sex on the pay-life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37: 357–368.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. 1996. Motivational agendas in the workplace: The effects of feelings on focus of attention and work motivation. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, vol. 18: 75–110. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Gerhart, B., Rynes, S. L., & Fulmer, I. S. 2009. Pay and performance: Individuals, groups, and executives. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3: 251–315.

Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. 2008. A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61: 227–271.

Goldberg, L. S., & Grandey, A. A. 2007. Display rules versus display autonomy: Emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and task performance in a call center simulation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12: 301–318.

Grant, A. M. 2007. Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 393–417.

Grant, A. M. 2008a. Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 48–58.

Grant, A. M. 2008b. The significance of task significance: Job performance effects, relational mechanisms, and boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 108–124.

Grant, A. M. 2012. Leading with meaning: Beneficiary contact, prosocial impact, and the performance effects of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 458–476.

Grant, A. M., & Berry, J. W. 2011. The necessity of others is the mother of invention: Intrinsic and prosocial motivations, perspective taking, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 73–96.

Grant, A. M., Campbell, E. M., Chen, G., Cottone, K., Lapedis, D., & Lee, K. 2007. Impact and the art of motivation maintenance: The effects of contact with beneficiaries on persistence behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103:

1
2
3 53–67.
4

- 5
6 Grant, A. M., & Mayer, D. M. 2009. Good soldiers and good actors: prosocial and impression
7 management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors.
8 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 900–912.
9
- 10 Grant, A. M., Nurmohamed, S., Ashford, S. J., & Dekas, K. 2011. The performance
11 implications of ambivalent initiative: The interplay of autonomous and controlled
12 motivations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116: 241–251.
13
- 14 Grant, A. M., & Sonnentag, S. 2010. Doing good buffers against feeling bad: Prosocial impact
15 compensates for negative task and self-evaluations. *Organizational Behavior and*
16 *Human Decision Processes*, 111: 13–22.
17
- 18 Green-Demers, I., Pelletier, L. G., & Ménard, S. 1997. The impact of behavioural difficulty on
19 the saliency of the association between self-determined motivation and environmental
20 behaviours. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 29: 157–166.
21
- 22 Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. 1985. Sources of conflict between work and family roles.
23 *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 76–88.
24
- 25 Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. 2006. When work and family are allies: A theory of work-
26 family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31: 72–92.
27
- 28 Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. 1976. Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory.
29 *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16: 250–279.
30
- 31 Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. 1980. *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
32
- 33 Harkins, S. G., & Petty, R. E. 1982. Effects of task difficulty and task uniqueness on social
34 loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43: 1214–1229.
35
- 36 Hochschild, A. R. 1989. *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New
37 York: Viking.
38
- 39 Houkes, I., Janssen, P. P., de Jonge, J., & Nijhuis, F. J. 2001. Specific relationships between
40 work characteristics and intrinsic work motivation, burnout and turnover intention: A
41 multi-sample analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10:
42 1–23.
43
- 44 Hox, J. J. 2010. *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. New York: Routledge.
45
- 46 Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. 2015. Making a difference in the teamwork: Linking team prosocial
47 motivation to team processes and effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58:
48 1102–1127.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Huang, X., & Van de Vliert, E. 2003. Where intrinsic job satisfaction fails to work: National
4 moderators of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24: 159–179.
5
6
7 Jamal, M. 1984. Job stress and job performance controversy: An empirical assessment.
8 *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 33: 1–21.
9
10 Jex, S. M. 1998. *Stress and job performance: Theory, research, and implications for*
11 *management practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
12
13
14 Kahn, R. L., & Byosiere, P. 1992. Stress in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough
15 (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (2nd ed.)*: 571–650. Palo
16 Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
17
18
19 Kahn, W. A. 1990. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at
20 work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 692–724.
21
22
23 Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. 1996. Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates
24 of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22: 280–
25 287.
26
27
28 Konrath, S., Fuhrel-Forbis, A., Lou, A., & Brown, S. 2012. Motives for volunteering are
29 associated with mortality risk in older adults. *Health Psychology*, 31: 87–96.
30
31
32 Korchmaros, J., & Kenny, D. A. 2001. Emotional closeness as a mediator of the effect of genetic
33 relatedness on altruism. *Psychological Science*, 12: 262–265.
34
35
36 Krapf, M., Ursprung, H. W., & Zimmermann, C. 2014. *Parenthood and productivity of highly*
37 *skilled labor: Evidence from the groves of Academe*. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis
38 Working Paper Series.
39
40
41 Kumashiro, M., & Sedikides, C. 2005. Taking on board liability-focused information: Close
42 positive relationships as a self-bolstering resource. *Psychological Science*, 16: 732–739.
43
44
45 Lambert, S. J. 1990. Processes linking work and family: A critical review and research agenda.
46 *Human Relations*, 43: 239–257.
47
48
49 Lapiere, L. M., Hammer, L. B., Truxillo, D. M., & Murphy, L. A. 2012. Family interference
50 with work and workplace cognitive failure: The mitigating role of recovery experiences.
51 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81: 227–235.
52
53
54 Leana, C. R., & Meuris, J. 2015. Living to work and working to live: Income as a driver of
55 organizational behavior. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 9: 55–95.
56
57
58 Leana, C. R., Mittal, V., & Stiehl, E. 2012. Organizational behavior and the working poor.
59 *Organization Science*, 23: 888–906.
60

- 1
2
3 Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Sablinski, C. J., Burton, J. P., & Holtom, B. C. 2004. The effects of
4 job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences,
5 and voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47: 711–722.
6
7
8 LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. 2005. A meta-analytic test of the challenge
9 stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships
10 among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 764–775.
11
12 Lino, M. 2014. *U.S. Department of Agriculture, Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion.*
13 *Expenditures on Children by Families, 2013, Miscellaneous Publication No. 1528-*
14 *2013.* < [http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/sites/default/files/expenditures_on_children_](http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/sites/default/files/expenditures_on_children_by_families/crc2013.pdf/)
15 [by_families/crc2013.pdf/](http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/sites/default/files/expenditures_on_children_by_families/crc2013.pdf/)>. viewed 23 March 2015
16
17
18
19 Losier, G. F., & Koestner, R. 1999. Intrinsic versus identified regulation in distinct political
20 campaigns: The consequences of following politics for pleasure versus personal
21 meaningfulness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25: 287–298.
22
23
24 McAdams, D. P., & de St. Aubin, E. 1992. A theory of generativity and its assessment through
25 self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography. *Journal of*
26 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 62: 1003–1015.
27
28
29 Meglino, B. M., & Korsgaard, M. A. 2004. Considering rational self-interest as a disposition:
30 organizational implications of other orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89:
31 946–959.
32
33
34 McGregor, I., & Little, B. R. 1998. Personal projects, happiness, and meaning: On doing well
35 and being yourself. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74: 494–512.
36
37
38 McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. 1994. The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in
39 prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of
40 prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79: 836–844.
41
42
43 Meuris, J., & Leana, C. R. 2015. The high cost of low wages: Economic scarcity effects in
44 organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 35: 143–158.
45
46
47 Mitchell, T. R., & Daniels, D. 2003. Motivation. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski
48 (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, vol. 12:
49 225–254. New York: Wiley.
50
51
52 Mitchell, T. R., & Mickel, A. E. 1999. The meaning of money: An individual-difference
53 perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 568–578.
54
55
56 Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. 2006. The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing
57 and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work.
58 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 1321–1339.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Morling, B., & Kitayama, S. 2008. Culture and motivation. In J. Y. Shah & W. L. Gardner
4 (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation science*: 417–433. New York: The Guilford Press.
5
6
7 Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. 1999. Taking charge: Extra-role efforts to initiate workplace
8 change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 403–419.
9
10 Motowidlo, S. J. 2003. Job performance. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.),
11 *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, vol. 12: 39–53.
12 New York: Wiley.
13
14
15 Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., & Manning, M. R. 1986. Occupational stress: Its causes and
16 consequences for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 618–629.
17
18
19 Murray, S. L., Bellavia, G., Feeney, B., Holmes, J. G., & Rose, P. 2001. The contingencies of
20 interpersonal acceptance: When romantic relationships function as a self-affirmational
21 resource. *Motivation and Emotion*, 25: 163–189.
22
23
24 Muthén, L. K. & Muthén, B. O. 1998-2012. *Mplus user's guide (7th edition)*. Los Angeles:
25 Muthén & Muthén.
26
27
28 Nix, G. A., Ryan, R. M., Manly, J. B., & Deci, E. L. 1999. Revitalization through self-regulation:
29 The effects of autonomous and controlled motivation on happiness and vitality. *Journal*
30 *of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35: 266–284.
31
32
33 Park, C. L., & Folkman, S. 1997. Meaning in the context of stress and coping. *Review of*
34 *General Psychology*, 2: 115–144.
35
36
37 Pearce, J. L., & Gregersen, H. B. 1991. Task interdependence and extrarole behavior: A test of
38 the mediating effects of felt responsibility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 838–844.
39
40
41 Pennebaker, J. W., & Seagal, J. 1999. Forming a story: The health benefits of narrative. *Journal*
42 *of Clinical Psychology*, 55: 1243–1254.
43
44
45 Peterson, B. E., & Stewart, A. J. 1996. Antecedents and contexts of generativity motivation at
46 midlife. *Psychology and Aging*, 11: 21–33.
47
48
49 Pew Research Center. 2010. *Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends Project:*
50 *The Decline of Marriage and Rise of New Families*, <[www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/11/pew-social-trends-2010-families.pdf)
51 [2010/11/pew-social-trends-2010-families.pdf](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/11/pew-social-trends-2010-families.pdf)>. viewed 01 July 2014
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. 2006. Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The
mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49: 327–
340.
Pratt, M. G. 2000. The good, the bad, and the ambivalent: Managing identification among
Amway distributors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 456–493.

- 1
2
3
4
5 Preacher, K. J., Zhang, Z., & Zyphur, M. J. 2011. Alternative methods for assessing mediation in
6 multilevel data: The advantages of multilevel SEM. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 18:
7 161–182.
8
- 9 Preacher, K. J., Zyphur, M. J., & Zhang, Z. 2010. A general multilevel SEM framework for
10 assessing multilevel mediation. *Psychological Methods*, 15: 209–233.
11
- 12 Quinn, R. W., Spreitzer, G. M., & Lam, C. F. 2012. Building a sustainable model of human
13 energy in organizations: Exploring the critical role of resources. *Academy of*
14 *Management Annals*, 6: 337–396.
15
- 16
17 Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. 2000. Daily well-being: The
18 role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology*
19 *Bulletin*, 26: 419–435.
20
- 21
22 Rector, R. 2012. *The Heritage Foundation Special Report #117 on Poverty and Inequality.*
23 *Marriage: America's greatest weapon against child poverty.* <[http://www.heritage.org/](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/09/marriage-americas-greatest-weapon-against-child-poverty)
24 [research/reports/2012/09/marriage-americas-greatest-weapon-against-child-poverty](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/09/marriage-americas-greatest-weapon-against-child-poverty)>.
25 viewed 23 March 2015
26
- 27
28 Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. 2010. Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on
29 job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 617–635.
30
- 31
32 Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. 2001. The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A
33 motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 1306–1314.
34
- 35
36 Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. 2010. On the meaning of work: A theoretical
37 integration and review. In A. P. Brief & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational*
38 *behavior*, vol. 30: 91–127. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
39
- 40
41 Rothbard, N. P. 2001. Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family
42 roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46: 655–684.
43
- 44
45 Rothbard, N. P., & Edwards, J. R. 2003. Investment in work and family roles: A test of identity
46 and utilitarian motives. *Personnel Psychology*, 56: 699–730.
47
- 48
49 Rothbard, N. P., Phillips, K. W., & Dumas, T. L. 2005. Managing multiple roles: Work-family
50 policies and individuals' desires for segmentation. *Organization Science*, 16: 243–258.
51
- 52
53 Rothbard, N. P., & Wilk, S. L. 2011. Waking up on the right or wrong side of the bed: Start-of-
54 workday mood, work events, employee affect, and performance. *Academy of*
55 *Management Journal*, 54: 959–980.
56
- 57
58 Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. 1989. Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining
59 reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57:
60

- 1
2
3 749–761.
4
5
6 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. 2000. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic
7 motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55: 68–78.
8
9 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. 2001. On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on
10 hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52: 141–166.
11
12 Ryan, R. M., & Frederick, C. 1997. On energy, personality, and health: Subjective vitality as a
13 dynamic reflection of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 65: 529–565.
14
15 Ryff, C. D. 1989. In the eye of the beholder: Views of psychological well-being among middle-
16 aged and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 4: 195–210.
17
18 Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. 1998. The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry*,
19 9: 1–28.
20
21 Saavedra, R., & Kwun, S. G. 2000. Affective states in job characteristics theory. *Journal of*
22 *Organizational Behavior*, 21: 131–146.
23
24 Sandelands, L. E., Ashford, S. J., & Dutton, J. E. 1983. Reconceptualizing of the over-
25 justification effect: a template-matching approach. *Motivation and Emotion*, 7: 229–255.
26
27 Schaffer, B. S. & Riordan, C. M. 2003. A review of cross-cultural methodologies for
28 organizational research: A best-practices approach. *Organizational Research Methods*,
29 6: 169–215.
30
31 Schoenrade, P. A., Batson, C. D., Brandt, J. R., & Loud, R. E. 1986. Attachment, accountability,
32 and motivation to benefit another not in distress. *Journal of Personality and Social*
33 *Psychology*, 51: 557–563.
34
35 Schwartz, S. H. 1994. Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values?.
36 *Journal of Social Issues*, 50: 19–45.
37
38 Schwartz, S. H. 2015. Personal communication, March 23.
39
40 Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. 1987. Toward a universal psychological structure of human
41 values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53: 550–562.
42
43 Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A.,
44 Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M. 2012.
45 Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social*
46 *Psychology*, 103: 663–688.
47
48 Scott, W. E. 1966. Activation theory and task design. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
49 *Performance*, 1: 3–30.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Seeley, E. A., & Gardner, W. L. 2003. The “selfless” and self-regulation: The role of chronic
6 other-orientation in averting self-regulatory depletion. *Self and Identity*, 2: 103–117.
7
- 8 Selig, J. P., & Preacher, K. J. 2008, June. *Monte Carlo method for assessing mediation: An*
9 *interactive tool for creating confidence intervals for indirect effects* [Computer
10 software] <<http://quantpsy.org/>>. viewed 15 February 2014.
11
- 12 Senécal, C., Vallerand, R. J., & Guay, F. 2001. Antecedents and outcomes of work-family
13 conflict: Toward a motivational model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27:
14 176–186.
15
- 16
17 Shah, J. 2003. Automatic for the people: How representations of significant others implicitly
18 affect goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84: 661–681.
19
- 20
21 Sheldon, K. M., & Kasser, T. 1995. Coherence and congruence: Two aspects of personality
22 integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68: 531–543.
23
- 24
25 Sherman, D. K., & Cohen, G. L. 2006. The psychology of self-defense: Self-affirmation theory.
26 In M. P. Zanna (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 38: 183–242. San
27 Diego, CA: Academic Press.
28
- 29
30 Sklair, L. 2011. *Assembling for development: The maquila industry in Mexico and the United*
31 *States*. New York: Routledge.
32
- 33 Slovic, P. 2007. If I look at the mass I will never act: Psychic numbing and genocide. *Judgment*
34 *and Decision Making*, 2: 79–95.
35
- 36
37 Small, D. A., Loewenstein, G., & Slovic, P. 2007. Sympathy and callousness: The impact of
38 deliberative thought on donations to identifiable and statistical victims. *Organizational*
39 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 102: 143–153.
40
- 41
42 Smith, R. W., Faro, D., & Burson, K. A. 2013. More for the many: The influence of entitativity
43 on charitable giving. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39: 961–976.
44
- 45
46 Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. 2007. *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
47
- 48
49 Taris, T. W. 2006. Is there a relationship between burnout and objective performance? A critical
50 review of 16 studies. *Work and Stress*, 20: 316–334.
51
- 52
53 Vallacher, R. R., & Wegner, D. M. 1987. What do people think they're doing? Action
54 identification and human behavior. *Psychological Review*, 94: 3–15.
55
- 56
57 Vallacher, R. R., & Wegner, D. M. 1989. Levels of personal agency: Individual variation in
58 action identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57: 660–671.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Vallerand, R. J. 1997. Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 29: 271–360: San Diego: Academic Press.
- Vallerand, R. J. 2001. Deci and Ryan's self-determination theory: A view from the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11: 312-318.
- Van Eerde, W., & Thierry, H. 1996. Vroom's expectancy models and work-related criteria: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 575–586.
- Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. 2000. Using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5: 219–230.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Sierens, E., Soenens, B., Luyckx, K., & Lens, W. 2009. Motivational profiles from a self-determination perspective: The quality of motivation matters. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101: 671–688.
- Vroom, H. V. 1964. *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wade-Benzoni, K. A., Sondak, H., & Galinsky, A. D. 2009. Leaving a legacy: Intergenerational allocation of benefits and burdens. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20: 7–34.
- Waterman, A. S. 1993. Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64: 678–691.
- Waterman, A. S. 2007. On the importance of distinguishing hedonia and eudaimonia when contemplating the hedonic treadmill. *American Psychologist*, 62: 612–613.
- Weibel, A., Rost, K., & Osterloh, M. 2010. Pay for performance in the public sector – benefits and (hidden) costs. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20: 387–412.
- Weiner, B. 1985. An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92: 548–573.
- Weiss, R. S. 1985. Men and the family. *Family Process*, 24: 49–58.
- Westman, M., & Eden, D. 1996. The inverted-U relationship between stress and performance: A field study. *Work and Stress*, 10: 165–173.
- Wiltermuth, S. S. 2011. Cheating more when the spoils are split. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115: 157–168.
- World Values Survey. 2010-2014. *World Values Survey Wave 6 official aggregate report*.

1
2
3 Aggregate File Producer: Asep/JDS, Madrid, Spain: <WV6_Results_v_2014_04_28.pdf.
4 http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/>. viewed 01 July 2014
5
6

- 7 Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. 2001. Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active
8 crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 179–201.
9
- 10 Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C. R., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. 1997. Jobs, careers, and
11 callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31: 21–33.
12
13
- 14 Wrzesniewski, A., Schwartz, B., Cong, X., Kane, M., Omar, A., & Kolditz, T. 2014.
15 Multiple types of motives don't multiply the motivation of West Point cadets.
16 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111: 10990–10995.
17
18
- 19 Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. 1998. Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance
20 and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 486–493.
21
- 22 Yeager, D. S., Henderson, M., Paunesku, D., Walton, G. M., D'Mello, S., Spitzer, B. J., &
23 Duckworth, A. L. 2014. Boring but important: A self-transcendent purpose for learning
24 fosters academic self-regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107:
25 559–580.
26
27
- 28 Yerkes, R. M., & Dodson, J. D. 1908. The relation of strength of stimulus to rapidity of habit-
29 formation. *Journal of Comparative Neurology and Psychology*, 18: 459–482.
30
31
- 32 Zacher, H., Rosing, K., & Frese, M. 2011. Age and leadership: The moderating role of legacy
33 beliefs. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22: 43–50.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLE 1

Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Cronbach's Alpha Reliabilities

<i>Variables</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Within Level</i>								
1 Job Performance	102.70	17.14	(.84)					
2 Energy	3.74	1.26	.12**	(.85)				
3 Stress	2.20	1.36	-.03	-.45**	(.81)			
<i>Between Level</i>								
4 Family Motivation	6.16	.96	.13**	.12**	.04	(.86)		
5 Intrinsic Motivation	4.87	1.22	.08*	.41**	-.26**	.29**	(.90)	
6 External Motivation	5.28	1.20	-.03	.08*	.00	.26*	.44**	(.61)

Note. $N_{\text{Between Level}} = 97$ employees, $N_{\text{Within Level}} = 791$ daily ratings. Correlations between constructs 1, 2, and 3 are on the within level; correlations between constructs 4, 5 and 6 are on the between level; correlations for constructs 1, 2, 3 with constructs 4, 5, and 6 are on the within level, based on disaggregated values for constructs 4, 5, and 6; Internal consistencies are provided in parentheses. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 2

Between-Level Coefficients of the Multilevel Models for Testing Moderation and Moderated Mediation Effects on Job Performance

Dependent Variable	Job Performance								
	Model 1a			Model 1b			Model 2		
	Estimate	S.E.	γ	Estimate	S.E.	γ	Estimate	S.E.	γ
Between-level Predictors									
Intercept	101.77**	1.13		102.36**	1.15		90.04**	5.63	
External Motivation (EM)	-1.11	1.07	-.13	-1.61	1.09	-.19	-1.50	1.14	-.17
Family Motivation (FM)	2.58*	1.09	.24	2.04*	.83	.19	1.75*	.85	.16
Intrinsic Motivation (IM)	1.31	1.11	.15	1.00	1.08	.12	.14	1.37	.02
EM x IM				.08	.49	.02	.02	.52	.00
FM x IM				-2.00**	.56	-.32	-1.94**	.65	-.31
Energy							2.69*	1.14	.28
Stress							1.10	1.19	.11
Between-Level Residual	95.95**	16.30		88.76**	14.60		84.05**	13.92	
R^2			.09			.17			.22
ΔR^2						.08			.05

Note. $N_{Between\ Level} = 97$, $N_{Within\ Level} = 791$; the reported values are unstandardized and standardized (γ) between-level estimates; within-level estimates are omitted; ΔR^2 refers to the change in R^2 when adding the hypothesis relevant variables; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.


TABLE 3

Between-Level Coefficients of the Multilevel Models for Testing Moderation Effects on Energy and Stress

Dependent Variable	Energy						Stress					
	Model 3a		Model 3b			Model 4a		Model 4b				
	Estimate	S.E.	γ	Estimate	S.E.	γ	Estimate	S.E.	γ	Estimate	S.E.	γ
Intercept	3.67**	.10		3.67**	.10		2.22**	.11		2.19**	.11	
External Motivation (EM)	-.09	.09	-.10	-.10	.09	-.11	.12	.10	.13	.15	.10	.17
Family Motivation (FM)	.07	.09	.07	.05	.08	.05	.08	.13	.07	.13	.09	.12
Intrinsic Motivation (IM)	.46**	.08	.52	.48**	.09	.54	-.39**	.11	-.44	-.39**	.10	-.44
EM x IM				.06	.05	.12				-.07	.08	-.15
FM x IM				-.11*	.05	-.18				.22**	.07	.33
Between-Level Residual	.84**	.12		.82	.11		.96**	.15		.89**	.14	
R^2			.26			.28			.15			.23
ΔR^2						.02						.08

Note. $N_{\text{Between Level}} = 97$, $N_{\text{Within Level}} = 791$; the reported values are unstandardized and standardized (γ) between-level estimates; within-level estimates are omitted; ΔR^2 refers to the change in R^2 when adding the hypothesis relevant variables; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.


FIGURE 1
Theoretical Model



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE 2


Simple Slopes for Job Performance



Note. $N_{Between\ Level} = 97$, $N_{Within\ Level} = 791$; regression slope for low intrinsic motivation: $**p < .01$.


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE 3
Simple Slopes for Energy



Note. $N_{Between Level} = 97$, $N_{Within Level} = 791$; regression slope for low intrinsic motivation: $*p < .05$.

FIGURE 4
Simple Slopes for Stress



Note. $N_{Between\ Level} = 97$, $N_{Within\ Level} = 791$; regression slope for high intrinsic motivation: $**p < .01$.

BIOGRAPHIES

Jochen I. Menges (jochen.menges@whu.edu) holds the Chair of Leadership and HRM at WHU - Otto Beisheim School of Management. He received his PhD in management from the University of St. Gallen, and is appointed as a University Lecturer at the University of Cambridge. His research focuses on leadership, emotions in organizations, and work motivation. Among his sources of motivation is his beloved family, especially Christine, Elisa, and Emily.

Danielle V. Tussing (dvtuss@wharton.upenn.edu) is a PhD candidate in management at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania. Her research focuses on factors that deter individuals from pursuing leadership roles, as well as motivation and interpersonal implications of electronic media in the workplace. Her workspace is heavily decorated with photos of her supportive husband, inspiring mom, and other family and friends.

Andreas Wihler (wihler@uni-bonn.de) received his PhD in industrial and organizational psychology from the University of Bonn, Germany. His research interests include leadership, proactive behaviour, social skill, and workplace motivation. He draws a lot of his motivation from spending time with his much-loved new-born son and wife.

Adam M. Grant (grantad@wharton.upenn.edu) is the Class of 1965 Wharton Professor of Management and Psychology at the University of Pennsylvania. He studies work motivation, job design, and employee proactivity, with a focus on understanding and unleashing generosity and originality. His wife, two daughters, and son have motivated him to work a lot less.