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ABSTRACT

It is argued that the new generation called Millennials are being needy, disloyal and narcissistic, and need more attention than previous generations. This is an issue for organizations and managers considering that employed Millennials have a higher turnover intention, thus will not stay for as long as prior generations which further contributes to large costs for the companies. Consequently, managers will have an advantage of understanding what is motivating Millennials in order to facilitate for the workforce to perform to the highest extent whilst being employed by the company. As a result, the purpose of this thesis was to examine if previously conducted studies regarding motivation and Millennials were applicable to employed Millennials in Sweden. Furthermore, we wanted to more specifically examine if job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback were of importance since those factors have been argued to be highly influential regarding what is motivating this new workforce. Motivation can further be divided into intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, where the former can be described as the drive that comes from within whilst the latter describes that the drive is the result from external factors. Our research question was as a result: Do job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback have an effect on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation among Millennials working in Sweden?

To answer the research question and fulfil the purpose of our thesis, we conducted a quantitative study by publishing a questionnaire online in order to reach Millennials working in Sweden since most previous studies conducted has been more focused on a qualitative nature within Anglo-Saxon countries. When analysing our results from the survey we could conclude that organizational commitment had a significant positive effect on both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, whilst work-life balance had a significant negative effect and unfavourable feedback had a significant positive effect on the sample’s extrinsic motivation.

To conclude, the theoretical contribution of this study has been to further provide knowledge regarding Millennials and more specifically employed Millennials in Sweden. Lastly, since we both are students enrolled in the Master’s program in Management, our focus has been on managerial considerations and has therefore contributed to results that can be of advantage to managers and organizations regarding how they can both motivate their new workforce in addition to obtain greater knowledge of understanding them and their needs.
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1. INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the research topic of our thesis and why we have chosen this subject. Moreover, we will give a brief background on the theoretical framework and explain concepts like Millennials and different motivational factors such as job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback. Furthermore, we will present the identified research gaps within the field and finally, we will present our research question and the purpose of this study.

1.1 SUBJECT CHOICE

We are two Swedish business students enrolled in the Master’s program in Management at Umeå University. During our time spent at the university, we have gained a lot of knowledge about both what we can expect when being employed after our studies in addition to what we should consider when working within the field of management. Additionally, we have learnt a lot about theoretical issues and models, and now with this thesis, we want to further implement these ideas in a practical setting in order to obtain further knowledge. Since we both are interested in organizational behaviour, people and their well-being at their workplaces, in addition to how managers can gain an advantage of understanding their employees and their needs, we early decided that we wanted to focus on something in connection to behaviour and motivation. Additionally, we believe that as students with a major in management, it is crucial to understand what is motivating a workforce in an organization in order to have an advantage when competing in a market.

When we examined the current trends within the field of management in previous courses, in addition, to discover what would be interesting to write a thesis about we came in contact with the generation Millennials. More specifically the notion that the upcoming workforce, the generation of Millennials, differ in their personality and workplace requirements in comparison to previous generations. As a result, changes and questions have occurred when discussing what is actually motivating this new workforce, and how managers can contribute to motivating them at their workplace. This issue is something we thought was interesting to examine since we are an actual part of this generation and will soon be a part of the workforce. We also thought it was interesting to study Millennials for the reason that most literature written about this generation is of the negative kind, which made us curious whether this is just a stereotype or if we actually differ from earlier generations.

We believe that this practical implication in connection to the discussions we had in many courses regarding motivation and job satisfaction, and how managers should address these issues in order to have loyal employees, seems like a timely issue. A further interesting aspect is that it will be a challenge for organizations to create a way to motivate their employees to stay as long as possible in the company. Hence, we as students within management may gain greater knowledge of what is important to consider as a manager. According to us, we believe that organizations will have to accept that the employee turnover will increase. Hence, they will have to find ways to motivate their employees for the time they are willing to stay, in order to keep the performance of the organization at the highest level possible.
1.2 PROBLEM BACKGROUND

There have been considerable social and technological changes in the past few years. Since the beginning of 1980’s, there has been a rapid development of technology and social networking, which has changed the behaviour of how we can communicate and search for information (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 46). The Internet itself can be described as a member of the Millennials generation, considering that it was born simultaneously, hence it has affected the Millennials’ behaviour since they are the first generation that is internet natives (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010, p. 212). Additionally, the economic crisis in 2008 had a great impact on the different generations, where the elder generations had to worry about their retirement, whilst the younger generation had to stress with being employed (Deal et al., 2010, p. 194). As a consequence, there has been a shift in motivational characteristics and individual needs which has been altered through past generations to the new generation (Martin, 2005, p. 39; Stewart et al., 2017, p. 50; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 238). As a result, organizations have to adapt to new organizational structures in order to meet these needs trying to keep their employees motivated (Ertas, 2015, p. 405).

One can argue that some changes do depend on the context and how people may behave differently in different cultures (Deal et al., 2010, p. 194). However, generational changes do occur worldwide. Organizations can have an advantage by understanding both the needs of the new workforce, in addition, to understand what has become different in comparison to previous generations. The most distinctive difference according to Hershatter and Epstein (2010, p. 212) is the technology experience where Millennials have a closer relationship to it than previous generations. Furthermore, according to a study conducted in the Nordic countries, and with a specific focus on Sweden, we need to gain more knowledge about the new workforce in order to understand how the changes will affect the workplaces as we know them regarding recruiting, retention and motivation (Hays, 2014, p. 4).

The new workforce called the Generation Y, Millennials (Ng et al., 2010, p. 282) and the Me Me Me generation (Stein, 2013, p. 2) is already in the phase of being employed within organizations, whilst some of them are still enrolled at universities and other educational levels. Nonetheless, the new generation will soon be the largest current workforce, which makes it timely to gain greater knowledge about them. In this thesis, we will refer to the new generation as Millennials, which consists of individuals that are born between the early 1980’s and mid-1990’s (Levenson, 2010, p. 257; Stewart et al., 2017, p. 46). Since there is a blurry line between the generations we have chosen to refer to people born between 1980 and 1995 when mentioning Millennials. The total number of Millennials in Sweden 2016 was 2 004 389 (SCB, 2017), which is approximately 20 percent of the total population.

Millennials, in general, have a stereotype which can be described with characteristics such as narcissistic, disloyal, needy and entitled (Ertas, 2015, p. 404; Thompson & Gregory, 2012). Those are not attributes that are very flattering for the new workforce and is probably not how one would describe an idealistic employee but, unfortunately, employers will soon have no choice except for accepting these characteristics, and maybe organizations will have to adapt to the Millennials rather than the other way around. However, one should note that Millennials in Sweden are more educated in comparison to previous generations as a result by high unemployment during the economic crisis in addition to free education (Swedish institute, 2008) which can be of advantage for
companies. Furthermore, several researchers have stated that the Millennials will soon choose which organizations they want to work for rather than organizations choosing which employees they want to employ (Ng & Gossett, 2013, p. 338; Ng et al., 2010, p. 282). One could, therefore, question whether or not the Millennials will start to rather interview the employer, which is contradictory in comparison to what previous generations are used to. As a result, it is crucial for managers to gain greater knowledge regarding how to manage and motivate this new workforce, trying to adapt to their needs (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 49; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 238).

One of the most crucial differences for managers to be aware of is how the various generations are being loyal to the company in order to have a workforce that wants to perform in a best possible way. Millennials have a rumour of not being very loyal to their employers and have a tendency of having higher turnover intentions in comparison to previous generations (Martin, 2005, p. 39; Stewart et al., 2017, p. 51; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 240). Sousa-Poza and Henneberger (2004, p. 113) describe how turnover intention "reflects the (subjective) probability that an individual will change his or her job within a certain time period". Consequently, firms and organizations have to struggle with a retention issue amongst Millennials trying to keep the new workforce for a longer period of time. This may further lead to costs connected to the hiring process finding qualified applicants in addition to training the new employees. Turnovers can be the result of different factors such as when employees experience that they are "underpaid, undervalued, or not challenged enough" (Ertas, 2015, p. 407), which can cause lack of motivation, hence contribute to higher turnover intentions.

As earlier mentioned, generational changes occur worldwide continuously where the generation sequent to Millennials called “GenZ” or “Generation Z (Deloitte, 2017) is already starting to slowly enter the workforce as well. As a result, by this new entrance of a new generation to the workforce it is now five generations working simultaneously side by side, which is the first time in history (Lanier, 2017, p. 288). It is argued that Millennials globally are more welcoming to this newest workforce, whilst the Nordic Millennials do not share these feelings (Deloitte, 2017). However, GenZ are the individuals who are born between 1996-2011 according to Lanier (2017, p. 288) which makes them between approximately 7 and 22 years old, where future research will need to be conducted in order to understand the upcoming workforce and their needs. As a result, managers of today should be aware that today’s priority should be to gain further understanding of their soon to be largest workforce, Millennials, before they can start to understand and facilitate for future generations to come. According to a study conducted by Hays (2014, p. 11), Millennials in the Nordic countries believed that the most important quality of a leader was the ability to motivate others, followed by being fair, being knowledgeable, and being supportive.

There are different elements that can be of advantage to companies, where motivation can be perceived as one of the key factors when describing employee productivity and performance (Ertas, 2015, p. 406; Wabba & House, 1974, p. 127). One can argue that if employees do not feel motivated to contribute when they are working, they will most likely not want to go the extra mile for their company during the daily operations. Hence, the productivity and performance would be damaged. Motivation can be both intrinsic, which can be described as something we find very interesting or meaningful, in addition to extrinsic, which can be described as something we do in order to reach a wanted outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55). Therefore, it is valuable to evaluate the outcome of
different types of motivators to know where to put effort when trying to generate motivated employees. It is argued that employees’ motivation can be affected by job satisfaction, work-life balance (Munn, 2013, p. 404), organizational commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, p. 182), and feedback (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 708). These factors have additionally been discussed to be of importance regarding the Millennials’ needs (Ng et al., 2010; Thompson & Gregory, 2012) and will further be defined and discussed in the theoretical background chapter.

1.3 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH GAPS

Organizational behaviour can be explained as the manner and attitude that is created and maintained within an organization amongst the members. Cummings (1978, p. 91) has defined it as the study of human behaviour of individuals and groups within organizations, where one can analyse the interactions amongst the individuals on a micro level. One can always only observe the behaviour of the individuals. However, considering that they can affect the organization and be affected by the organization simultaneously, one needs to understand the relationship and interactions in the specific context to have a comprehensive understanding. Furthermore, when the organizational behaviour on an individual level has been understood, one can examine what is the behaviour at the workplace. Workplace behaviour can be defined as "...pattern of action by the members of an organization that directly or indirectly influences the organization’s effectiveness." (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 78). One important factor one should have in mind is the job performance of individuals, considering that it is directly related to the organization's effectiveness.

According to Griffin and Moorhead (2013, p. 90), job performance is the sum of motivation, ability, and environment. One can assume that the needed abilities of individuals can be taught, environmental issues can be facilitated by the managers, however, motivation is more difficult to regulate. Motivation at work can be defined as "...a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity and duration" (Pinder, 2008, p. 11). Motivation has been a topic that previously has been covered by many different studies within different fields, such as psychological and social. Further research has found that motivation can vary in both the level of motivation in addition to what type of motivation, such as intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 54). As a result, one should separate these different types of motivations in order to understand what comes from within an individual and what is a result by external factors and activities in contemplation of reaching a specific outcome.

Frederick Herzberg (1968) developed a theory called Herzberg’s two-factor theory where he explains the motivation and job satisfaction amongst employees and what different factors that would drive them. He concluded that there are motivation factors which contribute to making us feel satisfied and hygiene factors that makes us dissatisfied with the working place. Locke’s (1976, p. 1304) definition of job satisfaction describes it as “...a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences”. It explains how individuals are perceiving their workplace positively regarding of how they evaluate their job or the operations connected to the job. Job satisfaction can further be explained as the extent to which expectations of how the job will meet the individual needs and desires and this is important for having satisfied
employees (Agarwal & Sajid, 2017, p. 124). Considering that intrinsic motivation is connected to the inner drive of individuals, one can argue that job satisfaction can have an impact on intrinsic motivation. Work-life balance has previously become of greater importance regarding job satisfaction, where individuals find it more important with flexible schedules and being able of controlling where and when to work so that one may be able to balance both work and life (Saltzstein et al., 2001, p. 453).

Work-life balance can be defined as "satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home with a minimum of role conflict" (Clark, 2000, p. 751). Individuals find it motivating to have the flexibility of balancing life and work, which further contributes to increasing the chances of retention (Sturges & Guest, 2004, p. 5). One can argue that it is the answer to the question whether we are “working to live or living to work”, and instead trying to find a balance between the two where individuals have different needs. Considering that work-life balance can be a motivational factor wanting to reach an outcome, which is the balance, we believe that it may have an impact on extrinsic motivation. The flexibility and possibility of combining work and life have been shown to have an increasing interest among both researchers and professionals the past years (Sturges & Guest, 2004, p. 5). This could be the result of increased use of technology facilitating for telecommuting, more equality in the household in addition to the motivational changes amongst the elderly and younger generations. Additionally, there have been many studies conducted regarding work-life balance within different fields such as family studies, gender studies, industrial relations, information systems, management, social psychology and sociology (Beauregard & Henry, 2009, pp. 9-10). One can therefore argue that the research within the topic is mature, however, it has gained more interest now than previously which makes the field relevant today.

According to Mathieu and Zajac (1990, p. 182) motivation is further affected by organizational commitment, thus we believe that it is an important factor to include in our study. Meyer and Allen (1991, p. 67) define organizational commitment as "a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization". The authors (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67) further has conceptualized the nature of the psychological states of commitment in three different approaches; affective, continuance, and normative commitment. These three could be explained by the reason one is remaining in the organization when feeling affective commitment, the employee is staying because he or she is wanting to because of emotional connection to, or identification with, the organization. Continuance commitment is when the employee needs to stay because of the alternative costs for leaving the organization, and normative is when the employee ought to do so because of obligation (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p.67). Considering that commitment can be divided into three approaches one can argue that it additionally can be mixed motivational factors with impact on both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation within individuals. Affective commitment can be connected to intrinsic motivation since it is something an individual has emotional connections to, whilst continuance commitment can be connected to extrinsic motivation trying to reach an outcome, which is avoiding alternative costs. Lastly, normative commitment can contribute to both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, depending if the obligation to stay is in the context of moral obligation to the former or legal obligation to the latter.
Organizational commitment is affected by several factors but one of them is development feedback from supervisors (Joo & Park, 2010, p. 493). By receiving feedback from others contributes to confirmation of what you have accomplished. It is either according to expectations and satisfying, or it could be that what you have accomplished was not according to expectations and could as a consequence be altered. Development feedback refers to when employees are provided with information that helps them to learn, develop and make advancement on the job (Zhou, 2003, p. 415). Even if the feedback is positive or constructive, individuals achieve a clearer vision of what they can learn from previous experiences. It has an additional motivational role when the supervisor allows the employees to experience positive emotions and connections about themselves and the organization (Joo & Park, 2010, p. 487). Individuals motivation for a company is more likely to be increased when feeling that they are being acknowledged for the effort and work they put in the organization, hence will be more committed to the workplace. As a result, we believe that feedback has an impact on extrinsic motivation in regard to wanting to reach a wanted outcome, which is performing accordingly to expectations. However, one can additionally argue that feedback has an impact on intrinsic motivation if the feedback is in the form of appreciation, which would affect the self-esteem and the inner drive of the individual. Feedback can be given by supervisors and managers through verbally or non-verbally communication such as email, phone calls or by having a personal meeting with whom it may concern (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 302).

As earlier mentioned, research regarding motivation has been broadly covered within different topics and fields. According to Locke and Latham (1990, p. 240), work motivation can be described when incorporating three famous theories; Goal setting theory, expectancy theory, and social-cognitive theory to explain what will drive employees to produce and perform as expected. By incorporating these three theories, employees will be motivated if they have goals that are dependent on organizational commitment and feedback in addition to provide a clear vision of what is expected of the workforce, where Millennials are the newest generation to be the majority of the workforce. Research has been conducted within the field and previous studies regarding differences amongst generations have shown that attitudes and values are two factors are not different between Millennials and other generations (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010, p. 212). However, studies regarding what is motivating the new generation need further research, in addition to more empirically significant findings in order to have something to base potential generalizations on working Millennials in Sweden.

Even though there have been different studies conducted related to the topic, there are issues regarding research gaps within the field of what is motivating working Millennials. Several articles stress personal traits Millennials have that differ from earlier generations, however, not too many quantitative studies have been conducted to show empirical findings (Deal et al., 2010, p. 191; Levenson, 2010, p. 263). Consequently, previous qualitative studies have generated a rich theoretical foundation, but quantitative studies are needed to test these theoretical findings in order to provide significant results that can be generalizable. Ertas (2015, p. 417) have conducted a study examining turnover intentions and motivation amongst working American Millennials in the federal service, and found that there are motivational differences, but not any drastically differences amongst the elderly and younger employees. If managers achieve an understanding of how to motivate employee’s will to perform, it will benefit both teams and organizations (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 53). One could argue that when it exists motivation not only on an individual level but additionally amongst team members of an organization, people
tend to be more motivated to perform in order to please not only yourself but your team members as well.

It is further argued that "Millennials may or may not be the next great generation, but they are certainly the next workforce, and with effective management, they absolutely have the potential to be a great one" (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010, p. 222). Considering that many scholars argue that Millennials have different needs and personality traits, it is crucial for additional research for understanding this new workforce and test if they actually are so different. In that way, managers gain implications regarding what is valuable for Millennials. In this thesis, we want to conduct a quantitative study examining to what extent earlier mentioned motivational factors; job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work-life balance, and feedback, is motivating employed Millennials in their workplace in Sweden. Thereby our study is relevant considering that there is a gap in previous research where authors have stated that one needs to gain greater understanding regarding what motivates Millennials (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 46), in addition to examine Millennials working in Sweden. As a result, our research question is;

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTION
Do job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback have an effect on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation among Millennials working in Sweden?

1.5 PURPOSE
The primary purpose of this thesis is to understand what is affecting the motivation of Millennials employed in Sweden within an organizational setting. Considering that previous research has highlighted the motivational factors job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work-life balance, and feedback, which is described as of greater importance to Millennials than to previous generations, we want to actually examine whether or not these apply to the new workforce. This focus is chosen due to the fact that we think it is important to be aware of everyone within an organization and make it suitable for all employees. In comparison to Ertas (2015) study where the turnover intention of the Millennials in the U.S federal service were examined, we want to scrutinize how the motivation of Millennials employed in Sweden are affected by the different variables mentioned earlier. This will be accomplished through a quantitative study where we will create a survey that will be published for working Millennials in Sweden to respond to, who have an employment of at least 80 percent. With this study, we want to provide organizations a practical input on how they can attract this new workforce and what to focus on when adapting their work environment towards them. As mentioned earlier, Millennials are less loyal and has a significantly higher turnover intention than older employees (Ertas, 2015, p. 413). Therefore, we find it important to further examine what organizations can do in order to motivate the Millennial employees and still get the best performance from them for that potentially limited time.

This study is relevant in order to contribute with some quantitative research on a topic where most qualitative research has been conducted (Thompson & Gregory, 2012; Levenson, 2010; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). Thompson and Gregory (2012) has studied the common stereotypes of Millennials and suggested that management style might be
the key to succeeding leverage Millennials talents. However, they conclude that more empirical research is needed in order to determine what one is looking to get out of an employment since it may vary across generations. Levenson (2010) studied the Millennials and the world of work from an economist’s point of view, and states that the generations always differ, but that the stereotypes Millennials possess will change the organizational setting. Furthermore, the field needs more research in order to examine if the stereotypes are only stereotypes or if they represent deep seated differences in the way Millennials interact with the world of work. Lastly, Hershatter and Epstein (2010) suggest that Millennials will change organizations and that with the right management it could be in an advantageous manner. This study, therefore, aims to give an addition to the field by using the most common changes the earlier researchers suggested that Millennials will bring into work and to study if they are true.

Since most research made has been focusing on Millennials who are studying at a higher level of education, we hope to gather some fruitful information regarding employed Millennials since we argue that many of them are old enough to be employed by now. Additionally, most of the research found has been conducted in Anglo-Saxon countries (Ertas, 2015; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Kaifi et al., 2012; Levenson, 2010; Ng et al., 2010; Stewart et al., 2017), hence we want to focus on Millennials working in Sweden with the aim to gain a greater understanding of our new workforce. However, it may be most relevant for companies and managers to obtain an input about how they could motivate their employees to go far and beyond in their performance. It is argued that it is important for managers and organizations to understand the new workforce and what motivates them in order to gain such organizational advantages (Boxall & Purcell, 2008, p. 5; Ertas, 2015, p. 406). Even if the turnover intention is higher among Millennials, it is crucial for managers to know how they could get the most out of their employees for the time they are being employed within organization. This could give benefits both in the outcome and to succeed to keep the employees for a bit longer than expected from the new workforce.
2. SCIENTIFIC METHOD

In this chapter, we will first present our preconceptions about Millennials and the subject. Moreover, we will present the philosophical view and discuss the ontological and epistemological standpoints. We will also present our research approach and our quantitative research design. Furthermore, we will finish with an argumentation why we chose our theories for the theoretical framework and how we found them.

2.1 PRECONCEPTIONS

It is argued that preconceptions are needed conditions in order to have the possibility to understand anything at all, considering that we do not live in a world that has not ever been explored. Hence, we have some assumptions that we do take for granted (Gilje & Grim, 2007, p. 179). One important reason why preconceptions are conditions that are crucial when trying to gain understanding of a domain is that we need to have some idea of what we are searching for when we are trying to grasp an important phenomena or text, or else we would not have any direction where to point our attention to (Gilje & Grim, 2007, p. 179). One would simply fool with blindness and not be sure of what is appropriate information or not. Gilje and Grim (2007, pp. 180-183) further argue that an individual’s understandings consist of three components; a) language and concept, b) beliefs and c) individual personal experiences. As a result, when conducting a study or choosing hypotheses, what concepts or keywords one is searching for and beliefs of what is the reality in addition to what one has experienced previously, are likely to affect the researcher and the study.

In regard to these facts, we ourselves are members of the generation Millennials, thus we do have some preconceptions in the domain. We will further describe individually what specific preconceptions we possess in the field of motivation and the new workforce Millennials. Firstly, one of us is born 1989 and is consequently a member of the generation we are examining. However, she is not part of the chosen population of the study considering that she is a full-time student and only works few extra hours a week, hence not fulfilling the criteria of the respondents to our questionnaire. Furthermore, knowledge regarding motivation and current trends in society has been gained during courses in the years of studying business and administration. Hence, additional preunderstandings regarding the subject exists. Considering that she, in addition, simultaneously studies Master’s in Management she has in previous courses learned about the challenges manager's may have regarding motivation amongst employees, which therefore contributed to the managerial perspective of the study.

Secondly, the other author is born 1990 and is therefore also a part of the Millennials, but as for the first author, this one is also a full-time student and consequently not a member of the population we seek to examine in this study. Like the first author this is also a Master student in Management and has collected knowledge about managerial challenges, but she has also written a paper on individualization, which is a topic that somewhat is connected to this chosen topic. However, it was more about the factors that drive the change in what we want in an organizational setting than the outcome of the change, but it helped to understand what to look for when searching for research in this field.

Nevertheless, we have continuously tried to be as objective and impartial as possible when searching for information and choosing what to ask our participants in order to gain
new insights with an external point of view. As a consequence, our understanding about this domain can be altered as the study proceeds, which make our knowledge revisable and therefore more likely to make us more aware of what other’s realities are instead of being trapped in our own worlds (Gilje & Grimen, 2007, p. 184).

2.2 ONTOLOGY

Ontology can be described as the assumptions about the nature of the social reality we have on an individual basis, where reality is either objective and external or subjective and cognitively constructed by the individual (Long et al., 2000, p. 190). According to Bryman (2008, p. 35) questions regarding ontology are focusing on the social entities species and nature. It is important to take in to consideration whether or not they are built by social actors and consequently being objective, or if they are constructed by the social actors, thus constructions build on their beliefs and actions (Bryman, 2008, p. 35). These two different contexts are further referred to as the ontological positions; objectivism and constructivism (Bryman, 2008, pp. 35-36). Objectivism can be described as the ontological position which “asserts that social phenomena and their meanings have an existence that is independent of social actors” (Bryman, 2012, p. 33). One can perceive it as something we as individuals do not possess the power to change and as the position that we need to adapt in order to understand the nature of reality. On the other hand, constructionism can be described as the position that “challenges the suggestion that categories such as organization and culture are pre-given and therefore confront social actors as external realities that they have no role in fashioning” (Bryman, 2012, p. 33). One can perceive it as that the nature of reality is not something that is constant over time as a result of external factors but is more likely being adjusted by social actors that alter the reality through interaction.

In this study we embrace the ontological position of objectivism, considering that we want to examine what is motivating working Millennials in Sweden, which is an external and objective position to us as researchers. Furthermore, in regard to our chosen research design which is conducting a quantitative study, it is more appropriate to have an objectivist position point of view. Our research question is the result of what previous qualitative research has mentioned is motivating the new workforce, Millennials, and we want to further examine whether or not it is applicable to our quantitative study. Additionally, we believe that the result from this study will not be affected by our knowledge of the subject since we are going to test hypotheses based on previous research, hence we will not influence the construction of the reality of the study. One could argue that motivation is the result of social interaction and is likely to change over time and settings. However, in our study we will not let the respondents form their own answers or contribute with further knowledge except for the asked closed questions which make the ontological position of objectivism even more suitable. Furthermore, considering that the variables that we believe is affecting both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation among the Millennials namely; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback, are variables that are more external to the individual as such considering that there are expectations from the organization and the management of how they want their workforce to behave. Consequently, they set rules and conduct procedures for their organization, which can lead to termination, hence the firm can be perceived as “a constraining force that acts on and inhibits its members” (Bryman, 2012, p. 32).
2.3 EPISTEMOLOGY

Epistemology is referring to knowledge theory and is comprising what could be considered as knowledge within a specific field (Bryman, 2008, p. 29). The most important question in epistemology is whether the social reality should and could be studied with the same principles and methods as applied within the natural science (Bryman, 2008, p. 29). There are three major viewpoints in epistemology; positivism, realism, and interpretivism (Bryman, 2008, pp. 30-32). If one perceives it as a spectrum, the positivism is on one end and interpretivism is on the other, whereas realism is placed between them although closer to positivism. Positivism is the viewpoint where one believes that one should imitate the methods of natural science in social science and that science should be objective, thus value free (Bryman, 2008, p. 30). Positivism includes deductive elements considering that the aim of theory is to create hypotheses that could be tested in order to make it possible to take a stand in explanations, but it also includes inductive elements in that suggests that one reaches knowledge through collecting facts that form the basis for legal regulations (Bryman, 2008, p. 30). Moreover, positivism makes a fairly sharp separation between theory and research (Bryman, 2008, p. 30). With a positivistic viewpoint one assumes that the role of research is to test theories and provide material for the development of rules and theoretical terms that cannot be observed directly are not genuinely scientific, thus they must be able to be subject to strict observation requirements (Bryman, 2008, p. 30).

With the viewpoint of realism, two parts are similar as positivism, namely that methods of natural science should be applied when studying social reality and that the researcher should focus on the external reality (Bryman, 2008, p. 31). Bryman (2008, p. 31) argue that unlike positivism, the standpoint of realism implies that the perceptions of researchers are just one of several ways of interpreting or knowing the reality, meaning that the objective reality could be interpreted in different ways. Furthermore, a researcher with the position of realism is willing to include theoretical terms that are not observable in their explanations (Bryman, 2008, p. 31). Additionally, realism could be divided into two different forms, namely direct- and critical realism (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 136). The main difference between them is that with the position of critical realism one argues that there are two steps to see the world. Firstly, there is the phenomenon itself and the sensations it brings, and then there is a mental process where the sensation meets our senses (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 136). In turn, with the position of direct realism is more like what you see is what you get and argues that the first step is enough (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 136).

The last position in epistemology is interpretivism which, in contrast to positivism, is based on the perception that the social reality has to be separated from natural science in order to grasp the subjective meaning of social action (Bryman, 2012, p. 30). Thus, the interpretivists share the view that social science differ fundamentally from natural science and require different research procedures (Bryman, 2012, p. 28). As the name might reveal, the position of interpretivism in social research is about interpreting how the sample examined in research interpret the world, and then place the interpretations into a social scientific frame (Bryman, 2012, p. 31). According to Saunders et al., (2012, p. 137), the interpretivistic researcher has to take an empathetic stance, and the challenge is to understand the world from the point of view of the research subjects. Additionally, interpretivist perspective is argued to be appropriate in business research and particularly in the field of organizational behaviour, since business situations are both complex and
unique (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 137). However, since we aim to make explanations through hypotheses rather than understandings, we argue that a positivistic perspective is more suitable in this research. Finally, if the researcher considers it to be impossible or unrealistic to undertake either of the earlier mentioned positions one can have the approach of pragmatism (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 130). Pragmatists mean that there are several different ways of interpreting the world and tackle research, and one single point of view cannot give the entire picture. Moreover, there could be several different realities (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 130). Consequently, one can perceive pragmatism as in the middle of the two different viewpoints positivism and interpretivism, where there can be multiple views of what is acceptable knowledge.

Since the purpose of this study is to test if Millennials has new motivational requirements as earlier research suggest, an objective stance is taken on what is regarded as acceptable and valid knowledge. That is justified by that we are going to use a quantitative method, a questionnaire, with measurable numbers in this study. We are going to develop hypotheses from theories that we are going to analyse through statistical tests, which in our opinion is regarded acceptable knowledge from the positivist epistemological standpoint. The interpretivistic standpoint had been more suitable if we were aiming to understand a phenomenon, which we are not since most previous research regarding motivation among Millennials has been focusing on that already. However, since the respondent makes a subjective interpretation in their answers of the questionnaire and the questions are not based on tangible shreds of evidence we will not have a positivistic position but rather the viewpoint of realism where we are as objective as possible.

Considering that we are conducting a study as business and management students, in addition to being aware of that our data collection will be a snapshot of the working Millennials in Sweden, we acknowledge that the social world is constantly changing, in our case changes within generations, and therefore can our perception of reality in this study be changed over time (Saunders et al., 2012, pp. 136-137). As a consequence, we perceive ourselves as critical realists, hence our epistemological position in this study is realism.

2.4 RESEARCH APPROACH

There are different research approaches that one can adopt when conducting a research study, namely deductive and inductive approaches (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 143). Firstly, the deductive theory can be described as when researchers deduce hypotheses regarding a social phenomenon which they have knowledge about in addition to theoretical considerations regarding the subject that then need to be subjected to empirical analysis (Bryman, 2012, p. 24). Researchers are starting with examining general aspects before reaching a specific conclusion where there is a clear and logical coherence (Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010, p. 316). The deductive theory is argued to be the most common aspect regarding the connection between theory and social research (Bryman, 2008, p. 26). The processes that are included in deduction is; theory, hypothesis, data collection, findings, hypotheses confirmed or rejected, and lastly revision of theory (Bryman, 2012, p. 24). Consequently, this research approach is common to connect with quantitative research design considering that one has hypotheses based on previous studies and knowledge that one wants to test if one can generalize it to others. A deductive conclusion can be perceived as a true conclusion when the premises are true (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 144).
Secondly, we have the inductive theory which can be described as an approach that generates a theory from observations and the result of research conducted (Bryman, 2012, p. 26). In comparison to deductive research approach, an inductive approach starts with details and end with generalizations (Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010, p. 316). It is common for researchers to have an inductive approach when there is a need to understand the connection between research and theory (Bryman, 2008, p. 28), for instance when examining a social phenomenon where there is insufficient previous research. Consequently, an inductive approach is prevalent when conducting a qualitative research design for a study, trying to gain greater knowledge about a specific domain. An inductive conclusion can be perceived as a conclusion that generates untested conclusions with known premises (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 144), hence the conclusion may be true.

Lastly, it is argued that inductive reasoning and deductive reasoning could be perceived as tendencies and not as you have to choose between two extremes when a researcher consider the relationship between theory and research (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 25). It has recently become more popular to have an abductive theory and especially within qualitative business research (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 26). It is when researchers are combining the deductive approach with the inductive approach which can be described as starting “with the observation of a ‘surprising fact’; it then works out a plausible theory of how this could have occurred” (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 147). It can be used when a researcher is conducting a study where one moves from inductive to deductive or the other way around, hence moving from theory to data. An abductive conclusion can contribute to testable conclusions based on known premises (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 144).

We embrace a deductive theory approach in our study considering that we have developed hypotheses based on previous qualitative research conducted and we want to test if chosen manipulated variables have an impact on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation among working Millennials in Sweden and if they are applicable to our study. Hence, we have from previous theories developed hypotheses that we want to either have confirmed or rejected depending on our findings, trying to generalize the findings of our snapshot of what is motivating the new workforce, Millennials. Consequently, our findings can be perceived as true if we obtain significant results, trusting that the premises are true. Having an inductive approach would indicate that we want to develop a theory from observations that we would realise during the data collection, which we are not. As earlier mentioned, there has mostly been qualitative research conducted with inductive approaches trying to understand what is motivating Millennials, thus we want to contribute with results that could be of empirical significance having a deductive approach and therefore contribute to greater knowledge in the domain. Furthermore, we do not believe that an abductive theory approach is appropriate considering that we do not want to modify an existing theory or generate a new theory but simply test whether or not previous findings are applicable to our study, hence a deductive approach is more appropriate to follow.

2.5 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design is referring to the overall plan the researchers has for how they will implement their study and answer their research question (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 159). The different research designs to follow are the quantitative, qualitative or mixed method and they differ in what ways the researcher will collect and analyse data (Saunders et al.,
Quantitative research can be described as “a research strategy that emphasizes quantification in to collection and analysis of data” (Bryman, 2012, p. 34). The characteristics of a quantitative research design is generally examining relationships between different variables which is then measured and analysed using different statistical techniques (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 162). Researchers that choose to conduct a quantitative research design often want to utilize social observations made and to analyse statistical relationships between preferred variables in order to interpret what they could mean (Jick, 1979, p. 604). Furthermore, it is argued that the researcher is independent from the respondents that are included in the study considering that researchers with a quantitative research design often use probability sampling in order to establish generalisability (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 163).

On the other hand, qualitative research can be described as “research strategy that usually emphasizes words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data” (Bryman, 2012, p. 36). Qualitative research design has the characteristics of wanting to study the meanings of the participants in a study and examine the relationship between them by using different data collection methods and analytical procedures in order to create a conceptual framework (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 163). When researchers choose to have a qualitative research design they tend to be encouraged to “systematize observations, to utilize sampling techniques, and to develop quantifiable schemes for coding complex data sets” (Jick, 1979, p. 604). As a consequence, the researcher is dependent on the participants considering that he or she is most likely to select participants by a non-probability sampling method (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 163).

Simplified one can make the distinction between quantitative and qualitative methods as numeric data and non-numeric data, where numeric data could be numbers and non-numeric could be words or images for example (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 161). In general, it is often thought that quantitative studies are similar to questionnaires and qualitative studies are similar to interviews but that is not always the case, sometimes researchers combine their studies with elements from both methods in order to fulfil their goal (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 161). For example, some questionnaires include open questions where the respondent could write their answer rather than just ticking a box, or the researcher conduct follow-up interviews to the questionnaire. In contrast, a researcher using a qualitative design could use quantitative elements when analysing the data (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 161). The research design is outlined from the research question and should be coherent with research philosophies and research approach (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 158). When researchers want to combine both qualitative and quantitative research in a research design one can adopt mixed method research (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 166), for example by both conducting in-depth interviews and sending out a questionnaire during the data collection of a study.

Since our purpose is to study if the independent variables job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback have an impact on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation for Millennials working in Sweden, we are going to have an objective and realistic philosophy with a deductive approach. Consequently, we will create a questionnaire in order to receive statistical data to measure. As earlier mentioned in the introduction chapter, this subject has often been studied with qualitative methods and we wanted to test if the notion that Millennials have specific motivational factors, wherefore we argue that a quantitative design is the most suitable for this study. A mixed-method could have been an alternative by interviewing managers in Sweden how they...
perceive the needs of Millennials within their organization in addition to publishing a questionnaire aimed at Millennials, however, since we found a research gap amongst the theories addressing the need of Millennials where there is a lack of quantitative research, we ought to test hypotheses rather than explaining them.

2.6 LITERATURE SEARCH

The theoretical framework for this study is based on previous research within the area of our chosen subject. The literature search aims to give the researcher deeper understanding but also to guide the researcher in the design and strategy for the study (Hart, 1998, p. 6). Furthermore, it is according to Hart (1998, p. 11) important to be open-minded when searching for literature in order to not get biased information. Therefore, we started out by reading an extensive amount of research made on Millennials and changes among the generations in general. To find fruitful information we used keywords such as Generation Y, Millennials, Millennials at work, Millennials and motivation, Millennials and organizations, generational changes in the workforce. From the research, we firstly found that most studies have been qualitative, and so we decided to fill the research gap of testing the theories. Secondly, we found out some themes of motivational factors that were mentioned the most when describing the Millennials organizational behaviour. As a consequent, we chose to use those factors as our dependent variables namely; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment and feedback, which additionally to motivation were our new keywords when further searching for literature. We have both included research on the variables per se but also in connection to Millennials in order to get a greater understanding of every sub-field.

In order to get a deep understanding of the subject, we started wide and tried to include different perspectives on the field. Moreover, when searching information, we first aimed to use only primary sources, which according to Saunders et al., (2012, p. 83) is when the information occurs for the first time. This is done to avoid that details get lost in the transformation to secondary sources (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 83). We succeeded to get most of our base information about the variables from primary sources but realized that it was difficult when trying to connect the literature to Millennials, so we decided to include secondary sources as well. Secondary sources are according to Saunders et al., (2012, p. 83) for example books or journals with the subsequent publication of the information. Saunders et al., (2012, p. 84) argues that the most useful source of secondary data is refereed peer-reviewed academic journals and we tried to follow that suggestion to the extent it was possible in order to get accurate information.

Journals are according to Saunders et al., (2012, p. 86) often available online for members of Universities and that is also correct in our case. Most articles referred to in this thesis are from the database EBSCO provided by either Umeå university or Google Scholar, and when searching for research about Millennials, the sources were naturally recent written. However, since we tried to use primary sources when describing our variables, the research provided was quite mature. We do not consider this an issue since the definitions in more recent research was the same and referred back to the sources we chose to use. Additionally, we have carefully chosen articles that have been peer-reviewed and tried to use articles that have been cited by other authors as well. Our reference list consists mostly of articles but for this chapter, we have included books as sources, and those are found in the course book section in the university library.
2.7 CHOICE OF THEORIES AND CONCEPTS

In our literature review, we have chosen to start by introducing what motivation is in order to state what it is and why it is necessary to take into consideration in workplaces. Motivation can be defined as “... a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity and duration" (Pinder, 2008, p. 11). The reason why we have chosen to focus on this definition is that it reflects motivation at the workplace and not the motivation in general, considering that we want to examine what is motivating the new workforce Millennials and what drives them at their working places. We have further chosen to focus on need-based perspective on motivation and process-based perspective on motivation when we have examined previous research and literature. Additionally, we have divided motivation into intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, considering that Ryan and Deci (2000, p. 54) argues that it is beneficial to understand what drives an individual from within in addition to what is external.

When focusing on need-based perspective on theory, we have chosen to include the famous theory of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943). Maslow’s pyramid is one of the most famous theories regarding motivation, which led to why we chose to include it in our literature review. Furthermore, we have additionally included ERG theory, which is a revised and extended version of Maslow’s theory, where Alderfer (1969) has reduced the number of different needs and the results were in favour to Alderfer. When focusing on process-based perspective, we have included equity theory, expectancy theory, and goal setting theory in our theoretical framework, considering that these three theories are important to recognise according to Griffin and Moorhead (2013, p. 101).

We further present the chosen variables which previous research has shown is affecting Millennials, namely; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback. Job satisfaction can be defined as the emotions that we have in connection with our jobs or the experiences we have in the workplace (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). We have chosen to focus on Herzberg’s dual-factory theory when describing and examining job satisfaction, which discusses how employees are either satisfied or dissatisfied depending on motivation factors and hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1968). We believe that this theory is the most appropriate theory to use when examining job satisfaction considering that it is one of the most mentioned theories in our searches in addition to one of the most known theories regarding motivation and job satisfaction. Furthermore, we believe that managers will have an advantage if understanding what Millennials believe is increasing their job satisfaction, considering that it is argued that they are less loyal to their working places and are more concerned with their overall job satisfaction (Ertas, 2015, p. 415).

Next factor that we believe is affecting motivation among working Millennials in Sweden is the upcoming importance of work-life balance, where employees are balancing the conflict between the different roles of work-self and private-self (Clark, 2000, p. 751). We have based most of the literature review about work-life balance on the study conducted by Clark (2000) considering that it was the most extensive and detailed article we came across in addition to the article that had the most citations from other authors when searching for literature in the domain at the moment. One important factor according to Clark (2000, p. 750) that is facilitating work-life balance is flexibility, where Smith et al., (2018, p. 46) have argued that telecommuting has an important impact making employees more in charge of when and where they want to work. However, it is
further argued that with the new workforce Millennials it is possibly leaning against employees will start to work-life blending (Illingworth, 2004, p. 9). Hence, the two different roles of work-self and private-self will become less distinctive.

The third factor we believe is important to recognise when examining what is affecting the motivation of Millennials is the importance of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment can be described as an individual’s interests which can be connected to the firm’s patterns and norms and as a result can be experienced as satisfying the needs of an individual (Kanter, 1968, p. 500). The reason why we have chosen to use Kanter’s definition of organizational commitment is that it is often referred to when searching for previous literature about organizational commitment. Hence, we believe that it is most applicable to our study. We have examined the conceptual model made by Fornes et al., (2008, p. 343) that describe how workplace commitment includes both organizational commitment and individual commitment. Furthermore, we included Meyer and Allen’s (1991, p. 67) theory of dividing commitment to three different types of the nature of commitment; affective, continuance and normative. This was realised in order to gain greater understanding of which type of commitment that could be of importance when examining what has an impact on the motivation of Millennials. Considering that we want to investigate what is motivating working Millennials at their workplaces in Sweden, we concluded that organizational commitment is most appropriate to investigate further.

The last factor that we believe is important to include in this study regarding the motivation of Millennials is feedback. Feedback can be described as “the process in which the receiver returns a message to the sender that indicates receipt of the message” (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 302). Furthermore, we have connected the importance of feedback with theory by including the argument of Locke and Latham (2002, p. 708) who are discussing that feedback is a crucial factor in goal-setting theory. Considering that we have included goal-setting theory when discussing the importance of motivation then we believe that feedback, in addition, could contribute to the motivation of Millennials.

Lastly, London and Beatty (1993, p. 354) stated that managers would have difficulties implementing changes that would be positively changing the organization if not implementing the 360-degree feedback. It can further be described as feedback that an individual is receiving from many different actors surrounding the organization (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 157). Considering that Millennials are known for needing feedback from their management (Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 244), we believe that it is important to include this factor as well. However, Thompson and Gregory (2012) noted that Millennials are quite specific in their requirements of feedback (i.e., more frequency, more personal, tailor made), thus we have decided to include three different parts of feedback; favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback, and source availability, where the latter refers to the frequency of feedback.
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, we will focus on previous literature and studies conducted regarding motivation, job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback. We will present each topic broadly before narrowing it down to how we relate the topics to Millennials and their specific needs. Lastly, we will present our theoretical framework of our study and the connected hypotheses we further want to test.

3.1 MOTIVATION

Motivation at the workplace can be defined as "... a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity and duration" (Pinder, 2008, p. 11). It is what drives people wanting to behave in a certain way, and it can differ between different people what is driving them more or less. Individuals within an organization may believe that fame and career is an important motivator, whilst others believe that CSR and saving the planet is the greatest motivator for them when performing for their company. Managers of firms and organizations worldwide strive on a daily basis to have motivated employees in order to improve the performance and effectivity at the workplace, in many different ways (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 90). Furthermore, Griffin and Moorhead (2013, p. 90) argue that job performance is a relationship between ability, motivation, and environment. Hence, motivation is directly affecting the performance of the employees. If employees are motivated at work and believe that their daily tasks are accordingly to what they are driven by in terms of both internally and externally factors, then they are much more likely to perform better. As one can see from the picture below (see figure 1), it illustrates how motivation that origin from an individual can be described as a spectrum from left to right. Hence, from having no drive to perform or act in the style of amotivation, moving to extrinsic motivation based on external factors, and lastly intrinsic motivation explaining that the reason one is performing is the result from enjoyment to perform (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 61).

![Figure 1. A taxonomy of human motivation. (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 61).](image-url)
Intrinsic motivation can be described as the motivation that comes from within an individual and is defined as "the doing of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable consequence" (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 56). However, it is further argued that in addition to existing within an individual, it can also exist in the relation between the individuals and activities (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 56). One can argue that intrinsic motivation is a very important factor for the performance of individuals considering that it is a stronger drive in comparison to external factors. Furthermore, intrinsic motivation is the drive for individuals to enlist to the work as a result of finding it interesting, engaging or somewhat satisfying itself (Amabile et al., 1994, p. 950).

Human beings are by nature playful, curious and positively willing to learn new things from the day we were born (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 56), which further strengthens the fact that intrinsic motivation is an important type of motivation to understand. Positive effect has been shown to raise the interest and pleasure of individuals to perform their tasks, hence have increased the intrinsic motivation within them (Isen & Reeve, 2005, p. 299).

Extrinsic motivation can be described as the opposite to intrinsic motivation, as an external drive that motivates individuals, which is defined as "a construct that pertains whenever an activity is done in order to attain some separable outcome" (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 60). For example, an employee can feel motivated to reach specific goals of the company connected to rewards, not because he or she wants to reach the goal itself but in order to claim the external reward. Hence, extrinsic motivation is the drive to work as a result of something else than the work itself (Amabile et al., 1994, p. 950). The extrinsic motivation may arise when individuals are becoming teenagers or young adults where activities we perform are not any longer of intrinsic interest but expectations of others (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 60). Hence, in comparison to intrinsic motivation, it will occur later in life when we have become older and more aware of the environment. As a consequence, we argue that external motivation is not as strong as intrinsic motivation considering that intrinsic motivation has been part of us much longer and is often more embedded in our thinking than extrinsic motivation.

Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are to some extent connected in regards that they may have an impact on each other (see figure 1). It is argued that intrinsic motivation, in which a person is driven to perform a task because of the task itself, can be in conflict with extrinsic motivation, in which a person performs a task because of a conditional reward (Bénabou & Tirole, 2003, p. 490). For instance, if an employee is aware of the environmental issues that are currently occurring worldwide and care about making a difference regarding the climate change, he or she might have low intrinsic motivation to realise a given task if it is not equivalent to the beliefs of the individual and potentially harmful to the environment. However, if it is rewarded well with extra pay he or she might experience high extrinsic motivation considering that it will be a contingent reward if performing well. Furthermore, it is argued that individuals who are obtaining contingent rewards, hence have a strong extrinsic motivation, are more likely to succeed in short-term but will be less effective in regard to the long run (Bénabou & Tirole, 2003, p. 495). As a consequence, if managers and organizations have short-term goals, it may be beneficial to focus on the extrinsic motivation of the employees. However, if they want to focus on the long-term perspective, they should rather investigate what drives them from within in order to reach overarching goals to the organization.

There are different perspectives on motivation, which can describe why individuals and employees are driven to satisfy their needs or performing well in an organization. Two
different perspectives are the need-based perspective on motivation and process-based perspective on motivation (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, pp. 92-101) which further will be described, in addition to different motivation theories that can be associated with the perspectives.

3.1.1 Need-based perspective on motivation
Need-based perspectives on motivation amongst individuals can be described as "that humans are motivated primarily by deficiencies in one or more important needs or need categories" (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 93). One of the most famous theories in connection with motivation and needs is Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory. Maslow (1943) developed a theory based on human motivation describing individuals as animals in consideration of that we have a congenital desire to satisfy needs which can be divided into five different levels namely; physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. It describes how we desire firstly to satisfy the first level of need, and when it has been reached the next need slowly arises and even though we are satisfied that we have accomplished the first level we can feel unsatisfied until we have satisfied the next level. Physiological needs, safety needs, and love needs are the three levels that are contemporary called deficiency needs that are needed to be realised in order to make an individual essentially comfortable, whilst esteem needs, and self-actualization are the needs that are called growth needs focusing on the development of individuals (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 93). Physiological needs are the most basic such as water, food, sleep and sex (Maslow, 1943, p. 372). When these needs are satisfied one can satisfy the safety needs which can be described as the needs we have to feel safe against danger (Maslow, 1943, p. 376) for example roof over our heads to protect us from cold or freedom to do what we want.

Next step is the love needs, describing our needs for love, acceptance and belongingness with others (Maslow, 1943, pp. 380-381) which are mainly social needs. When these deficiency needs are being satisfied, one can begin to satisfy the growth needs starting with esteem needs. Esteem needs can be divided into two aspects, the desire of self-respect and a positive image of yourself, and the desire of respect from others (Maslow, 1943, p. 381-382). Lastly, when all these levels are being gratified we reach the top of the pyramid which is the need of self-actualization. This need is described by Maslow (1943, p. 382) as "what a man can do, he must do" meaning that the need of self-actualization is being satisfied when an individual is doing what he or she is meant to do and actually reaching the full potential.

Within organizations, managers have the opportunity to facilitate these needs in order to have motivated employees. The deficiency needs can be met by having a safe working environment, providing a decent salary, implementing a retirement system and focusing on strengthening the relationships amongst teams at the organization. Growth needs can further be satisfied by recognizing what employees are achieving and reward them by performance. However, the need of self-actualization can be more difficult to satisfy considering that managers may not understand what individuals want from their lives. ERG theory, which refers to existence, relatedness, and growth, is another need-based perspective and can be perceived as an extended and revised version of Maslow’s theory (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 95). Alderfer (1969) conducted this study and an empirical test by developing an alternative to Maslow's theory, where the results were more in favour Alderfer’s alternative. Alderfer reduced the number of different needs, where existence was identifying the need for survival, relatedness was described as the social
interaction amongst individuals and the need for recognition and respect, and lastly growth focusing on the ego of an individual, achieving and developing our own potential (Wiley, 1997, p. 365).

3.1.2 Process-based perspective on motivation

Process-based perspectives on motivation are focusing on how individuals are behaving in order to satisfy their needs, and how motivation actually occurs (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 101). There are different theories that are perceived as important to recognise when discussing process-based perspective on motivation according to Griffin and Moorhead (2013, p. 101) namely; the equity theory, expectancy theory, and goal-setting theory. Equity theory was developed by Adams (1963) explaining how employees at workplaces are expecting not only to be fairly rewarded by what they accomplish at work such as outcomes versus inputs but additionally it should be equal amongst the others at the firm, so it is fair between all of them in order to have them motivated to perform. As a consequence, equity is when the employees are experiencing that they all are, in comparison to each other, justly rewarded. Whilst if there would be any differences, both such as over-rewarded or under-rewarded, inequity would be followed by decreased motivation. The inputs of an employee can be recognised as “the exchange are his education, intelligence, experience, training, skill, seniority, age, sex, ethnic background, social status, and, very importantly, the effort he expends on the job” (Adams, 1963, p. 422). In other words, previous experience in addition to what an employee performs for a company is what he or she contributes to the overall performance of the organization. On the other side of the exchange is the outcome from the workplace to the employee, which further is defined as “pay, rewards intrinsic to the job, seniority benefits, fringe benefits, job status and status symbols, and a variety of formally and informally sanctioned perquisites” (Adams, 1963, p. 423).

The equity theory can be described as an input-outcome ratio where you compare the ratio of self with the ratio of other; Outcome(self)/Inputs(self), in comparison with, Outcome(other)/Inputs(other) (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 102). Huseman et al., (1987) further developed the theory, describing how individuals’ preferences additionally for the ratios should be included, considering that even though there are different ratios amongst employees it does not have to result in inequity. As a result, employees can be divided into three categories; a) Benevolents, those who favour having a lower ratio than others, b) Equity sensitives, those who follow the rule earlier mentioned that the ratios should be equally, and lastly c) Entitleds, those who prefers to have a higher ratio than others (Huseman et al., 1987, p. 223). Employees that believe that the ratios are satisfying will feel more motivated to continuing to perform as previously in order to stay in status quo, however, they who believe it is inequity occurring amongst the workers will want to change their situation and can do so in different ways (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 102). In other words, the individual could either lower the inequity or increase the equity in comparison to others. For instance, one can increase the inputs by increasing the effort made at work, increase the outcome by demanding a raise in salary, or even quitting at the firm (Adams, 1963, pp. 427-428).

Expectancy theory was first developed by Vroom (1964) who explained how individuals choose to behave in a specific way over others as a result of expecting a result connected to the chosen behaviour. In an organizational context, one can examine what is driving employees to behave in a certain way in order to reach a wanted outcome from the workplace. The motivation is further depending on how much individuals want to achieve
something, in addition to the likeliness that one can achieve the wanted result (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 104). What the individual wants to achieve can both be a result from intrinsic motivation, for instance wanting to accomplish something that is strengthening the self-esteem, or it could be the result of extrinsic motivation such as a reward. Furthermore, expectancy theory can be divided into two different aspects; effort-to-performance expectancy, and performance-to-outcome expectancy, where the former is the idea a person has regarding the possibility of the effort made leads to a successful result, whilst the latter describes the idea a person has regarding the probability of how they perform will lead to other specific outcomes (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 104-105). One can further comprehend effort-to-performance expectancy as when an employee believes that the effort made has a high probability to perform better, then the expectancy of the individual will be high. On the other hand, if the person believes that the probability is low that no matter how much or little the effort made is going to affect the performance, then the expectancy is very low.

Furthermore, performance-to-outcome can be comprehended as when an employee believes that the probability of performing can lead to a specific outcome, i.e. a promotion is either highly correlated with high expectancy or low correlation with low expectancy. Indeed, the employee may believe that performance is an important factor that has an impact on the outcome, but not the only factor. Hence, the perceived probability can differ between 0 and 1. Wabba and House (1974, pp. 121-122) argue that individuals make a decision based on the interaction between “(1) the valences he perceives to be associated with the outcomes of the behaviour under consideration; and (2) his subjective estimate of the probability that is his behaviour will indeed result in the outcomes. Valences can be described as the degree of the attractiveness, or unattractiveness, of an outcome that differs between every individual (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 105), hence may have different importance depending who you ask.

Lastly, the goal-setting theory describes how behaviour of an individual can be “a result of conscious goals and intentions” (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 152). It facilitates for managers to comprehend how goals can make employees more motivated, hence performs better at their working places. Goals are the psychological object or aim of a strategy and have often a time limit when it should be reached (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 705). The performance of the employees can be affected by goals in four different ways; they tend to direct the attention and effort to the necessary activities, have an exhilarating function on employees, affect the endurance of the employees, in addition to the excitement employees may experience when using task-related knowledge in order to reach the goal (Locke & Latham, 2002, pp. 706-707). As a result, if managers implement goals in their strategies which are available for the employees, they will most likely not waste time accomplishing activities that are not connected to reach the goal or risk the chance of having bored employees.

It is further argued that goal-setting theory is characterised by two different factors that have an impact on the performance of employees; goal difficulty and goal specificity, where the former can be described as “the extent to which a goal is challenging and requires effort”, and the latter can be described as “the clarity and precision of the goal” (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 152). Consequently, the performance of employees will depend on how difficult the set goal is to realise, in addition to how well the managers or supervisors have explained what they expect them to accomplish and how they want them to accomplish them. Previous studies have shown that individuals are less motivated by
goals that are easy to reach and vague such as “do your best”, whilst goals that are specific and more difficult to reach can drive them to perform even better and increase the motivation (Locke & Latham, 1990, p. 240). As a consequence, goal-setting theory can be perceived as contradicting to expectancy theory, considering that the probability of reaching a successful outcome by performance is lower if the goal is difficult, hence the expectancy would be low, and motivation would be decreased according to expectancy theory (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 706).

Millennials are somewhat similar to previous generations regarding extrinsic motivation factors such as payment, security and so forth, whilst the differences that are more outstanding are the intrinsic motivation factors focusing on the job and the experience one has at the workplace (Ertas, 2015, p. 406). However, considering that it is argued that they do differ among generations, we will continue to focus on both intrinsic motivation in addition to extrinsic motivation considering that we believe it may have an impact on our results. As a consequence, we will gain further insight in what is driving working Millennials from within in addition to examine external factors. Furthermore, it is argued that Millennials are being motivated by job satisfaction (Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 239), work-life balance (Ertas, 2015, p. 418; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010, p. 219; Ng et al., 2010, p. 282), organizational commitment (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 50) and feedback (Ng et al., 2010, p. 282) which is further divided into favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback and source availability, and we are going to present these variables in this chapter and connect them to the discussed theories and perspectives on motivation.

3.2 JOB SATISFACTION

As earlier mentioned, job satisfaction can be defined as “... a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). It is the feelings employees have about their current state at the workplace and how the activities at work affect them. When the workforce of a company experience that their needs, desires, and expectations of the organization and their workplace they will consequently have greater job satisfaction, hence are more likely to perform better (Agarwal & Sajid, 2017, p. 124). Job satisfaction can, therefore, be related to the need-based perspective of motivation, where job satisfaction can contribute to increased motivation through feeling safe at work which is satisfying the deficiency needs, having responsibilities that raise the self-esteem which satisfies the growth needs and so forth. On the other hand, if employees are dissatisfied at their workplace it could potentially lead to managers having issues such as turnover intentions and low morale amongst the employees (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 162).

Additionally, job satisfaction is an important factor according to the equity theory where employees who experience inequity will have less job satisfaction, hence become less motivated at the workplace (Huseman et al., 1987, p. 228). Thus, one can argue that those who experience that others are not treated as well as they are or that they are being neglected of the managers in comparison to the other employees will not be as motivated as employees who experience equity. Job satisfaction is additionally affecting the process-based perspective of motivation regarding goal-setting theory, where Locke and Latham (2002, pp. 709-710) argue that goals that employees are achieving are increasing their satisfaction at work, whilst goals that are not accomplished is contributing to dissatisfaction. One can assume that employees’ self-esteem will increase leading to
intrinsic motivation as a result when realizing set goals by the company if the goal was somewhat difficult to reach in addition to enhance the team spirit.

Frederick Herzberg (1968) developed a motivation theory called the two-factor theory, describing how employees are either dissatisfied or satisfied at work as a result of hygiene factors or motivating factors. Presently, it is more common to call it the dual-factor theory, which is more appropriate considering that the name is more explanatory (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 95). Herzberg (1968, p. 56) states that dissatisfaction and satisfaction at the working place are not affected by the same factors, hence if a factor that makes an employee satisfied at work is absence it does not make the employee dissatisfied or the other way around. There are two different factors that have an impact on the satisfaction or dissatisfaction, namely motivation factors and hygiene factors (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 98). Motivation factors are the intrinsic factors to the job, which are; achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility and growth/advancement (Herzberg, 1968, p. 57). Furthermore, the factors extrinsic to the work called the hygiene factors include; company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security (Herzberg, 1968, p. 57).

Managers of organizations will have an advantage by understanding these different factors, considering that satisfaction and dissatisfaction should not be perceived as the opposite to each other but rather as two different spectrums. Hence, there are different approaches to enhance the culture at work. Through changing some of the motivational factors at the workplace for an employee could additionally change the way they are satisfied or not, and on the other hand, if making changes that are not according to what they need from the workplace it could decrease the feeling of satisfaction. The employee will, as a result, be not satisfied; however, the feeling of dissatisfaction will not arise. Furthermore, if an employee is dissatisfied at the workplace, the employer can only take actions to make the employee less dissatisfied, or hopefully make the employee not dissatisfied, by changing the hygiene factors, but it will not lead to more satisfaction at work.

Millennials are more concerned about the overall job satisfaction at their workplaces according to a study conducted by Ertas (2015, p. 415). As a consequence, we believe that it is of importance to further examine how it may affect working Millennials in Sweden in our study. Additionally, Millennials are in comparison to previous generations more in need for having a closer relationship with their immediate managers in order to be satisfied at their workplace (Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 239). It is affecting the intrinsic motivation factor where one can assume that Millennials want to be recognised in order to satisfy their esteem needs in addition to their love needs where individuals have a need of acceptance of others. Moreover, according to Kaifi et al., (2012, p. 91) Millennials score higher job satisfaction than prior generations which they believe can be a result of having higher education and can require more benefits.

\[ H1a: \text{Job satisfaction has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials} \]
\[ H1b: \text{Job satisfaction has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials} \]
3.3 WORK-LIFE BALANCE

Several articles (Clark, 2000; Kim et al., 2013; Saltzstein et al., 2001) describe the upcoming importance of work-life balance as a result of the new situation where women, the ones that traditionally have been working part-time and had the responsibility for taking care of the household, are starting to work as much as men and consequently the family has no longer a natural caretaker. As earlier mentioned work-life balance is referring to when there is a minimum of role conflict between job-self and private-self and consequently, the individual feel satisfied with the balance between work and life (Clark, 2000, p. 751). Employees are more likely to enhance their intrinsic motivation when reaching this state of satisfaction, which can be perceived as a need-based perspective on motivation.

Clark (2000, pp. 750-751) explain that the reason a conflict could occur because work and life, or family, are different domains and could be seen as two countries with different languages, cultures and different acceptable behaviours. In other words, people tend to struggle juggling both work and life. Hence, they need to find a balance where one does not take time and attention on behalf of the other. Individuals are daily border-crossers between these “countries” and adjust their focus, goals, and personality to match the setting of each (Clark, 2000, p. 750). As a result, employees are increasing their extrinsic motivation when reaching these goals and juggling the domain. This can be perceived as the process-based perspective on motivation and have a connection to expectancy theory, where the employee wants to perform order to reach a specific outcome, in this case, a balance between work and life. For some people, the domains are quite alike, and the transition is slight, however, for others the contrast is more significant and then the transition is more extreme (Clark, 2000, p. 750). One can explain it as when employees who have a formal employment with specific dress codes and rules how to behave, for instance very service minded, one has to step into a role when coming to work and then when the shift is over the individual transform back to the private self. On the other hand, there are employees who do not have the same need for transition when coming to work with more informal positions that do not require specific behaviour have a strong culture. There are different factors fostering this balance and one way is to implement family-friendly workplace principles (Bloom et al., 2011, p. 344). Family-friendly workplace principles could be for example the possibility to maternity leave, parental leave, on-site childcare services, reduced working hours, flexitime or telecommuting (Kim et al., 2013, p. 3927).

Flexibility is one important factor that could help foster work-life balance (Sturges & Guest, 2004, p. 18). It could include employees being able to choose when to work and where to work, which would make the physical border between work and life flexible (Clark, 2000, p. 750). For instance, if a mother or father have the possibility choose their working hours they can more easily plan their days when to leave or pick-up their kids from childcare, in addition, to have the possibility to plan spontaneous activities during weekdays. The physiological border could also be flexible if the employees are able to think or talk about work and life simultaneously (Clark, 2000, p. 750). There are several different ways making flexible work arrangements, for instance; compressed work weeks, extended or flexible work schedules and telecommuting (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p.141).
Telecommuting has increased because of the technological advancement including laptops and smartphones which have made it possible for employees to work from wherever they want (Smith et al., 2018, p. 46). The idea consists of that it does not matter if you are working at the office, at home or even at the café, as long as the work is getting done. Telecommuting could entail advantages both on individual and organizational level, such as increased performance, decreased absenteeism, lower turnover and increased job satisfaction (Kurkland & Baily, 1999, pp. 56-57). On the other hand, telecommuting could also have some disadvantages, for example, that telecommuters miss out on informal learning situations, in addition to adapt to the norms and values of the organization (Kurkland & Baily, 1999, pp. 59-60). If an employee is working a lot from home, he or she may feel lonely by not having co-workers next to them to consult if needed in addition to have more responsibility of working the amount that is expected from the employer. However, one should note that Caillier (2012, p. 474) discovered that people who did not have the possibility to telework showed lower levels of work motivation than those who had the possibility to telework.

Nonetheless, it is argued that work-life balance among Millennials will probably develop further into work-life blending (Illingworth, 2004, p. 9) in the near future. Millennials have been found to focus more on how they perform and what they produce rather than where they are, and what they wear doing it, which makes them alternate between their work and life domains all day and night (Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 242). This might have a connection to Lancaster and Stillman’s (2004) notion that Millennials “are looking for work that is meaningful and fulfilling” (cited in Ng et al., 2010, p. 283). Millennials grew up fully connected via the Internet, so they are aware of what is going on in other parts of the world and therefore wants to contribute to make the world a better place (Weber, 2017, pp. 519-520). However, even if work-life balance might take new forms with the Millennials and go towards work-life blending we argue that it is still about feeling satisfied and balanced in all roles. Additionally, work-life blending is a quite new field of research, hence there has not been that many studies conducted regarding it and we argue that it is needed more qualitative studies before there is something one should test. As a result, we believe that work-life balance is more appropriate to our study regarding motivation among Millennials working in Sweden. Our hypotheses will therefore be as follows;

**H2a: Work-life balance has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials**

**H2b: Work-life balance has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials**

### 3.4 ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organizational commitment can be explained as the process through which an individual’s interests become connected to the implementation of the organization’s patterns and norms which then can contribute to feeling as fulfilling the individual’s own nature (Kanter, 1968, p. 500). In other words, organizational commitment can be described as the psychological connection an employee has with the company and employer.
Commitment exists on several different levels and Fornes et al., (2008, p. 343) have created a conceptual model of workplace commitment (see figure 2) which includes both organizational commitment and individual commitment. When workplace commitment is accomplished, it will lead to positive outcomes both for the organization and individual, such as accountability, extra role performance, lower turnover, increased job satisfaction and work motivation (Fornes et al., 2008, pp. 346-347). Becker (1992, p. 238) further argue that organizational commitment, in turn, includes supervisory commitment, which means that the employee has an identification with the managers or supervisor’s values. This happens when an employee admires or look up to attitudes, behaviours or achievements of the manager and adopts to these (Becker, 1992, p. 238). As a result, admired managers and supervisors are more likely to have committed employees behaving like they do, hence have the power to change an organizational behaviour that does not correspond with how they want the employees to behave.

Organizational commitment is when the employee has an emotional connection to the organization, which is according to Fornes et al., (2008, p. 346) built upon the idea that the employee has a clearly stated purpose, is treated fairly, gets permission to take responsibility, has the feeling of partnership, feels appreciated and find the job interesting. This is in line with the process-based perspective on motivation and the equity theory, where it is argued that employees are more likely to be motivated when one is treated equally as the co-workers. Asides from organizational commitment, individual commitment has also an impact on workplace commitment, which refers more to the job itself. Individual commitment is when the employee feels connected to the colleagues and the work itself, which is established when the employee finds the tasks purposeful and is satisfied with the career and the others within the organization (Fornes et al., 2008, p. 346).
Meyer and Allen (1991, p. 67) argue that there are three different types of the nature of the psychological states behind commitment, which they refer to as affective, continuance and normative commitment and they have different underlying factors. These three describe the different reasons behind the decision to stay within an organization and as earlier mentioned in the theoretical background the difference is whether one wants to, one needs to or one ought to stay. Consequently, these three different perspectives are beneficial to understand in order to comprehend what underlying factors that have an impact on an individual’s organizational commitment. Employees who feel the affective commitment and want to stay often do accordingly because they are provided with positive work experiences from the organization. Affective committed employees are more likely to be effective and particularly productive considering that they want to contribute to the relationship with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 75). According to a study by Kim and Beehr (2018, p. 17), empowering leadership could lead to affective commitment, by helping them to develop themselves, make decisions and make them feel responsible. We argue that affective commitment could create intrinsic motivation since the feeling of being willing to perform comes from within the individual rather than external factors.

Continuance committed employees feel that they need to stay in the organization in regard to the costs connected to leave the organization, for instance that another job would need additional education (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 77). The performance of continuance committed employees is reflecting the level they feel that they need to exert in order to keep their job and could, therefore, be barely acceptable if they knew that they are guaranteed employment (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 77). According to Vandenberghhe et al., (p. 419) continuance commitment regards more rational thinking than affective commitment, considering that the employee evaluates the cost and benefits of leaving the organization. Considering that one is not committed to the organization as such, but more committed to the fact that you need the job to survive, one can hardly believe that employees would go the extra mile for the company performing better than expected. Lastly, normative commitment develops from the feeling of obligation, it could be for example individuals growing up with parents stressing the importance of loyalty, which results in an individual who stays within an organization because he or she ought to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991, pp. 77-78). Since normative commitment regards for example moral standard and behavioural norms, it is also connected to culture it is often more valued in collectivistic cultures (Yao & Wang, 2006, p. 1070). Furthermore, it could be when the employee has an obligation towards the organization for different reasons (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 78). For instance, if an employee receives an education paid by the organization, with the requirement that he or she stays within the organization for some time after the education is finished.

However, regardless the reasons behind organizational commitment, the term itself means that the individual feel an emotional relationship toward the organization (Fornes et al., 2008, p. 346) and as earlier mentioned several positive outcomes could arise. Stewart et al., (2017, p. 49) have found that Millennials differ from earlier generations in regard to that they do not consider any relationship between workplace culture and organizational commitment. At the same time, they stress the importance of modifying workplace culture and performance evaluation process since that can create a habitat where Millennials create organizational commitment, which in turn will contribute to motivation and retention that could be of benefit for all individuals in the organization (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 50). With this in mind, we want to investigate whether organizational
commitment has an effect on motivation among Millennials and consequently our hypotheses will be:

- **H3a**: Organizational commitment has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials
- **H3b**: Organizational commitment has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials

### 3.5 Feedback

Feedback can be defined as “the process in which the receiver returns a message to the sender that indicates receipt of the message” (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 302). The receiver can either return the message verbally, written or non-verbally back to the sender in order to confirm that the message is received (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 302). Verbally feedback can be accomplished through a simple conversation or by a phone-call, whilst written feedback can be by text messages, emails or letters. Lastly non-verbally feedback can be rewarding as a symbol for good work or body language showing what you believe. Feedback is important for individuals in order to know the progress and stay motivated when striving to reach a goal (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 708). It can be connected to the process-based perspective on motivation, more specifically goal-setting theory, where feedback then is an important factor to the individuals in order to perform as wanted by the organization. Furthermore, people who reach their goals often set a higher goal for themselves which also enhance motivation (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 708). As earlier mentioned, goal setting is important in order to create motivation, but according to Locke and Latham (1990, p. 241) “Goal setting is more effective, and usually only effective, when feedback allows performance to be tracked in relation to one's goals”.

Issues are likely to arise if feedback is absence at the workplace. Firstly, if the sender does not get a response from the receiver, he or she may not know if the receiver actually has gotten the message at the first place considering that feedback can be perceived as a verification (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 311). Secondly, if there is a lack of feedback and the receiver act on the message without confirming, he or she might behave in a manner which could potentially not be appropriate (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 311), hence needed to be solved later on. One important feedback system for managers to consider is the 360-degree feedback, which can be described as the feedback one receives comes from all surroundings including the stakeholders to the company (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013, p. 157). It can be an advantage for managers to implement this system considering that it can improve the performance of the organization knowing both advantages and disadvantages that one has knowledge about both from within the organization in addition to from outside the organization. For instance, by receiving feedback from the customers one can enhance the customer service, by listening to the subordinates one can make the employees more motivated by satisfying their needs in addition to developing a greater relationship to the suppliers. London and Beatty (1993, p. 354) argue that changes in the organization are difficult to make if not implementing the 360-feedback system considering that managers would have difficulties to understand what could be improved or not if not listening to everyone affected by the change.

Feedback can be both positive and negative and both could be beneficial if used correctly, however, positive feedback is often more available (Audia & Locke, 2003, p. 632). According to a study by (Belchak & Den Hartog, 2009, p. 290) positive feedback leads
to positive emotions for the receiver, whilst negative feedback leads to negative emotions. Moreover, they have found that either negative feedback or the lack of positive feedback leads to increased turnover intention and decreased organizational commitment (Belchak & Den Hartog, 2009, p. 296). Positive feedback lets the receiver understand when he or she is doing accordingly to what is expected and could lead to facilitating effectiveness at the workplace, where people are inclined to provide and receive this kind of feedback, so it often is a natural element in organizations (Audia & Locke, 2003, p. 642). Nonetheless, positive feedback can have negative outcomes, for instance when people are used with positive feedback it can make them worse at recognizing need for changes due to the trust of what has worked in the past (Audia & Locke, 2003, p. 642). Sometimes people need to know that they are not living up to the expectations, otherwise problems can go undetected and lead to bigger issues for the organization (Moss et al., 2003, p. 505). However, people are reluctant to receive negative feedback considering that it could threaten the self-esteem and the feeling of competence, but people are more willing to seek negative feedback from people they trust and whom one knows have the individuals best interest at heart and no other hidden agenda (Audia & Locke, 2003, p. 634). If a manager experience that employees avoid feedback the manager needs to study their own behaviour, it could be that they are too aggressive in their feedback (Moss et al., 2003, p. 505). Moreover, the foundation of negative feedback is that it has to be clear and easy to understand, otherwise it will only be recognised as negative comments (Audia & Locke, 2003, p. 636). People are likely to develop a lower organizational commitment in regard to tasks and goals when they receive negative feedback which makes them feel like their ability to succeed it low, therefore the sender of the negative feedback and the content of it is of great importance, for instance that the feedback includes details of what could be changed (Audia & Locke, 2003, p. 640).

Several researchers (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 53; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 244) argue that Millennials have a need for more frequent feedback in order to feel satisfied and moreover, the feedback has to be tailored and centred on the individual level to each employee. This may further be strengthening the intrinsic motivation satisfying the deficiency needs making the employee more comfortable knowing if he or she is performing as expected. Additionally, Van Dijk and Kluger (2011, p. 1100) found that motivation and feedback is task related. Their findings show that when performing prevention tasks, employees are more motivated by negative feedback than positive feedback, and the other way around when performing promotion tasks (Van Dijk & Kruger, 2011, p. 1100). With that said, one should have in mind that feedback could exist in different forms and is not always in a positive meaning, and that different forms can have diverse outcomes regarding motivation.

Thompson and Gregory (2012, p. 244) has also highlighted the Millennials’ need for feedback and suggests that managers should try to create genuine relationship with their subordinates and focus on building mutual trust between them and their employees. Furthermore, they suggest having a coaching approach rather than just give the right answers, since that could help the Millennials to develop their ability to critically evaluate and seek answers for themselves (Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 244). Millennials are found to prefer tangible pieces of evidence on that they have contributed and want their feedback in an informal way, such as instant messages, chats on internet or messages (Shah & Singh, 2016, p. 292) which further can be perceived as an extrinsic motivation factor. Since feedback exist in different forms and Millennials seem to have specific requirements about frequency and form of feedback, we have decided to divide feedback
into three parts in order to see if there is any specific part that impact motivation. Thereby the hypotheses will be as follow:

\[ H4a: \text{Favourable feedback has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials} \]
\[ H4b: \text{Favourable feedback has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials} \]

\[ H5a: \text{Unfavourable feedback has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials} \]
\[ H5b: \text{Unfavourable feedback has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials} \]

\[ H6a: \text{Source availability has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials} \]
\[ H6b: \text{Source availability has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials} \]

### 3.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR OUR STUDY

As several researchers (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Levenson, 2010; Ng et al., 2010; Thompson & Gregory, 2012) have stated, the Millennials will create a new organizational environment and we will further investigate if this is something which is possible to examine and potentially test. Additionally, we want to focus our study on working Millennials in Sweden in regard to most earlier studies have been conducted on students, and as time has passed Millennials are now a large part of the workforce. Earlier studies (Ertas, 2015, p. 413) have found that the turnover intention is higher among Millennials and considering that it has become a larger issue for managers and organizations which is probably difficult to solve, we wanted to examine what is motivating them for the time they are being employed. Motivation has been stated as one of the key factors for employee productivity (Ertas, 2015, p. 406; Wabba & House, 1974, p. 127), and therefore we see this as an important subject to study, contributing to both theoretical and practical implications.

We have chosen to conduct a quantitative study in order to examine if job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback is affecting Millennials intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation and thus we have developed a conceptual model:
One could argue that one should combine intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation into one dependent variable gathered simply as motivation in general like previous studies have done. However, considering that it is argued that motivation should be divided to two separate aspects in order to understand what the internal factors are and what is the external factors of an individual’s drive, we chose to divide them into two dependent variables.

Our conceptual model (see figure 3) includes six independent variables since we decided to divide feedback into three parts and intend to solve the question how the factors job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback are affecting Millennials' intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. The reason for dividing motivation is because they are not equally affected by the factors behind them and according to Ertas (2015, p. 406), Millennials might differ more regarding intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation compared to earlier generations. Furthermore, we believe that they may have different outcomes. Hence, it could be favourable for organizations to be able to choose what they believe is more important to concentrate on.
In order to test our conceptual model, we have developed twelve different hypotheses (see table 1), consisting six hypotheses regarding intrinsic motivation (H1a, H2a, H3a, H4a, H5a, H6a) and six hypotheses regarding extrinsic motivation (H1b, H2b, H3b, H4b, H5b, H6b). All hypotheses derived from our literature review and we aim to test if there is an effect between the different independent variables on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Job satisfaction has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Job satisfaction has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Work-life balance has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Work-life balance has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Organizational commitment has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Organizational commitment has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Favourable feedback has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Favourable feedback has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>Unfavourable feedback has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>Unfavourable feedback has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>Source availability has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>Source availability has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will test these hypotheses in two different multiple regression analyses in order to examine the cause-and-effect relationships between our independent variables; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment and the variables regarding feedback with our dependent variables; intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.
4. PRACTICAL METHOD

In this chapter, we will first present our research design and then describe how we have collected our data. Furthermore, we will describe how we constructed our questionnaire that has been answered by Millennials working in Sweden. We will further describe how we have analysed the collected data in order to interpret the results later on. Lastly, we will conclude with the ethical considerations we had in mind when conducting the data collection in order to do no harm to the participants.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

One can have three different purposes when conducting research, which is namely exploratory, descriptive or explanatory purposes (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 170). Exploratory studies can be described as when a researcher wants to explore what is the underlying issue to a problem, or when one wants to gain greater understanding about the nature of a problem (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 171). It can start with a broad focus before narrowing it down to a more detailed focus as the research proceeds (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 171), which can be in relation with qualitative studies considering that one is wanting to discover social phenomena and not explain them. When a researcher is having a descriptive purpose of a study, he or she wants to have an accurate and specific description of a certain situation, persons or events (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 171).

As we earlier mentioned in the theoretical method chapter, we conducted a study where we wanted to examine if there is a causal relationship between our independent variables; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback, and source availability with the dependent variables; intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. An independent variable can be described as the variable which we believe is having an impact on the values of the dependent variable, hence a dependent variable is a variable that is being influenced by either one or several independent variables (Collis & Hussey, 2014, p. 204). Explanatory study can be described as when researchers are collecting statistical data and comparing if there are any correlations between the variables (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 172). Consequently, our study is most consistent with this research design, considering that we will follow the process. We had a clear vision of what our research problem was, hence we did not need to explore or obtain an accurate description of the event of what is motivating working Millennials in Sweden but to explain if discussed factors had an impact on their intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.

There are five different types of practical research designs that a researcher can follow, which are; experimental design, cross-sectional design or survey design, longitudinal design, case study design and comparative design (Bryman, 2012, p. 50). It is argued that experimental design may be used when a researcher is conducting experiments in order to determine the effect of new reforms or policies within social policy (Bryman, 2012, p. 50). However, it is not that common to follow when conducting research within business and management in comparison to other fields where it is used when wanting to have as a yardstick when conducting non-experimental research (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 53). Cross-sectional research design can be described as when a researcher collects data at one period of time but on more than one case in order to have quantitative data connected to two or more variables, which later on is examined if they have a connection or not (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 62). On the other hand, survey design includes cross-sectional
research design built upon questionnaire or structured interview when collecting the data for the research (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 63).

A longitudinal design is used when a researcher conducts a study over a longer amount in time in order to examine and map potential differences within business and management research (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 66). When a researcher wants to conduct an extensive and detailed analysis of a specific case it is appropriate to follow a case study design, which is more concentrated on the complexity and nature of the case in the study (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 67). Lastly, comparative research design is used when a researcher is comparing two different, and contrasting, cases in the same study in order to understand a social phenomenon that is best described when being compared (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 72).

As earlier mentioned in the theoretical method chapter, we conducted a questionnaire which we used in order to examine whether or not our independent variables will have an impact on our dependent variables. Considering the time and cost constraint we have as master students we will only accomplish this study in one period of time, which is during this semester. Thus, a longitudinal design would not be of advantage in our study. Furthermore, we collected the data in more than one case in order to gain a rich body of information regarding Millennials working in Sweden, hence a cross-sectional research design is most appropriate to our study. More specifically, considering that we are collecting all our data through a questionnaire one can argue that we will conduct a survey research.

4.2 DATA COLLECTION

One can use both primary data in addition to secondary data when a researcher wants to collect data for a study. Primary data is when a researcher is collecting data for his or her own study in order to analyse the findings and make conclusions based on the results (Bryman, 2012, p. 13). Secondary data can be described as the data a researcher external to the study has collected but is used by other researchers in order to analyse for their own study (Bryman, 2012, p. 312). The use of secondary data can be of advantage, for instance, if the researcher of a study has lack of time or cost issues in addition to the opportunity to accomplish a longitudinal analysis considering that someone else has already invested previously in the data collection (Bryman, 2012, pp. 312-313). However, there are limitations to use secondary data that one should be aware of, such as lack of knowledge about the data and its complexity in addition to not knowing the quality of the gathered data (Bryman, 2012, p. 316). In this study, we collected and analysed our own data through a survey and more specifically an online questionnaire. Hence, we used the primary data from that collection when stating our conclusions for the findings. A questionnaire is a method collecting primary data and can be described as a list consisting of specific questions that carefully has been chosen after testing with an aim for receiving reliable responses from a sample of a population (Collis & Hussey, 2014, p. 205).

One can administer a survey research instrument through two different ways, either through conducting a structured interview or through developing a self-completion questionnaire (Bryman, 2012, p. 186). A structured interview is when a researcher is interviewing respondents following an interview schedule aiming to provide the different respondents the exact same experience of the interview with the same questions in order to ensure that the answers given can be aggregated (Bryman, 2012, p. 210). Additionally,
researchers with a survey research design often prefer to have used structured interviews instead of other forms of interviews considering that it foster standardization of a) the asking of the questions in addition to b) the recording of the questions (Bryman, 2012, p. 210). There are many advantages to use structured interview in lieu of self-completion questionnaire such as that the respondent has the possibility to ask if they do not understand the questions in order to give the most appropriate answer, hence one is more likely to have completed surveys and you are sure of who is actually responding to the survey (Bryman, 2012, p. 234).

On the other hand, self-completion questionnaire can be described as when the respondents themselves are administering the completion of the questionnaires (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 419). The questionnaires could either be sent by post to the respondents, through an email or have a web-based questionnaire where the respondents then have to either reply to the researcher or simply complete the web-based version in order for the researcher to collect the data (Bryman, 2012, p. 232). There are many advantages for using self-completion questionnaires over structured interviews as well, for instance when the researcher need quick answers in order to be time efficient, lower costs connected to the administration and more convenient to the respondents to answer considering that they do not need to show up at a specific time and place (Bryman, 2012, p. 234). As a consequence, it facilitates both for the researchers and the participants of the survey, considering that both parties can administer the questionnaire when it is most appropriate for everyone included.

In our study, we used a self-completion questionnaire which was accessible online on the internet and social media. We chose to administer our data collection accordingly considering that, as we earlier mentioned, have limited time during this thesis process in addition to lowering the costs. Furthermore, we believed that it was easier to reach out to working Millennials in Sweden through an online survey, so they had the possibility to respond when they wanted and where they wanted in comparison to structured interviews or email. Additionally, considering that we wanted to reach out to as many individuals as possible spread around in Sweden, it facilitated to have self-completion questionnaires that we could spread on the internet and receive help to spread it by others as well, which further will be described in this chapter.

4.2.1 Population

A population of a study consists of all the units from which one chooses the sample studied from (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 187). The reason that the word units is used is that it is not necessarily individuals but can also be for example nations or firms (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 187). A sample for the study is the segment of the population that is selected for the research and thereby a smaller group than the population (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 187). Our population for this study was people born between 1980 and 1995 working at least 80 percent in Sweden. As earlier mentioned in the introductory chapter, there was 2 004 389 Millennials in Sweden 2016 (SCB, 2017), which is approximately 20 percent of the total population. How many individuals that are employed for at least 80 percent is not quantified but considering that the youngest of the Millennials have finished senior high school one can assume that the majority of them are either employed or higher educational students.

In this study it is impossible to reach out to every individual in the population and especially in regard to that we cannot specify the dimension of working Millennials in
Sweden. However, it is important for us to identify the population to the largest extent possible in order to create a relevant survey that assures that the respondents are included in the chosen population. This has been made through gathering information firstly, about how many Millennials there are in Sweden, and from that drawn conclusions that the majority of them are probably employed or in post-secondary education by considering their ages.

4.2.2 Sample
When it is a manageable size and possible to collect data from the whole population it is called a census (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 260). Lack of time, budget, other practical issues, or as in our case, a combination of them all, can make a data collection from the whole population impossible and then a sample is an appropriate alternative. It is not necessarily better with a census than a sample as long as the sample represents the entire population, sometimes it could be even better with a sample considering that the smaller size makes it possible to use more time for designing the appropriate data collection (Saunders et al., 2012, pp. 260-261). However, Saunders et al (2012, p. 261) highlight that the most important thing when selecting the sample is to assure that it makes it possible to answer the research question.

There are different techniques when choosing a sample and they could be divided into probability sampling or non-probability sampling (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 187; Saunders et al., 2012, p. 261). Probability sampling is the technique that is most commonly associated with surveys and when using probability sampling the chance for each case of the population of being selected is equal (Saunders et al., 2012, pp. 261-262). In order to make a probability sample possible one needs a sampling frame consisting all the cases in the population from which the sample will be picked (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 262). If the research concerns for example members of a specific gym, the sampling frame for that study would be a complete list of all the members at that gym. The sampling frame will additionally make implications for the generalisability, and strictly speaking one can never generalize beyond the chosen sampling frame (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 264). When the sampling frame is chosen there are different techniques that could be used to obtain a representative sample; simple random, systematic random, stratified random, cluster or multi-stage (Bryman & Bell, 2015, pp. 190-193; Saunders et al., 2012, p. 271). However, since all these techniques are built on the fact that there is a sampling frame which is not possible to get in our case these will not be explained any further. Instead, we will use a non-probability sample which, in regard to that it refers to all non-random sampling techniques, covers a wide range of sampling strategies (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 200).

There are four groups of sampling techniques when following a non-probability sampling, namely; quota, purposive, volunteer, and haphazard (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 284). Quota sampling means that the sample represents the population in its variability (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 284), for example regarding gender; if the population consists of 60 percent women and 40 percent men, the sample should consist of the same distribution. Purposive sampling is most useful when working with small samples and want to select extra informative cases and cannot be generalized since it is not representative for the whole population (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 285). Volunteer sampling refers to techniques where the respondents choose to participate rather than being chosen (Saunders et al., 202, p. 289). Lastly, haphazard sampling means that the participants are chosen out of convenience (Saunders et al., 2012, pp. 290-291). For example, when choosing a person
that just passes by, which should be done with caution considering that the results could be very biased if one, for example, aims to investigate how many students that carry their own food to school and the participants are picked next to the microwave ovens.

Since we did not have enough time and resources we decided to use a volunteer sampling and more specifically we used the technique of snowball sampling, even if probability sampling is preferred in quantitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 434). Snowball sampling means that we took initial contact with a group of people and then let them spread the questionnaire forward. More precisely, we published the questionnaire on Facebook and LinkedIn and asked people to share it to their network. When conducting a snowball sampling it is difficult to know who is participating in the study (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 434). However, we included a covering letter that was at the front page of the questionnaire where we were specifying our requirements of the respondents, hence that they needed to be born between 1980-1995 and being employed for at least 80 percent in Sweden. If the participants did not read that or ignored the information we also had three opening questions regarding age, employment, and country they work in so that we were able to exclude respondents that were not part of our population.

When deciding the sample size, time and money are often the factors setting the limitation (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 298). One rule of thumb is that the larger the sample size is, the greater will the precision be in the results (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 298). Considering that we had a limited amount of time to collect our data we decided to set a deadline after a week and aimed to collect 200-250 accurate responses. We closed our questionnaire the 16th of April and ended up with 248 respondents. When we had excluded those that were not fulfilling our requirements we had 209 respondents.

4.2.3 Generalizability
Generalisability describes to what extent the research findings are applicable to other populations than the sample studied (Collis & Hussey, 2014, p. 341). Quantitative research is often more generalizable than qualitative, however, there are some limitations regarding how generalizable this study is. First of all, one can never generalize outside the population from where the sample is taken (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 205). Furthermore, one cannot generalize outside the context of where the study has been conducted (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 205), in our case, that means that in regard to that our respondents are employed in Sweden we cannot generalize it to other countries. When conducting a non-probability sample the likelihood of a representative sample is lower (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 284) and consequently it is more difficult to generalize from it.

With this in mind, we will not be able to generalize this research to the population chosen for the study, however, a snowball sampling is the most appropriate option due to the time limit. A limitation with snowball sampling is that the respondents could be biased since the respondents who pass it forward to others might choose people like themselves and that could create a homogenous sample (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 289). However, we argue that our sample could get a width and reach people with different employment considering that we as researchers have different background and circuits of people we will announce the questionnaire too.
4.3 QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTRUCTION

We decided to construct a questionnaire by using a free online program called Google Forms, where we could easily export the results straight to Excel or SPSS. Our questionnaire included 76 questions (see appendix 1), where we wanted Millennials employed in Sweden to respond with the focus on six independent variables; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback, and source availability, in addition to our dependent variables; intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Firstly, we included a short introduction in the questionnaire where we described what the respondents could expect from the survey in order to understand the purpose and importance of their participation in addition to improve the response rate (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 242). Secondly, we included personal factual questions at the beginning of the questionnaire, which can be described as when researchers want to know personal information about the respondents in order to gain some insight of who the respondents are (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 262). We were interested to know firstly if they were part of the population we wanted to examine, hence we asked when they were born, their occupation and if they were working in Sweden. If they were not part of the population they went straight to a “Thank you page”, explaining that they were not the participants that we wanted to examine in our study.

Moreover, we asked questions in order to gain some knowledge about the respondents and about their situation at home such as gender, marital status and if there were any children in the household (see appendix 1). Lastly, we wanted to ask the respondents some questions regarding their work situation such as level of education, which sector they work in and how long they have been employed. Consequently, from our demographical questions, we had the possibility to examine and analyse different aspects regarding who our respondents were, in order to get an overview how our sample was distributed in addition to make a replication more feasible.

Following questions concerning our dependent variables and independent variables were closed questions where the respondents were asked to grade to what extent they either agreed or disagreed to a statement scale, which is referred to as using the Likert-scale rating (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 436). Our rating scales included six-point rating scale from 1= Strongly disagree to 6= Strongly agree, which forced the respondents to take a stand in whether or not they did agree to each statement. One can argue that respondents should have the possibility to choose not to have an opinion, however, we believe that when including six-point rating scale one provides the respondents the opportunity to slightly agree or slightly disagree which is more likely that one can relate to rather than not feeling anything at all. Additionally, it decreased the chances for respondents to quickly answer “do not know” or “uncertain” instead of taking a second and actually reflect upon whether or not they did agree or disagree to the statement (Bryman, 2012, p 259). Krosnick et al., (2012, p. 396) further argue that respondents are more likely to respond “do not know” or “no option” later in the survey when they are bored or when they are responding anonymously, hence we believe that it was appropriate to have a Likert-scale where the respondents did need to take a stand. The possible responses were presented in a horizontal line, which is argued to encourage the respondents to process the data rather than using a vertical line (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 436).

Lastly, we have tried to adopt questions from previous studies conducted to the highest extent that was possible, which contributes to the reliability of the questionnaire and study
However, we had to adapt some of the questions regarding the contextual essence in some of them, which further will be described in detail. When we adapted questions, we kept them as close to the original as possible in order to receive both positive and negative statements, which according to Saunders et al., (2012, p. 436) is beneficial in order to keep the respondent focused and make them think about their answers.

The chosen questions for intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, questions 10-24 and questions 25-39 respectively (see appendix 1), in our questionnaire is adapted from a previous study conducted by Amabile et al., (1994), where they examined the intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation of adults in regard to the Work Preference Inventory (WPI) toward what they do. These items showed good reliability when tested in their study (Amabile et al., 1994, p. 958) and therefore we wanted to keep them as close to the original as possible when adapting them to our study, however we had to group them a bit to keep the questionnaire shorter and easy to follow.

Questions from 40-45 (see appendix 1) are measuring our variable job satisfaction, which was adopted from Curry et al., (1986) who conducted a quantitative study where they wanted to examine the interaction of satisfaction and commitment over time, where the respondents were employees of nursing departments. Curry et al., conducted the study in 1986, which can be perceived as outdated, however, we have found more recent studies which have adopted their questions in surveys from Curry et al’s., (1986) study which made us convinced that it was appropriate to use.

Questions between 46 and 54 (see appendix 1) measuring or variable work-life balance are from a study conducted by Sturges and Guest (2004) measuring the career-related attitudes of graduates in the early stage of their career. They measured several parts regarding work and life, but we chose to exclude the questions about work involvement and kept their questions regarding maintaining a balanced lifestyle and measurements regarding satisfaction with their work-life balance in order to use the measurements appropriate to our study.

We have adopted the questions from Williams and Anderson (1991) study when choosing questions to our questionnaire measuring organizational commitment, which is the questions 55-66 (see appendix 1). They examined the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction and performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991, p. 605), thus we adopted the used measurements regarding organizational commitment for which they had tested that it was a reliable measurement.

The chosen questions for feedback are adapted from the Feedback Environment Scale (FES) developed by Steelman et al., (2004). Their aim was to develop and validate an instrument to assess the aspects of feedback that could be useful for managers and co-workers, and we chose to include the ones having a managerial perspective. However, in our questionnaire we excluded measurements regarding source credibility, feedback quality, feedback delivery and, promotes feedback seeking. We kept the measurements for favourable feedback, question 67-69, unfavourable feedback, question 70-72, and source availability, question 73-76 (see appendix 1). The reason why we chose to do accordingly is that we argue that these parts of feedback are the ones most relevant in the context of studying working Millennials as a result of from theoretical framework and previous studies (Shah & Singh, 2016, p. 292; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 244).
have kept these parts separated in the questionnaire and as a consequence, we were also able to measure if there were any specific parts of feedback that affected motivation more than others.

We decided to keep the survey in English considering that it is the original language of the questions and there may arise some errors that could occur when translating (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 442). Another, and maybe the most important reason to keep it in English, is that the population we have chosen is Millennials working in Sweden and they are not necessarily speaking or understanding Swedish. However, we have adapted the questions where the questions contained advanced or technical language in order to make them easier to understand, hence facilitate for those who do not feel too comfortable responding to questions in advanced English.

### 4.4 Pre-test

When one has created a questionnaire and is meant to publish it to the respondents, one should consider to pre-test the questionnaire when it is possible in advance (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 272). A pilot study can illuminate the researcher whether or not the questions should be redefined in order to facilitate for the respondents, so they more easily can comprehend how they are meant to understand the questions (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 451). Additionally, a pilot study can provide the researcher information about how long time the questionnaire approximately takes to accomplish for the respondents. It is further preferable to have a group of experts within the field to participate (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 451) in addition to individuals that should not be considered being part of the sample in the full study responding to the pilot study (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 272). However, if a researcher has very limited time and finds it difficult to find appropriate participants to the pre-test, it would be of an advantage to ask friends and family to be respondents instead of not accomplishing a pre-test at all (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 451).

We conducted a pilot study the 6th of April, asking 10 friends to accomplish our pre-test in order to provide us feedback on how they perceived the questionnaire in addition to potentially find errors that could have occurred. The respondents are themselves part of the generation called Millennials, however, they are not working since we chose to ask full-time students which makes them not part of the sample for the full study. We believe that the students we asked to participate can be perceived as more appropriate to our pilot study in regard to that they possess some knowledge what to expect from a survey and could be more critical instead of asking other friends or family members. We specifically asked the respondents of the pre-test to be critical and measure how time-consuming the questionnaire was and two of the students got instructions about what to answer regarding age and employment in order to test if the filter questions worked properly, which they

---

**Table 2. Design of questions used from previous studies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10-Q24: Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Adapted</td>
<td>Amabile et al., 1994, p. 956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25-Q39: Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Adapted</td>
<td>Amabile et al., 1994, p. 956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40-Q45: Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Curry et al., 1986, p. 856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q67-Q69: Favourable feedback</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Steelman et al., 2004, p. 181-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q70-Q72: Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Steelman et al., 2004, p. 181-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q73-Q76: Source availability</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Steelman et al., 2004, p. 181-182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
did. In order to ensure that the final survey would be of convenience to respond to, we asked the remaining respondents to use different devices of different brands, such as computers, tablets and cell phones considering that the questionnaire was published online. Furthermore, we gave the additional respondents instructions to not answer correctly in the critical demographic questions in order to be able to accomplish the questionnaire.

The respondents thought overall that the survey was clear and easy to follow, however, some minor critique arose. Firstly, we had to state more clearly that it was the motivation at the workplace we were examining and not the motivation in general. Secondly, we received comments regarding our demographical section where we had to make clearer statements regarding how long they have worked for and if it was being in total or within the same organization. As soon as the pre-test were finished we made sure to reset the survey to ensure to eliminate the risk of mixing up the answers.

4.5 QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

4.5.1 SPSS

In order to analyse our data, we used the software called SPSS for Microsoft version 23. In social science, SPSS is probably the most common tool for analysing data and it has been used since the mid-1960’s (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p.365). The reason why we chose SPSS was because one of us had some previous knowledge from using it before in addition to that it had the functions we needed in order to analyse our collected data and test our hypotheses. When collecting the data, we chose to create a questionnaire in Google Forms in order to easily export the collected data to an Excel file that could be transported straight into SPSS. We began with filtering out incomplete answers and considering that we had both positive and negative statements we had to re-code the reversed questions to get accurate values in our analysis. That further made it possible for us to create indexes and group our questions into the dependent and independent variables before examining whether or not we could find any correlations between them.

4.5.2 Cronbach’s alpha

Researchers need to consider the internal reliability when examining multiple-item measures, where respondents have answered questions that are clustered to conduct an overall score, hence it may be an issue with the reliability if the items do not measure the same thing (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p.168). Cronbach’s alpha is frequently used in research in order to calculate internal consistency of the responses to the scale items which are combined in the chosen scale to measure a specific concept (Saunders et al., 2012, p.430). An alpha coefficient has a value between 0, describing no reliability, and 1, describing perfect reliability, where values of 0.7 or higher should be perceived as that the questions in the scale are measuring the same thing (Saunders et al., 2012, p.430).

An assumption is that different indicators should have a correlation, however, not a perfect correlation considering that they all would then measure the same thing and not different aspects of the index (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010, p.81). Cronbach’s alpha is a measurement that is only relevant to multiple-item measures as a result of measuring internal consistency, the stability and the validity of used measures that are unknown (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p.181). As a result, we analysed the different values of Cronbach’s alpha in our different indexes, so we could discover if we had an accepted
value of lowest 0.7 or if we needed to exclude questions in order to have an appropriate Cronbach’s alpha value.

4.5.3 Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics were used when analysing the data collected from the questionnaire. It can be defined as “... a group of statistical methods used to summarize, describe or display quantitative data” (Collis & Hussey, 2014, p. 226). It allows researchers to present and display their findings in a compressed form such as tables, charts, pictures and so forth (Collis & Hussey, 2014, p. 226). There are two aspects that descriptive statistics focus on which are a) the central tendency, and b) the dispersion (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 503). The central tendency can be described as when the researcher is using a quantitative description of samples and populations which can be perceived as common, middling or average measurements (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 503). The three ways that are most common to use when measuring central tendency is a) mode, which is the most frequent value, b) median, which is the midpoint of the values collected, and c) mean, which is the average of the values (Saunders et al., 2012, pp. 503-504).

The dispersion can be described as the distribution in a sample that can be measured by either the range or by the standard deviation (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 349). The range is the difference between the highest value in the sample and the lowest value in the sample associated with an interval/ratio variable (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 349). Interval variables/ratio variables are the variables “where the distances between the categories are identical across the range of categories” (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 345). An additional range that is more common to use when conducting business research is an inter-quartile range which can be described as a quarter of a range, hence not focusing on the extreme values but more concerned about the middle 50 percent of the collected data (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 506). On the other hand, the standard deviation is the extent of spread around the mean of the collected data (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 349). The standard deviation is affected by the outliers, however, in comparison to the range they have less of an impact considering that they are divided by the number of values in the sample (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 350).

In our study, we measured the central tendency by the mean in order to include all data values in the measure in regard to that we collected numerical data. When examining if the responses are somewhat similar or not, we measured the dispersion by the standard deviation. As a result, we believe that we will present the values that are describing the collected data in a way that is not focusing too much on the extreme values, hence the values that are not similar to the average, but more in line with what the majority has responded.

4.5.4 Pearson’s correlation

A method that can be used when examining the relationships and correlation between interval/ratio variables is called Pearson’s r (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 352). It measures the strength of a linear relationship between two variables, for instance, X and Y (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010, p. 175) or as in our case the relationship between our chosen dependent variables and independent variables. One can argue that our independent variables and dependent variables are interval/ratio variables considering that they are responded to according to the Likert scale, hence the distance between the categories are the same across categories (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 345).
Pearson correlation is measuring the coefficient, which can have the value of 0 or 1, where 0 can be described as no existing relationship between the two chosen variables, whilst 1 can be described as a perfect relationship between the variables (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 352). One should note that perfect relationship was very unlikely to have in our study, hence we needed to examine relationships that are strong or moderate. Additionally, the value of the correlation coefficient can be both negative and positive depending on the direction of impact, hence -1 is perfect negative correlation and 1 is perfect positive correlation (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 521) where one can describe negative correlation as when the variables behave opposite to each other’s, for instance increasing when the other is decreasing.

In our study, we will measure the correlation between our independent and dependent variables in order to examine if there is any relationship, this is also a way to check for multicollinearity. Multicollinearity means that the correlation between the independent variables in multiple regression models is high, and according to Collis and Hussey (2014, p. 274) that is a correlation of $\geq 0.90$. This could make it difficult to identify the individual effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable (Collis & Hussey, 2014, p. 274). When this happens within a study, one of the independent variables could be excluded from the multiple regression models in order to avoid overlaps (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010, p. 181).

### 4.5.5 Multiple regression analysis

Multiple regression analysis is used when one wants to examine a dependent variable and one or more numerical independent variables in order to find the strength of a cause-and-effect relationship between them through a coefficient of determination (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 523). There are three different purposes of conducting a multiple regression analysis, namely; making the model more realistic, being a control for other variables in addition to explaining the variance in the dependent variable (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010, p. 182). The only difference between a simple linear regression and a multiple regression analysis is the inclusion of more than one independent variables (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010, p. 182). The multiple regression model can be composed as:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1x_{i1} + \beta_2x_{i2} + \ldots + \epsilon_i,$$

where $Y_i$ is the dependent variable, $\beta$ is the slope, $x_{in}$ describes the independent variables and $\epsilon_i$ is the error term (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010, pp. 178-182).

Multiple regression analysis was an appropriate statistical model to follow in our case, considering that we had six different independent constructs we wanted to examine. Consequently, we conducted many regressions in this study. Considering that we have two different dependent variables, we further conducted two multiple regression analyses focusing firstly on intrinsic motivation, in addition to extrinsic motivation. Each multiple regression analysis included the same independent variables, hence they only differed regarding what type of motivation we are examining. Moreover, this made it possible for us to get an adjusted $R^2$ value, which shows an estimation of the goodness of fit for our model, thus the percentage of the variation in the dependent variables that could be explained by the regression equation (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 525).
4.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

One should be aware of the ethical concerns that may arise when conducting research. Ethics within research refers to the “… standards of behaviour that guide your conduct in relation to the rights of those who become the subject of your work, or are affected by it” (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 226). Bell and Bryman (2007, p. 71) have identified eleven categories of ethical principles for research, which we had in mind during this process. The first two principles are harm to participants and dignity, which describes how researchers need to assure the physical and psychological well-being of the participants and respect the dignity of everyone involved in the research (Bell & Bryman, 2007, p. 71). Our opinion is that the subject examined in this research is quite general with no aspects of intruding anyone’s personal life and considering that the respondents are volunteering to participate and have the possibility to quit whenever they want the risk of harm or discomfort is minimal for both us as researchers and the participants. However, regarding that we are asking individuals to respond to our questionnaire, it is crucial to be aware of the rights of the respondents, so they do not get harmed by our study in other ways.

Furthermore, this lead us to the following three principles by Bell and Bryman (2007, p. 71), namely privacy, confidentiality and anonymity. These three principles are focusing on protecting the privacy and anonymity of everyone involved (Bell & Bryman, 2007, p. 71). Considering that we have not asked for any information about the participants of the survey that makes it possible for us to connect the respondents to the answers, our opinion is that these ethical principles are not harmed, thus we have protected the privacy and anonymity. Furthermore, there are no organizations involved in our study that needs to be protected, hence we did not need to take this into consideration either.

In addition to the principles mentioned, there are three additional practical principles that we have taken into consideration. These are informed consent, honesty and transparency, and reciprocity (Bell & Bryman, 2007, p. 71). Informed consent is concerned that the participants are informed about their approval to participate (Bell & Bryman, 2007, p. 71) and we ensure this by the cover letter that is presented before the questionnaire starts. This is further ensuring the honesty and transparency principles, which we also mentioned by a short introduction to each section of the questionnaire where we describe what we aim to find out with the questions. The reciprocity principle means that not only the researchers but also the participants have benefits of the research (Bell & Bryman, 2007, p. 71) and in our cover letter we have informed the participants that they could contact us if they are interested in the results of the study. Additionally, the participation is voluntary, so the respondents could choose for themselves if they are interested to be involved or not.

Finally, there are the principles of misrepresentation, affiliation and deception (Bell & Bryman, 2007, p. 71), which is connected to what Saunders et al., (2012, p. 231) mention as objectivity. In our study, we have acted openly with an objectivistic standpoint throughout and have avoided any kind of deception and misrepresentation of data collected considering that we have used numerical data that has been through an analysis in SPSS, hence have not coded the data ourselves. In order to further avoid misrepresentation, we have stated the population we seek to study in the cover letter. In addition to that, we have also included two filter questions at the beginning of our questionnaire so we as far as possible could ensure that the respondents belong to the
population even if our sample is a voluntary non-probability sample. Even if we had some pre-understanding in the subject we are not dependent on a specific result of the research and therefore we could also avoid affiliation, neither is it any other organizations or sponsors involved in the research, which could have increased the risk.
5. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter, we will present the empirical findings of our study. First, we will present the demographical findings of our participants in our survey before we will present our Cronbach’s alpha reliability statistic and our descriptive statistics. Lastly, we will present the findings of our multiple regression analyses for both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.

5.1 SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

Our survey started with demographical questions to the participants regarding age, occupation, gender, marital status, etc. (see appendix 1). This provided us information about the respondents regarding who they are, which can be of advantage when the respondents are anonymous, and we did not know anything about them. The first questions were used in order to filter out respondents that belong in our population and the following questions were to obtain an overview of how the distribution among the respondents was. When we closed our questionnaire after a week we had received 248 responses, where 209 responses were a part of our sample.

The distribution regarding gender were 56 percent women and 43 percent men, however, 1 percent of the respondents preferred not to disclose their gender (see figure 4). Since it is nearly impossible to know the balance between gender in the whole population of working Millennials in Sweden we have assumed that it is equal between men and women, hence our sample includes an overrepresentation of women. However, we argue that the balance between our respondents is close enough to have a representative sample regarding gender.

![Gender Distribution](image)

**Figure 4. Gender distribution of respondents**

The following question we asked the participants was when they were born (see appendix 1) since we wanted our respondents to be born between 1980 and 1995 in order to be part of the generation of Millennials. Additionally, we had two intervals of Millennials so that
we could understand how the distribution of early-born Millennials and late-born Millennials were among our respondents. Our respondents included 33 percent of people born 1980-1987 and 67 percent of respondents born 1988-1995 (see figure 5), hence we had an overrepresentation of Millennials who were born later in the time spectrum.

Furthermore, the respondents were asked to answer a question about their current marital status, and the majority of our respondents had partners, were singles or married (see
As one can see we have a strong overrepresentation in the distribution of Millennials that are in a relationship in comparison to those who are single or divorced.

Additionally, we asked whether or not they had children in their household and 71 percent of the respondents responded that they did not have children in the household, whereas 26 percent had children full-time and only 3 percent had children in the household part-time (see figure 7). As a result, in our study, we have a strong overrepresentation of households not having any children in comparison to those who have.

Moreover, we asked the respondents about their level of education, and our sample included a majority of respondents with post-secondary education with 77.5 percent (see
figure 8) and 21.5 percent had finished secondary school. Only 1 percent of the respondents had other types of education, for instance, elementary school. As a result, we can argue that we had a strong overrepresentation of well-educated Millennials in this study.

![Working in sector chart](image)

**Figure 9. Distribution among respondents regarding employment by sector**

Furthermore, the distribution of respondents working for organizations in private sectors and public sectors were quite equal (see figure 9) but only 4 percent worked in a not-for-profit sector. The majority of respondents had been employed for 1-4 years but longer and shorter work experience was also represented in the sample (see figure 10). Since it is difficult to receive information about how the distribution of this would be regarding

![Years employed chart](image)

**Figure 10. Distribution of time employed among respondents**
the population studied we cannot state anything about whether these are representative findings or not. However, we can conclude that the respondents of this survey can be described as quite experienced in their work-life.

5.2 CRONBACH’S ALPHA

In order to measure the internal consistency for our study’s measure, we used Cronbach’s alpha. In our questionnaire we have asked several questions about each dependent variable and the independent variables where we have clustered the items into indexes, which represent further the variables when examining the findings. It is important to measure the reliability in these questions since that describes whether or not the findings are consistent between different samples (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 430). There are several different methods for assessing reliability but Cronbach’s alpha is according to Saunders et al., (2012, p. 420) the most frequently used in social science. It is essential that all questions have the same metric when using Cronbach’s alpha according to Bonnet and Wright (2015, p. 4) otherwise they have to be transformed, but since we had a scale from 1 to 6 on every question among the variables it was not a problem in our case.

When using Cronbach’s alpha it should consist of an alpha coefficient between 0 and 1 where a value of 0.7 or above indicates that the combined questions are measuring the same thing (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 430). However, Bonnet and Wright (2015, p. 4) mention that there is no universal minimum value but that it depends on the type of application. In our case, all values were higher than 0.7 (see table 3) except the measurement for work-life balance where the value was 0.656. To solve this issue, we chose to exclude two questions in this measurement, namely; “I work to live, I don’t live to work. I won’t be happy at work unless I’m happy in my social life” in addition to “I am only working standard office hours”. As a result, our new Cronbach’s alpha value became 0.741 (see table 3) for the index of work-life balance and we still had seven questions remaining in our analysis. All our constructs were then reliable for our regression analyses, which will be further described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>0.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source availability</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

As earlier mentioned, we have chosen to analyse our data with descriptive statistics in SPSS in order to describe our quantitative data collection. We have chosen to use descriptive statistics in order to facilitate the presentation of our primary data from our questionnaire in tables (Collis & Hussey, 2009, p. 221) as you will see below. After we had examined the Cronbach’s alpha of the variables we conducted an analysis in order to measure the central tendency where we chose to examine the mean of the data collection. The mean is simply explained as the arithmetic average of the data collected from a sample (Collis & Hussey, 2009, p. 240) where we have scrutinized the sum of the observations from our Likert scales and divided the sum by the number of participants, which was 209 acceptable responses.

The variable that had the highest mean value in our analysis was the dependent variable intrinsic motivation with a value of 4.5640, whilst the variable with the lowest mean value was organizational commitment with a value of 3.6926 (see table 4). The second analysis we chose to examine was the standard deviation of the data collected in order to measure the dispersion, hence measuring how the spread of the observations is around the mean (Collis & Hussey, 2009, pp. 244-245). As one can see from the table below, the standard deviations of our variables vary between the lowest value of 0.52546 regarding the dependent variable intrinsic motivation, and the highest value of 1.39399 regarding the independent variable unfavourable feedback (see table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>4.5640</td>
<td>.52546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>3.7435</td>
<td>.62428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>4.0502</td>
<td>1.18867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>4.2262</td>
<td>.85029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>3.6926</td>
<td>.87035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
<td>3.7990</td>
<td>1.30213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>3.7145</td>
<td>1.39399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source availability</td>
<td>3.9378</td>
<td>1.33925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 PEARSON’S CORRELATION ANALYSIS

We conducted a Pearson’s correlation analysis in order to examine the strength of the relationships between our independent variables; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback and source availability, with our dependent variables intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. As earlier mentioned, Pearson correlation is measuring the coefficient which has a value between 0 and 1, where 0 refer to no relationship at all between the variables and 1 refer to perfect relationship between the variables (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 352). It is further argued by Saunders et al., (2012, p. 521) that a value of 0 is perfect independency, values of ± 0.2 should be considered as no relationship followed by intervals that should be
perceived as; up to ±0.35 weak relationship, up to ±0.6 moderate relationship, up to ±
0.8 strong relationship and lastly up to ± 1 with perfect relationship. As one can see from
the table below (see table 5) our coefficient values regarding the correlations with a
significant value at the 0.05 level varied between 0.140 at the lowest defined as no
relationship and 0.599, which is defined as a moderate relationship. Furthermore, there
are in total 4 significant relationship between constructs that are included in the intervals
of ± 0.2 with no relationship, 12 significant relationships between constructs that have
a weak relationship with values up to ± 0.35 and lastly five significant relationships
between constructs that had a moderate relationship with a value up to ± 0.6.

Table 5. Pearson’s correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation (2)</td>
<td>.140*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (3)</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance (4)</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment (5)</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>.547**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback (6)</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.399**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback (7)</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.267**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source availability (8)</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.599**</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Considering that we had five relationships between constructs that could be perceived as
a moderate relationship, we wanted to conduct one more test in order to detect whether
or not multicollinearity could exist among those constructs (see appendix 2). We
discovered that the variance inflation factor (VIF) varied between the lowest value of
1.083 and the highest value of 1.741. The square root of the VIF is the degree to which
the standard error has been increased due to multicollinearity (Hair et al., 2006, p. 227)
and the rule of thumb is that a VIF higher than 10 implies multicollinearity (Hair et al.,
2006, p. 230). Consequently, our variables did not show any issues with multicollinearity.
Furthermore, all the relationships had a positive correlation. As a consequence, all
significant relationships will increase simultaneously together. Lastly, there are seven
relationships which cannot be described to be empirically significant, whilst one
relationship is significant at the level of $p < 0.05$ and the remaining relationships were found to be significant at the level of $p < 0.01$ (see table 5).

5.5 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

As earlier mentioned in the practical method chapter, multiple regression analyses were used in order to measure the effect job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback, and source availability have on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. In our analyses, we chose a confidence interval of 90 percent, which means that the criterion for significance was 0.1. We conducted two separate analyses where the effects of our independent variables; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback, and source availability, first were tested on intrinsic motivation and then on extrinsic motivation, which will further be presented in detail below.

5.5.1 Regression 1: Intrinsic Motivation

The first multiple regression analysis that we conducted in order to examine how our independent variables; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback, and source availability affected the dependent variable intrinsic motivation. The adjusted $R^2$ for this analysis was 0.103 (see table 6) and as mentioned in the practical method, that indicates how good of a predictor the equation is likely to be, when multiplied by 100 it could be understood as the percentage of the variation in the dependent variable that could be explained by the regression equation (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 525). Consequently, our adjusted $R^2$ indicates that the independent variables together explain 10.3 percent of the variation in the dependent variable intrinsic motivation.
Table 6. Multiple regression analysis 1: Intrinsic motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.359*</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.4976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction, Work-life balance, Organizational commitment, Favourable feedback, Unfavourable feedback, Source availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>15.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source availability</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Intrinsic motivation

As we had a confidence interval of 90 percent only one of our independent variables showed a significant effect on intrinsic motivation and that was, as you can see in table 6 organizational commitment (p < 0.019). As a result, our hypothesis H3a was supported in this multiple regression test regarding the impact on intrinsic motivation, whilst the hypotheses H1a, H2a, H4a, H5a, and H6a could not be supported. We can further describe the effect of organizational commitment as positive, with a B-unstandardized coefficient value of 0.117, hence it has a positive effect changing the dependent variable with 11.7% when being changed with one unit alone.
5.5.2 Regression 2: Extrinsic motivation

As earlier mentioned, the second regression analysis was to examine whether or not the dependent variable extrinsic motivation was affected by the independent variables; job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback and source availability. From the table below (see table 7) one can detect that the adjusted R^2 once again is a bit low, describing 8.5 percent that can be statistically justified regarding the impact the independent variables have on the dependent variable’s variance. The significance level in this regression analysis was also p < 0.1 considering that our chosen confidence level was at 90 percent.

Table 7. Multiple regression analysis 2: Extrinsic motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary: Extrinsic motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction, Work-life balance, Organizational commitment, Favourable feedback, Unfavourable feedback, Source availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficientsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Extrinsic motivation
As one can detect from the table above, two of the independent variables with a significant effect, organizational commitment and unfavourable feedback, had a positive B-unstandardized coefficient, thus had a positive effect. Organizational commitment had a B-unstandardized coefficient value of 0.137 describing 13.7% of the change in extrinsic motivation when being changed by one unit. Unfavourable feedback had a B-unstandardized coefficient value of 0.085 describing 8.5% of the variation in the dependent variable when being changed by one unit. Furthermore, the third independent variable with a significant effect, work-life balance, had a negative effect on extrinsic motivation with a B-unstandardized coefficient value of -0.098. As a result, the hypotheses that could be supported by this multiple regression model was H2b, H3b, and H5b, whilst hypotheses H1b, H4b, and H6b could not be empirically justified at a significance level of p < 0.1.

5.6 RESULT OF TESTED HYPOTHESES

As earlier mentioned, our empirical findings gave us the possibility to determine whether or not our stated hypotheses were supported and in table 8 we have summarized the result from our study. As one can see from the table below (table 8) we had to reject the majority of our hypotheses, which were; H1a, H1b, H2a, H4a, H4b, H5a, H6a, and H6b. However, we had four hypotheses that could be supported, namely; H2b, H3a, H3b, and H5b. As a result, only one hypothesis was supported regarding intrinsic motivation among Millennials, whilst extrinsic motivation obtained three supported hypotheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Job satisfaction has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Job satisfaction has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Work-life balance has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Work-life balance has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Organizational commitment has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Organizational commitment has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Favourable feedback has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Favourable feedback has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>Unfavourable feedback has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>Unfavourable feedback has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>Source availability has an effect on intrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>Source availability has an effect on extrinsic motivation among Millennials</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. DISCUSSION

In this chapter, we will further discuss the findings of our collected data and compare it to previous research in order to highlight similarities and differences. We will further revise our conceptual model according to the findings. Lastly, we will end the chapter with a general discussion.

6.1 SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

We will begin the discussion with a deliberation regarding the demographics of our sample. Since the information about the chosen population, Millennials working in Sweden is limited, it is difficult to say whether the sample was representative or not regarding the level of education and their domestic life. However, even though that most of the studies that we have read about regarding Millennials (Deal at al., 2010; Ertas, 2015; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Levenson, 2010; Ng et al., 2010; Ng et al., 2013; Shah & Singh, 2016; Stewart et al., 2017; Thompson & Gregory, 2012) are conducted abroad, we believe that it is of advantage to understand the demographics and have in mind what the distribution has been previously in order to make further discussions. Our respondents consisted of more women than men which are in line with the study conducted by Ng et al., (2010) where the study included more than 60 percent female respondents.

Furthermore, our sample included more people without children in the household than with children and that could be connected to that the sample was including more younger Millennials than older in our study, but it could also imply that people are starting families late. However, the majority of the respondents were in a relationship, thus we did not have many Millennials that were all by themselves which is of advantage for us when discussing the importance of the domestic life and family. Considering that we used a non-probability sampling method there is less of a possibility to get a representative sample, and these factors do of course affect the results. Previous research has further shown that Millennials are more likely to have a higher education (Swedish Institute, 2008), which is consistent with the participants of our study where the majority had a post-secondary education.

Regarding the descriptive statistics the mean for five out of eight constructs was below four, this is an implication for having a normal distribution curve as often is the case when having a larger sample (McCormick & Salcedo, 2015, p. 350). Moreover, the standard deviation of the constructs job satisfaction, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback and source availability was > 1, which implicates that the spread in the answers is quite inconsistent for those ones.

Stewart et al., (2017, p. 46) argued that more research was needed to be able to understand what motivates Millennials, and as mentioned in the theoretical framework, researchers have stated that job satisfaction (Ertas, 2015, p. 415; Munn, 2013, p. 404; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 239), work-life balance (Ertas, 2015, p. 418; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010, p. 219; Munn, 2013, p. 404; Ng et al., 2010, p. 282), organizational commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, p. 182; Stewart et al., 2017, p. 50) and different kinds of feedback (Joo & Park, 2010, p. 493) are affecting motivation. Furthermore, in the study by Ryan & Deci (2000) highlight the difference between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, which made us separate them in our model and test our independent variables accordingly. Therefore, two multiple regression analyses were made, and our results will further be discussed more in depth below.
6.2 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

As earlier mentioned, we wanted to analyse if our independent variables job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback, and source availability had an impact on our dependent variables intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Consequently, our two regression analyses have provided us more knowledge regarding how the independent variables are having an impact on the dependent variables when their value changes. As mentioned previously, it is argued that Millennials have different needs and motivational factors than previous generations. Furthermore, it is argued that motivation can be divided into intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 54), which we believe is of advantage to understand and discuss separately when describing the motivation of Millennials working in Sweden. One should note that previous studies among Millennials and what is motivating them have mostly focused on an overall motivation (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Levenson, 2010; Thompson & Gregory, 2012), not dividing the motivation into two separate focuses, however, we will further describe what our findings were regarding both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, whilst comparing and connecting it with previous findings. By doing so, we have discovered in our analysis that the independent variables impact on the dependent variables do differ depending on if focusing on intrinsic motivation or extrinsic motivation, which we would not have known if we had clustered them to an overall index of motivation.

We found in our first regression analysis that it was only one independent variable, organizational commitment, which could be concluded to have a significant positive impact on working Millennials motivation, which was on intrinsic motivation. Our second regression analysis was examining how our chosen independent variables had an impact on our second dependent variable, extrinsic motivation. We had a greater success to find significantly supported hypotheses, where we found that organizational commitment and unfavourable feedback had a positive effect, whilst work-life balance had a negative impact on extrinsic motivation. However, job satisfaction, favourable feedback and source availability did not have a significant impact at all. We will now further discuss each independent variable more in-depth and separately in order to present our findings in connection with our theoretical framework.

6.2.1 Job satisfaction

The first construct that we examined was job satisfaction and whether or not it had an impact on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, which did not show any significant effect on any of our dependent variables. However, there was a significant correlation according to Pearson’s correlation between job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation, where the relationship was defined as a weak relationship. We could further see from our statistical findings in Pearson’s correlation that job satisfaction and extrinsic motivation did not have any significant correlation at all. The findings from the multiple regression analyses were to us surprising considering the previous analysis of Ertas (2015, p. 415) described how the overall job satisfaction was of importance when discussing the motivation of Millennials, which was in addition supported by the study in the article. However, one should note that Ertas (2015) analysis was conducted on Millennials working in federal services whilst we have a greater spread among different industries, in addition to examine working Millennials in Sweden, hence could be a factor why we do not have any significant findings regarding job satisfaction and motivation. Furthermore, we believed that job satisfaction would have a significant effect on motivation
considering that Thompson and Gregory (2012, p. 239) argued that Millennials differ from previous generations regarding that they need closer relationship with their managers and organizations in order to be satisfied which further would lead to motivation. However, we cannot argue that job satisfaction has a significant effect on what is driving Millennials either from within nor as an external factor as a result by our survey and multiple regression analyses.

The reasons why our findings did not show any significant results regarding job satisfaction effect on motivation can be understood differently. Firstly, as a result of being less loyal to the companies and therefore have higher turnover retention than previous generations (Martin, 2005, p. 39; Stewart et al., 2017, p. 51; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 240), one explanation may be that job satisfaction is not as important to Millennials overall considering that they would not mind changing workplace in the future. When reading about Millennials and their behaviour, it is clear that it is more important to them to realise what they believe in rather than what the organization wants, thus they may not perceive job satisfaction as an inner driving force defined as intrinsic motivation. They rather believe that the work is a state of being there temporarily, hence it is not needed to have high job satisfaction to be motivated or that less job satisfaction would contribute to decreased intrinsic motivation.

Furthermore, an explanation why job satisfaction did not have an impact on extrinsic motivation could be that in contradiction to Herzberg’s (1968) theory, job satisfaction could be perceived as a hygiene factor instead of a motivational factor in the eyes of Millennials. Thus, they do not achieve the feeling of increased motivation by being satisfied at work, but rather feeling not motivated when there is a lack of job satisfaction. It could, in addition, be somewhat blurry how job satisfaction itself could contribute to extrinsic motivation and a wanted outcome as a consequence, thus it could be difficult to obtain the feeling of increased motivation as a result of increased job satisfaction.

6.2.2 Work-life balance
Our second construct was the work-life balance which did not have a significant effect on intrinsic motivation but had instead a significant effect on extrinsic motivation. However, surprisingly the relationship was negative between the constructs. This finding was the most surprising result in our study, considering that we had assumed that the correlations would contribute to a positive effect on motivation. Additionally, it is in contradiction to the study conducted by Ng et al., (2010) where they found that work-life balance was one of the most important work attributes among newly graduated Millennials when applying for a job, hence had a positive effect on the motivation. It is in addition contradictory to the study of Shah and Singh (2016, p. 294) who argue that work-life balance is an important factor on the motivation of Millennials, and specifically intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, Sturges and Guest (2004, p. 18) study regarding what is motivating young professionals also highlighted in line with Ng et al., (2010) that regardless of the respondent’s marital status or if there were any children in the household, they would appreciate and be motivated by decreasing the work and life conflict, hence appreciating to have a satisfying work-life balance. However, one should note that the study was conducted in 2004 on graduate students, which may involve other young professionals than Millennials, but we assume that the results are applicable to them.

Another interesting finding worth to discuss is regarding the difference between how work-life balance, in the Pearson’s correlation test, had an impact on intrinsic motivation.
If we would not have divided motivation into intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation in our study, then we would not have gained knowledge of how the impact of work-life balance differs among Millennials depending on which kind of motivation one wants to focus on. Firstly, reasons why we did not have a significant result regarding work-life balance on intrinsic motivation could be that our sample did have an underrepresentation of children in the household. One can consider the need-based perspective on motivation, where we believed that employees of an organization that has children in the household would be more likely to obtain intrinsic motivation as a cause of work-life balance considering that the social needs which Maslow (1943, pp. 380-381) describe would be fulfilled as a result of being able to balance work and domestic life. As a consequence, our participants of the survey may have thought that work-life balance is not an important factor regarding what is motivating them at their workplace when we had an underrepresentation of children in the household, since it is argued that work-life balance has been highlighted lately as a result of more women and mothers are starting to work (Clark, 2000; Kim et al., 2013; Saltzstein et al., 2001), thus not being applicable to our sample. One should also note that the previous studies regarding the motivational factors of Millennials has been conducted in Anglo-Saxon countries, hence there could be cultural differences since our sample were working in Sweden where equal rights is already of great importance. One can therefore argue that work-life balance among employees in Sweden do not share the same motivational feelings of having a work-life balance, but more in accordance with the two-factor theory discussed by Herzberg (1968) that it can be perceived as a hygiene factor that is needed in order to not being dissatisfied at work. Hence, it may be similar to the feelings towards job satisfaction earlier discussed regarding job satisfaction’s absence when motivating the sample of Millennials in this study.

Secondly, explanations why work-life balance had an impact on extrinsic motivation and not intrinsic motivation could be that our sample of Millennials working in Sweden believes that it should be perceived as an external factor driving them to perform. However, considering that we had a negative correlation, one has to assume that our sample believe that work-life balance is reducing the extrinsic motivation, thus feeling that their motivation to perform for a company is lowered by balancing work and their domestic life. One explanation why we obtained a negative correlation between the constructs could be that work-life balance for one individual could have a different meaning than for someone else. This could be in accordance with Ryan and Deci’s (2000, p. 61) conceptual model (see figure 1), where they argue that one structure of extrinsic motivation is identification where individuals believe that a certain human behaviour of personal importance and the regulations should be accepted as his or her own. For instance, one may feel that the focus regarding work-life balance is on the flexibility of choosing when and where to work that can have a negative impact on the extrinsic motivation in regard to the process-based perspective on motivation and more specifically Adams’ (1963) equity theory where it might be indifferences of how long and often employees are at the actual office. The negative effect could be explained by understanding the disadvantages of work-life balance, which was discussed by Kurkland and Baily (1999, pp. 59-60) where employees may experience the feeling of being lonely and miss out on learning situations in addition to adapting to the norms and values of the firm. Considering that it is argued that Millennials are needy (Ertas 2015, p. 404; Thompson & Gregory, 2012) and want to have close supervision (Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 244), one can describe the negative effect on extrinsic motivation among
Millennials as the lack of knowing when and where their co-workers are, hence not knowing how to schedule your own day if you need guidance or need to collaborate on a project and therefore would not gain wanted outcomes as a result.

6.2.3 Organizational commitment
The third construct that we examined in the regression analyses was the organizational commitment, which was the only construct that had a significant positive effect on both of our dependent variables, intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation respectively. As a result, we believe that it is once again important to acknowledge that motivation should be considered as intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation in order to understand how organizational commitment may affect them differently. The results of our regression analyses addressing how organizational commitment had a positive significant impact on motivation are consistent to Stewart et al.’s., (2017, p. 50) study where they found that organizational commitment would contribute to motivation and retention among Millennials. One could, therefore, argue that organizational commitment is driving working Millennials in Sweden from both within in addition to as an external factor. It could, for instance, appear by increasing the self-esteem or triggering the need-based perspective on motivation where it is argued that individuals have a need for belongingness with others, hence conform to the social needs (Maslow, 1943, pp. 380-381). Regarding the second analysis where we discovered the significant positive impact of organizational commitment on extrinsic motivation, one can relate to the findings once again to Stewart et al.’s., (2017, p. 52) study, focusing on how the organizational commitment have a correlation with the wanted outcomes of an employee, for instance by being rewarded for their committed work. This is also consistent to Fornes et al., (2008, p. 346) who argue that organizational commitment is built upon the idea where the employee has for instance a clearly stated purpose, is treated fairly, feels appreciated and so forth, hence could further be connected to the process-based perspective on motivation and more specifically equity theory (Adams, 1963) where it is of importance to have equal conditions at workplace.

By examining our sample demographics, we could identify that we had an overrepresentation of young Millennials where the majority had worked at least one year or more. We do not know if the participants have worked at the same company for the whole period or not, however, the important aspect was whether or not the respondents thought that the organizational commitment they felt for the companies was correlated to the motivation they felt, thus work experience is of importance considering that commitment is something that arises over time. An explanation to why organizational commitment had a significant effect on intrinsic motivation could be, as earlier mentioned, the result of being built upon the idea that organizational commitment is when the employee has an emotional connection to the organization which is in accordance with Fornes et al., (2008, pp. 346-347) structured literature review on commitment. Thus, when having the feeling of organizational commitment, one can argue that the intrinsic motivation is being increased in regard to the need-based perspective of motivation where the needs of belongingness, love, and safety that Maslow (1943, pp. 380-381) argue are of importance on motivation are fulfilled.

Furthermore, extrinsic motivation may be enhanced as a result by increased organizational commitment likewise, in regard to the process-based perspective on motivation where according to Adams’ (1963) and the equity theory describing how the employees may feel that they are treated fairly, thus increased organizational commitment
and increased extrinsic motivation as a result. Another potential explanation why organizational commitment is positively affecting extrinsic motivation could be the result of knowing that if you are committed to the organization as an employee, your chances to be noticed and rewarded increases. This is coherent with Fortes et al.’s. (2008, pp. 346-347) discussion of how organizational commitment can enhance the productivity and positive outcomes both for the organization in addition to the employee. Hence, the organizational commitment is based on external factors as the knowledge of how the employer value the employees to reflect upon the values of the organization and so the employees do accordingly in order to live up to the expectations and be considered as a valuable resource in the company. In turn, this could lead to a feeling of normative commitment where one acts in the way that is perceived as the way one is expected to act (Meyer & Allen, 1991, pp. 77-78). Consequently, the activity of being committed to the organization may provide the positive outcome of a promotion or a raise in wage, which is consistent with the definition made by Ryan and Deci (2000, p. 60) regarding extrinsic motivation, where individuals are driven to accomplish activities in order to reach a specific outcome.

6.2.4 Feedback
The last variable we chose to divide into three independent variables was feedback which, in this study was divided into favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback, and source availability. We chose to divide feedback as a result of Thompson and Gregory’s (2012) study where they explained that feedback came in different forms, hence we believe it is important to examine each factor separately, which further is argued to be of importance regarding the needs of Millennials (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 53; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 244). By dividing feedback into favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback and source availability was of advantage in our study since we only found one significant positive effect, which was by unfavourable feedback on extrinsic motivation. This is contradictory to other previous studies, for instance, Thompson and Gregory (2012, p. 241) and Stewart et al (2017, p. 51) state in their articles that feedback is a crucial factor regarding the motivation of Millennials as a result of being needier than previous workforces, wanting more frequent feedback which should be both positive and negative in order to make the new generation pleased with their supervisors. A reason why we did not obtain more significant results could be that Millennials prefer coaching rather than feedback as Thompson and Gregory (2012, p. 244) stated and that this effects our result if our respondents consider their feedback to be in a non-coaching manner. We will further discuss each variable regarding feedback separately more in detail.

Firstly, favourable feedback was one of the variables that we believed in advance was going to have a significant effect on at least one of the dependent variables considering that it could arise the self-esteem which is connected to the need-based perspective on motivation and the esteem needs discussed by Maslow (1943, pp. 381-382), confirming that Millennials as employees are contributing to a good work and that they are being appreciated, which is closely connected to intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, we thought that based on arguments of that Millennials are argued to be narcissistic (Deal et al., 2010, p. 192), entitled (Stein, 2013, p. 3; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 241) and needy (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 50; Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 240), favourable feedback would have an impact on their extrinsic motivation, where they could perceive the favourable feedback as a reward of performing well. However, now in hindsight one potential explanation to why favourable feedback did not have an impact on either intrinsic motivation nor extrinsic motivation could be the result of growing up in a world
where you were praised by family and others no matter how you performed, as Stein (2013, p. 3) argue is common among this generation. Hence, Millennials might be expecting praises and taking them for granted instead of appreciating them in form of motivation at their workplace.

Secondly, unfavourable feedback was as earlier mentioned the only variable regarding feedback that had a significant positive effect on one of the dependent variables, which was extrinsic motivation. This is consistent with Audia and Locke’s (2003, p. 643) review arguing that those who receive either solicited or delivered unfavourable feedback will benefit from it in comparison to those who do not. Additionally, Shah and Singh (2016, p. 292) discovered also in their study that Millennials want to be provided specific feedback in order to learn from their mistakes. One can further connect unfavourable feedback to process-based perspective on motivation and Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory, where it is argued that employees are being motivated to behave in a specific way over another, in order to reach a specific outcome as a result. Hence, one can argue that Millennials are being motivated by receiving unfavourable feedback in order to know what the supervisor expects from the employee, hence is more likely to reach a wanted outcome. Furthermore, an explanation to why unfavourable feedback had a positive impact on extrinsic motivation and not on intrinsic motivation could be that Millennials are motivated by the thought of obtaining a benefit from unfavourable feedback, hence more aligned with extrinsic motivation than intrinsic motivation.

An additional explanation why unfavourable feedback did not have a significant impact on intrinsic motivation among our sample of Millennials working in Sweden could be that negative feedback can damage the ego of an individual even if it would facilitate for performing. However, we would have thought that it would have a negative impact on intrinsic motivation considering that Millennials are so used to be praised all the time (Stein 2013, p. 3) and then unfavourable feedback might be seen as a threat. Audia and Locke, (2003, p. 634) stressed the importance of trust when delivering unfavourable feedback and what is even more surprising then is that source availability did not show any significant effect on motivation, since we argue that trust is built on having a close relationship, which is more likely when being able to contact the supervisors. Unfavourable feedback could consequently be connected to the need-based perspective on motivation and social needs discussed by Maslow (1943, pp. 380-381), where it is important for individuals to be recognised by others and feel appreciated. However, one should note that in our study we did not have a negative relationship when examining the B-unstandardized coefficient value in the regression model between the two constructs, thus unfavourable feedback should not be considered as having a decreasing effect on intrinsic motivation but more as no impact at all.

Lastly, it is argued that both favourable feedback and unfavourable feedback need to be given to Millennials frequently, hence source availability has been discussed to also be of great importance (Thompson & Gregory, 2012, p. 239). This is consistent with Shah and Singh’s (2016, p. 292) and Weber’s (2017, p. 525) studies where they, in addition, discovered that Millennials are in need of frequent feedback in order to stay motivated and perform as wanted. However, we could not find any significant results from our multiple regression analyses regarding the impact of source availability on either intrinsic motivation nor extrinsic motivation. We believed in advance that considering that it has been covered in the studies mentioned above and articles stressing the importance of a coaching supervisor and the need of source availability would provide us significant
results. On the other hand, one explanation to why it did not have any significant effect on motivation could be that working Millennials in Sweden believe that it is more perceived as the discussed by Herzberg (1968) hygiene factor and not a motivational factor, thus making Millennials less dissatisfied at work if absence but not increasing the motivation. One further explanation to why source availability did not have a significant effect on motivation among our sample could be associated with goal-setting theory and Locke and Latham’s (1990) argument that employees are being motivated by goals that are specific and difficult to accomplish, thus source availability of feedback would have a negative effect on the motivation if feedback was given continuously making the goals easier to achieve.

6.3 REVISED CONCEPTUAL MODEL

Previous in the theoretical framework of this study, our conceptual model was presented where we showed our hypothesized effect on the dependent variables intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, by the independent variables job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback and source availability. The result from the findings in our two regression analyses where we tested if the independent variables had an empirically significant effect on the dependent variables intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation showed that only four of the hypotheses was supported, namely H2b, H3a, H3b, and H5b (see table 8). Consequently, we have revised our conceptual model in order to conceptualize the findings as follows (see figure 11):
As one can see in figure 11 above, it clearly shows that among our sample of Millennials working in Sweden, job satisfaction, favourable feedback, and source availability had neither a significant impact on intrinsic motivation nor extrinsic motivation. The remaining independent variables work-life balance and unfavourable feedback had a significant impact on only one of the dependent variables simultaneously except for organizational behaviour that showed a significant positive effect on both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.

6.4 GENERAL DISCUSSION

One important aspect that could not be stressed enough in this study is that the multiple regression analyses describe the cause-effect relationship on the different dependent variables separately with all independent variables included. Thus, if other variables would be included or changed the results would be different as well, in addition to potentially making the model stronger. Furthermore, when discussing our results that had a significant effect one should bear in mind that we have used a non-probability sample, and more specifically used a snowball sample, when conducted the survey. This makes it
impossible for us to state that the results are representative for the sample considering that we would not have the possibility to conduct the study again on this specific sample, hence we could not predict that the results would be the same one more time.

According to our empirical findings, we could state that we found significant findings regarding three out of six independent variables, hence one can argue that there are other factors one should consider having an impact on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation among Millennials working in Sweden. Furthermore, as a result of a low adjusted R² value in both multiple regression analyses where the model of intrinsic motivation had a value of 0.103 describing approximately 10 percent of the impact regarding the change in the variable, and a value of 0.085 describing only 8.5 percent of the change regarding change in extrinsic motivation, thus both models should be considered as weak. As a result, one can argue that there are other important factors that we have not included in our models that could have strengthen the models in general.

Firstly, job satisfaction did not have a significant impact on either intrinsic motivation nor extrinsic motivation and should therefore not be considered when discussing what is having an impact on the motivation of working Millennials in Sweden. Secondly, one could potentially divide work-life balance into different variables such as telecommuting, flexibility and the importance of domestic life. One would then have the possibility to more easily both focus on what aspect of work-life balance that is having an impact on motivation in addition to potentially obtain a different result of understanding what is contributing to the extrinsic motivation and strengthen the model. Furthermore, considering that organizational commitment had a positive effect on both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation one should perceive that independent variable as an important variable in comparison to the others as a result of affecting Millennials working in Sweden both from within in addition to external factors. It was shown that it was only unfavourable feedback regarding feedback that had a significant positive impact on motivation, thus it could be interesting to develop that variable in order to potentially strengthen the model. For instance, by dividing the variable unfavourable feedback into smaller variables, one could potentially strengthen the models by examining how unfavourable feedback was delivered or when it was received and so forth, which could contribute to further understandings.

One can further discuss how the previous qualitative studies conducted regarding Millennials and their needs in order to be motivated (Thompson & Gregory, 2012; Levenson, 2010; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010) is not confirmed by our sample. As earlier mentioned, most studies that we have examined have been conducted in Anglo-Saxon countries, hence one explanation to why our models were weak could have been the result of differences among countries and cultural differences. Furthermore, previous studies have been more focused on specific industries whilst we have been more focused to reach out to as many working Millennials in Sweden as possible through social media considering our time and cost restraint, thus the importance of industry has not been considered in this study. Consequently, different independent variables could have been more appropriate to use in order to strengthen our model, however, at least we have discovered that they were not applicable which is a finding in itself.
In this chapter, we will present our conclusions of our study as a result of the findings in regard to our research purpose and research question. We will further discuss how we have answered our research question in addition to describe our theoretical contributions and practical contributions by this study. Lastly, we will present our limitations and provide suggestions for further research within business and administration regarding the field of Millennials and motivation.

7.1 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine what is affecting the motivation of Millennials working in Sweden in their work setting. More specific we aimed to study both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation of Millennials working in Sweden, which led us to the research question:

“Do job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment, and feedback have an effect on intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation among Millennials working in Sweden?”

The findings of our study show that the factors affecting the different types of motivation differ for intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Job satisfaction had no significant effect on neither intrinsic motivation nor extrinsic motivation, and the only variable regarding feedback that resulted in any significant effect was unfavourable feedback which had a positive effect towards extrinsic motivation. In contrast, work-life balance presented a negative effect on extrinsic motivation, whilst organizational commitment had a positive significant effect on both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Conclusively intrinsic motivation was affected by organizational commitment only, whilst extrinsic motivation was positively affected by organizational commitment and source availability, and negatively affected by work-life balance. We believe that it was interesting that organizational commitment was the independent variable that had a significant effect on both dependent variables since it is somewhat in contrast to an earlier study where Stewart et al., (2017) have found that Millennials are less susceptible to commit to their organizations, however their study did not examine the connection to motivation.

One additional finding that we thought was interesting was that unfavourable feedback was the only type of feedback that had a positive effect on motivation since Audia and Locke (2003, p. 642) argue that unfavourable or negative feedback is more difficult to both give and receive. It was also a surprise to discover that job satisfaction had no significant effect on motivation at all since Agarwal and Sajid (2017, p. 124) argue that people perform better when satisfied at work. To conclude, the purpose of the study has been realised where we have examined what is affecting the motivation of working Millennials in Sweden. However, not all factors that we thought would have an impact was consistent with previous research which could be a result from cultural differences or other contextual reasons such as having an underrepresentation of children within the household among the sample or an overrepresentation of younger Millennials.
7.2 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Previous studies have shown that Millennials have different requirements in an organizational setting than prior generations. For example, Stewart et al., (2017, p. 50) and Thompson and Gregory (2012, p. 238) argue that there has been a shift in motivational characteristics, hence we wanted to examine how to motivate Millennials working in Sweden. Thereby we have in our revised conceptual model showed our findings where it is found that organizational commitment where the only factor that had a positive effect on both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, whilst job satisfaction, favourable feedback, and source availability showed no significance on either one. That favourable feedback did not have any significant effect on motivation might be for the reason that Millennials are so used to be praised (Stein, 2013, p. 3) that they take it for granted. The finding that job satisfaction did not affect motivation was surprising considering that Kaifi et al., (2012, p. 91) found that Millennials score higher on job satisfaction in comparison to prior generations. Unfavourable feedback showed a positive effect on extrinsic motivation, whilst work-life balance, on the other hand, had a negative effect on extrinsic motivation, which was a very interesting finding considering that we thought in advance that it would be the opposite.

Consequently, we have contributed to existing literature with further knowledge regarding what leads to intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation among employed Millennials, hence we have created a base with quantitative findings in a field where most qualitative research has been made. As a result, we have contributed to the research gap stated in the introductory chapter, where it was argued that further quantitative research was needed (Deal et al., 2010, p. 191; Levenson, 2010, p. 263). This base has also contributed to more research regarding the generation of Millennials overall which is a relatively new field, hence could facilitate to make the research about it more nuanced with more views. As we also have stated previously, most peer reviewed articles and studies that we have examined have been conducted in mostly Anglo-Saxon countries (Ertas, 2015; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Kaifi et al., 2012; Levenson, 2010; Ng et al., 2010; Stewart et al., 2017), thus we have further contributed to more knowledge regarding what is motivating Millennials employed in Sweden, which has been shown from our sample to differ in comparison to previous studies.

Furthermore, considering that we found that our multiple regression analyses showed that both our models were weak with a low adjusted R², we have further contributed with theoretical insights regarding that it is needed further research about what could be affecting the motivation of Millennials. As a result, one can argue that further qualitative research could be needed in Sweden in order to determine what other independent variables could be more appropriate to examine when discussing the motivation of Millennials and then conduct a quantitative research in order to test those findings.

7.3 PRACTICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

7.3.1 Societal considerations

Millennials have, as earlier mentioned in the problem background, been described with less flattering characteristics as disloyal, needy and entitled (Ertas, 2015, p. 404; Thompson & Gregory, 2012) and these factors could probably make it difficult to match the wish from organizations regarding their employees. With this study, we have contributed additional knowledge whether or not these attributes have been met or not in
regard to if our independent variables are contributing to Millennials motivation. With that said, this thesis contributes with some further knowledge regarding how to actually motivate this needy group, which has been argued to be difficult for managers. One can argue that work diversity is important for organizations in order to be creative and effective, thus it is important not to neglect this upcoming workforce but rather understand their needs and take advantage of that. Furthermore, since Millennials are being described with this less flattering stereotype we wanted to shine a light on motivation in order to eliminate the risk of creating a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Overall it is important to highlight the contribution of further knowledge regarding generations since stereotypes do not always fit the actual case. One should also note that in Sweden we are trying to be as equal as possible regarding gender, nationality, religion and so forth, trying not to focus on their stereotypes, thus the stereotype regarding age and generation should be treated likewise in our opinion. Moreover, this thesis has contributed with implications for the ones who are going to teach the new generation and ensure that they have the right tools for doing this in order to be able to facilitate for Millennials to use their full potential. Organizational commitment was the only variable that had a positive impact on both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, hence Millennials might value the feeling of belonging and being emotionally engaged in organizations. Furthermore, this could have implications for more groups than just businesses. It could be beneficial for older colleagues to know more about their younger colleagues in order to create a functional environment. Since the generations changes all the time the education has to follow up to that and then decision-makers have to be aware of these changes. In addition to that, older generations overall obtain information about the younger generation which simplify for them understand Millennials and not base their beliefs on stereotypes only. As earlier mentioned in the problem background, the Millennials are often described with negative attributes and if one wants to fully utilize the human capital people need to gain better knowledge in order to make a difference between facts and stereotypes. Mental illness is further becoming more and more common and keeping people motivated could be a solution to prevent that, hence another important societal contribution of this study.

7.3.2 Managerial contributions
The main contribution of this research is probably from the perspective of managers, which has been of our interest considering that we both are enrolled in Master’s program in Management. Managers get through this study implications for how to treat this new workforce called Millennials to make them live out to their full potential. It is important for managers to be aware of how to motivate all their employees and see if there is something they need to change now when the majority of the workforce soon is going to be members from the generation of Millennials. Moreover, they get a possibility to adapt their organization in a way that fits Millennials in order to avoid unnecessary turnover. For example, considering that organizational commitment showed a positive effect on both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation among Millennials, managers should consider this factor and find out how to increase it. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, affective organizational commitment for example could be increased by empowering leadership (Kim & Beehr, 2018, p. 17). Moreover, Millennials seem to increase their extrinsic motivation by receiving unfavourable feedback, thus managers should create an honest working environment where employees trust them enough to receive the unfavourable feedback. In addition, as earlier mentioned in the theoretical framework intrinsic motivation is more important in the long run whilst extrinsic is more
transiently, hence managers could get a clue of what to focus on depending on what outcome they seek to create. A better understanding of Millennials could also help to shape the cooperation and teamwork at organizations with workforce diversity such as varying ages among the employees and have motivated employees overall.

As also mentioned in the theoretical framework, motivation is very important in order to create a more effective performance and that is probably more important than ever since it seems to be a problem with higher turnover intentions among Millennials than earlier generations. It is probably not a surprise that the ability to create motivation among the employees is a crucial factor if one seeks to be a successful organization. Furthermore, considering that it is argued that a new generation called GenZ is already slowly becoming part of the newest workforce, managers of organizations worldwide would have the advantage to understand the Millennials before starting to understand generations to come. Additionally, if managers succeed to motivate Millennials and hopefully keep them longer within the organizations, they will be a very valuable resource motivating the upcoming generation to become a great one too.

7.4 LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

First of all, this study is limited to Millennials working in Sweden and organizational behaviour could, of course, differ among cultures. As a consequent, future research should be conducted in other environments. Furthermore, this study is limited to just a snapshot of our population that is included in this research since we used a snow-ball sampling method, which is difficult to control and does not count as a probability sample. However, as discussed in the empirical findings chapter, the demographics of the sample includes a differentiated group of respondents. Since some Millennials are still in education, most earlier research has been conducted on studying Millennials or focused on generational differences in specific industries, and for all we know this is the first quantitative study focusing on working Millennials in Sweden and the factors affecting their motivation. We therefore believe that more research has to be made and should probably focus more in detail on the different motivational factors of Millennials working in Sweden considering that our B- unstandardized coefficient values of the multiple regression analyses were weak, hence the independent variables could be changed in order to have a stronger model with more significant results. For example, further research on the different parts of work-life balance with regard to flexibility, telecommuting, and responsibility separately could be of advantage instead of clustering it into one index. Moreover, one should focus on whether intrinsic motivation or extrinsic motivation is more important to the Millennials and have a greater impact on them in order to better understand their main drives if they, for example, are more eager to work for money than for their personal beliefs.

In a new field like this, all research can be count as good research but further limitations with this study are that we did not obtain any deeper understanding of the factors behind the variables included, consequently a mixed method study could be beneficial for future research. With the position of critical realism, we are aware of that the findings are more than we see (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 136) considering that our study is a snapshot of a large population. Hence, with a mixed method study one could receive more views on the topic, hence we believe that future research could address this issue. This can be done by
first interviewing Millennials regarding their motivation and then testing those themes, in
that way one can obtain more applicable variables to test. On the other hand, it could be
fruitful with a qualitative part after a survey, in order to gain a deeper understanding of
how organizational commitment affects motivation for example.

Another limitation with our study is that our questionnaire was distributed in English,
with regards to that all Millennials working in Sweden might not be understanding
Swedish, whereas most Swedish people are having a base knowledge of English.
However, some people might have experienced problems with the language and dropped
out without finishing the questionnaire. Also, even if we argue that the questions in the
questionnaire was not that sensitive it can have created a feeling of dissatisfaction from
people who are not having the feeling of having their “dream job” hence, it is always the
risk of people trying to persuade themselves that they are having other feelings that they
actually have by answering in a biased way. Conclusively more research could be
conducted on both motivational factors per se, since according to our model there are a
lot more variables that could affect motivation. Additionally, further research could
examine and describe the differences between older and younger Millennials, in order to
prepare organizations for future upcoming generations and their organizational
behaviour. In today’s environment where technology develops in a rapid pace the human
will probably too, and then everyone needs to be prepared for it in order to create
successful businesses where everyone is hopefully having the will to perform their best.

Lastly there are some possibilities and limitations of research related to our thesis topic
of Millennials and motivation. First of all, fairly little research is conducted in Sweden,
and as mentioned earlier generations could differ among cultures, thus further research
could be made in Sweden on Millennials overall in addition to an organizational setting.
Furthermore, as mentioned in the problem background there is a new generation that is
upcoming that may be more interesting to investigate in the future, and we argue that
Millennials and GenZ are more similar in consideration to the technology development.
This is a possibility for future research to examine more in depth, however, it is a
limitation of research related to Millennials considering that it may experience less
attention since it may be more interesting to investigate GenZ, both for researchers and
managers. However, one could investigate whether or not they are different by conducting
either in depth interviews or conducting a quantitative survey for measuring the
differences, which also should be of interest among companies to be included such as
case studies in order to understand their employees’ needs. Secondly, motivation as a
topic is very limited considering that it has been broadly covered and has been discussed
for many years. As a consequent, we believe that it would not be interesting to conduct
research about what motivation is, however, motivational factors at a workplace or other
contextual settings is always interesting to examine, and especially with a focus on
managerial implications considering that motivation is argued to be one of the most
important factors regarding job performance of the employees.
8. QUANTITATIVE QUALITY/TRUTH CRITERIA

This last chapter of the thesis will present our quality/truth criteria that we have focused on in order to have a high quality of the thesis. We will first describe the reliability of the study before defining the validity and lastly finish with the potentials of replication. By making this evaluation, one can understand the credibility of our study.

Bryman and Bell (2015, p. 49) argue that there are three criteria of importance that should be evaluated in business and management research, namely; reliability, validity, and replication. We have therefore taken these criteria into consideration when planning and writing this thesis in order to increase the quality and credibility throughout this writing process. As a consequence, we will further describe in detail how we have taken these three criteria into consideration separately when conducting our study and writing this thesis.

8.1 RELIABILITY

It is important for us as researchers to present the reliability of our study in order to describe the quality of our thesis. The reliability describes whether or not other researchers could replicate the study or if the results of the study would be consistent if it was to be conducted again with the same data collection techniques and the analytical procedures taken (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 192). It is further argued that reliability is more of importance when conducting quantitative studies in business research (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 49). There are various threats that could damage the reliability of a study. One threat is called participant error, which may occur if the participant’s performance is being altered by any factors (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 192). In order to prevent this threat in our study was to publish the questionnaire online where the participants chose themselves if they wanted to respond or not in addition to choosing when they wanted to respond. Secondly, participant bias can be a threat when participants of a study can elicit false responses as a result of external factors (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 192). In our study, we did not take any information from the respondents that could reveal the identity of the individuals, which we believe contributes to higher reliability considering that the respondents have full anonymity, hence it facilitates for true responses.

Internal reliability is further needed to be discussed considering that we have in our study used multiple-indicator measures when asking several questions which have been clustered into one index providing an overall score (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 168). Internal reliability concerns if the items chosen to measure are measuring what we intend them to, hence not having a lack of coherence if they would not relate to the same thing (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 168). As earlier mentioned, we chose to use the statistical tool of Cronbach’s alpha in order to calculate the internal consistency of our study. It is argued that the alpha coefficient should be $>0.7$ for researchers to state that the items are measuring the same thing, where the value is between 0 and 1 (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 430). Both of our dependent variables; intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation had a value of $>0.7$, thus we could conclude that the questions asked in the questionnaire had an internal consistency. Unfortunately, one of our independent variables, work-life balance, had an initial alpha coefficient value of 0.656 which would damage the internal consistency of the index. As a consequence, we needed to exclude two questions which lowered the value of Cronbach’s alpha aiming to have a value higher than 0.7 in order to have an internal consistency. Nonetheless, our five additional independent variables; job
satisfaction, organizational commitment, favourable feedback, unfavourable feedback and source availability had all an alpha coefficient value of > 0.8, which indicates strong internal consistency.

Lastly, stability is one important reliability factor, which is depending on that the measures have a high correlation from one period of time to another later period of time (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 168). In our study, we will not have the possibility to examine whether or not the stability of our measures is acceptable or not due to two important reasons. Firstly, due to time limitation of our thesis, we will not be able to perform a test-retest method in order to measure the correlation between two different occasions. Secondly, considering that we included a non-probability sample in our study we could not find the same sample from the first observation in order to make a second observation, thus we are aware that our reliability of the study is somewhat reduced as a consequence.

8.2 VALIDITY

One should, in addition to reliability, also consider the validity of the research in order to state whether or not the quality of the research could be perceived as valuable (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 193). Validity indicates how well a measure is reflecting its unobservable construct (Ping, 2004, p. 130), and it can be identified in various forms. Firstly, internal validity concerns about the issue of how a conclusion that covers the causal relationship between two or more measures, which often are the independent and dependent variables, actually can be confirmed (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 50). In our study, we conducted the two regression analyses where we examined the causality between the independent variables to our dependent variables in order to detect whether or not we could support or not support our hypotheses that they would have an impact. By doing so, we easily could examine the causality of the various variables and how much of the variance in the dependent variables, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, could be described of the independent variables. Unfortunately, both regressions had low adjusted $R^2$ value, hence only a small part of the variance in the dependent variables could be described of our independent variables.

Content validity addresses the issue when using a questionnaire of how well the measurement device provides acceptable coverage of the analytical questions (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 429). Face validity is when the researcher has to consider whether or not the measurement device is making sense, hence will be correctly understood by the respondents (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 451). Furthermore, when constructing our questionnaire, we did first a careful literature search of previous studies that measured the same variables we wanted to measure. Secondly, we tried to adopt to the largest extent possible the questions that the researchers had used and when needed we adapted some of the questions in order to facilitate for the respondents. Additionally, we searched for studies that had successes regarding their measurements, hence we wanted appropriate questions to ask in order to have high content validity. Lastly, by meeting the criteria of face validity, we run a pilot study of our questionnaire that was answered by ten participants who gave us feedback about uncertainties or language errors in order to have the opportunity to make changes before publishing our questionnaire to the respondents of the study.

Another form of validity is construct validity which concerns whether or not the researcher can make conclusions based on the results of a study related to the constructs
intended to be measured, hence trusting that the questions asked is measuring the presence of the variables one intended them to measure (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 430). Furthermore, it is argued that researchers with a quantitative research design are encouraged to deduce hypotheses from theories relevant to the domain (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 171). In our questionnaire, we have carefully considered which previous studies that had the most appropriate questions and that they were easy to understand measuring only one construct at the time. Additionally, our hypotheses are the results based on previous theories that are addressing what is motivating both Millennials in addition to employed Millennials, hence one can perceive it as increasing the validity of the study.

Lastly, external validity is concerned with how the findings of the study can be generalized outside the specific research context (Bryman & Bell, 2015, pp. 50-51). Furthermore, ecological validity is a form of external validity, which is involved with how the theoretical contribution of collected data is reflecting the everyday life of respondents (Graziano & Raulin, 2013, p. 181). As earlier mentioned in the practical method chapter, we cannot state that our empirical findings can be generalizable for all working Millennials in Sweden. Considering that we conducted a snowball sample, hence a non-probability sample, we cannot for sure state that our findings would be the same if we would publish the survey once again among other respondents. Furthermore, considering that we have not been able to define our population regarding how many employed Millennials there are in Sweden, we cannot say that our sample is an appropriate group of respondents. Nevertheless, despite the fact that we had both time and cost limitations, we managed to reach many working Millennials around in Sweden through social media which we believe can contribute to trustworthy results.

### 8.3 Replication

When the circumstances are appropriate, researchers may want to replicate studies for different reasons to investigate if the findings appear to be the same, and for that to be possible the research procedure has to be spelled out in great detail in order to facilitate for other researchers to copy the process (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 50). One reason to why a researcher wants to replicate a study could, for instance, be that one has difficulties to believe that the findings are true (Graziano & Raulin, 2013, p. 44), but according to Bryman and Bell (2015, p. 50) replication is quite rare within business research. However, in a quantitative study like ours, it is important to stay as objective as possible in order to make a replication possible (Bryman & Bell, 2015, p. 176). Hence, the researcher should be transparent and clear in the description regarding choices of everything from literature search to measurement and data analysis procedures in contemplation of increasing the possibility of replication (Graziano & Raulin, 2013, p. 194).

Considering our study, we have aimed to be as thorough as desirable when describing why we have chosen specific research methods, in addition, to argue why they have been more appropriate to our study in comparison with other alternatives. Furthermore, by having a detailed explanation of the procedures regarding the construction and collection of the data of our survey, we have further facilitated for the possibility of replication by explaining the population and sample of the study, and where we found inspiration to the questions asked. We have also included all sources that we have used in order to simplify the search for information needed when examining where we have taken inspiration. We believe that the fact that we adapted questions from earlier studies in our questionnaire makes it more replicable and that is also one of the reasons for the comprehensive
description of how we adapted the questions. Even so, there is a problem regarding our sampling method, since we used a non-probability sample there is a small chance that a replication would reach the exact same respondents. Instead, we were comprehensive in our presentation of the demographics of the respondents so that there should not be any misunderstanding of the representation of the population. Furthermore, since we were not dependent on a specific outcome of the research, it made it more possible to stay objective and not be biased in the interpretations. Conclusively we argue that we have done everything that we could have done to make this research replicable.
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APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

Motivation among Millennials

Hello,
We are two students from Umeå university enrolled at the master’s programme in management. We are currently writing our master’s thesis and it would be very helpful if you wanted to help us with our study. This survey is constructed in order to help us answer what is motivating the new Swedish workforce of Millennials (people born between 1980-1995), which is our purpose of the thesis.

The survey includes 78 questions and is divided into seven parts starting with general information about you and then questions regarding intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, work-life balance, organizational commitment and feedback. The questionnaire should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

If you are born between 1980 and 1995 and are employed in Sweden at a minimum of 80% we would be very thankful if you took some time to answer these questions. All responses will of course be kept anonymous. If you have any questions or are curious for the results, do not hesitate to contact us. We would like to thank you in advance for answering our survey and helping us with our thesis.

Since you give something to us, we want to give something as well and therefore we will give 2 kr to BRIS for every approved respondent in order to support their great work helping the next generations and get even more awesome!

Thank you and best regards,
Rebecka Junghagen & Hanna Fonsberg
Rebecka.junghagen@gmail.com
Hannaaforsberg@gmail.com
*Obligatorisk

Demographics
In this section we want to know more about you and your occupation. Please choose one answer that fits you the best.

Age

   - Born earlier than 1980  Fortsätt till Thank you.
   - Born between 1980-1987  Fortsätt till Thank you.
   - Born later than 1995  Fortsätt till Thank you.

Occupation

   - Student  Fortsätt till Thank you.
   - Employment 79% or less  Fortsätt till Thank you.
   - Employment 80% or more

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1/sMU6XE3yp0RLDQe44T5lZaYC71C5pL8oAJRmSnSFO4/edit  1/13
3. Is your employment in Sweden? *
Markera endast en oval.
- No  Fortsätter till Thank you.
- Yes

Further demographics

4. Gender *
Markera endast en oval.
- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say

5. Current marital status *
Markera endast en oval.
- Single, never married
- Partner
- Married
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed

6. Are there children in your household? *
Markera endast en oval.
- Yes
- Part-time
- No

7. Level of education *
Markera endast en oval.
- Elementary school (Grundskola)
- Secondary school (Gymnasium)
- Post-secondary education (Eftergymnasial utbildning)
- Other

8. Working in sector *
Markera endast en oval.
- Private sector
- Public sector
- Not-for-profit sector

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1vSMUXZH3yp9LQv4fTKLZvYC27C5joLu8AjRnt5SNg7O4/edit
9. I have been employed in total for *
   Markera endast en oval.
   ○ Less than 1 year
   ○ 1-4 years
   ○ 5-9 years
   ○ 10 years or more

Intrinsic motivation
In this section we want to know what is motivating you at your workplace from within. Please choose one answer that fits you the best.

I enjoy...

10. ... tackling problems that are completely new to me *
    Markera endast en oval.

    1  2  3  4  5  6
    Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

11. ... trying to solve complex problems *
    Markera endast en oval.

    1  2  3  4  5  6
    Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

12. ... trying to solve a problem the more difficult it is *
    Markera endast en oval.

    1  2  3  4  5  6
    Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

13. ... figure things out for myself *
    Markera endast en oval.

    1  2  3  4  5  6
    Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

14. ... doing work that is so absorbing that I forget about everything else *
    Markera endast en oval.

    1  2  3  4  5  6
    Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree
15. ... relatively simple, straightforward tasks *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □ □ Strongly agree

I want...

16. ... my work to provide me with opportunities for increasing my knowledge and skills *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □ □ Strongly agree

17. ... to find out how good I really can be at my work *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □ □ Strongly agree

18. ... to set my own goals in order to be more comfortable *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □ □ Strongly agree

It is important to me...

19. ... to be enjoying what I do *
    Markera endast en oval.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □ □ Strongly agree

20. ... to have an outlet for self-expression *
    Markera endast en oval.

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □ □ Strongly agree
21. **... to be able to do what I most enjoy**
*Markera endast en oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. **Curiosity is the driving force behind much of what I do**
*Markera endast en oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. **I prefer work I know I can do well over work that stretches my abilities**
*Markera endast en oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. **No matter what the outcome of a project, I am satisfied if I feel I gained a new experience**
*Markera endast en oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extrinsic motivation**

In this section we want to know what is motivating you at your workplace from external factors. Please choose one answer that fits you the best.

**I am strongly motivated by...**

25. **... the money I can earn**
*Markera endast en oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. **... by the recognition I can earn**
*Markera endast en oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. ... doing better than other people *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

28. ... earning something for what I do *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

29. ... working on projects with clearly specified procedures *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

30. ... having someone set clear goals for me in my work *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

I am keenly aware...

31. ... of the promotion goals I have for myself *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

32. ... of the income goals I have for myself *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

33. I want other people to find out how good I really can be at my work from other people *
   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree
34. I seldom think about salary and promotions *
   *Markets end stage on oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree ☐

35. As long as I can do what I enjoy, I'm not that concerned about exactly what I'm paid *
   *Markets end stage on oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree ☐

36. I believe that there is no point in doing a good job if nobody else knows about it *
   *Markets end stage on oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree ☐

37. I'm concerned about how other people are going to react to my ideas *
   *Markets end stage on oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree ☐

38. I'm less concerned with what work I do than what I get for it *
   *Markets end stage on oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree ☐

39. I am not that concerned about what other people think of my work *
   *Markets end stage on oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree ☐

Job satisfaction
In this section we want to know how satisfied you are with your job. Please choose one answer that fits you the best.

40. I find real enjoyment in my job *
   *Markets end stage on oval.*

   1 2 3 4 5 6
   Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree ☐
41. I believe that I like my job better than the average worker does *
Mark a response on the oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

42. I am seldom bored with my job *
Mark a response on the oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

43. I would not consider taking another job *
Mark a response on the oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

44. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job *
Mark a response on the oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

45. I feel well satisfied with my job. *
Mark a response on the oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

Work-life balance
In this section we want to know how pleased you are with your work-life balance. Please choose one answer that fits you the best.

46. I work to live, I don’t live to work. I won’t be happy at work unless I’m happy in my social life *
Mark a response on the oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

47. I am satisfied with the work/life balance I have achieved *
Mark a response on the oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1vEUxZH3px9L4kCv044TkJL2zvYCY7C5joLaBAJRez3KSNbTO4/edit
48. I am working with something that fits in with my domestic life
   * Markera endast en oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | Strongly agree |

49. My family and my outside interests are very important
   * Markera endast en oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | Strongly agree |

50. I want to find a balance between hard work and family life
   * Markera endast en oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | Strongly agree |

51. I am only working standard office hours
   * Markera endast en oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | Strongly agree |

52. After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I would like to do
   * Markera endast en oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | Strongly agree |

53. My work takes up time I would like to spend with family/friends
   * Markera endast en oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | Strongly agree |

54. On the job I have so much work that it detracts from my personal interests
   * Markera endast en oval.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | Strongly agree |

Organizational commitment
In this section we want to know how committed you are to your organization. Please choose one answer that fits you the best.

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1sMUxZH3prXDQs4tTKLZeYCY7C5jeL8AjRmskSNdTO4/edit
55. If the values of this organization were different, I would not be as attached to this organization
Markets endest en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. Since joining this organization, my personal values and those of the organization have become more similar
Markets endest en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. The reason I prefer this organization to others is because of what it stands for, its values
Markets endest en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. My attachment to this organization is primarily based on the similarity of my values and those represented by the organization
Markets endest en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. What this organization stands for is important to me
Markets endest en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this organization
Markets endest en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for
Markets endest en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. I feel a sense of "ownership" for this organization rather than being just an employee *
Mark: endcast en oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

63. Unless I'm rewarded for it some way, I see no reason to expend extra effort on behalf of
this organization *
Mark: endcast en oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

64. How hard I work for the organization is directly linked to how much I am rewarded *
Mark: endcast en oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

65. My private views about this organization are different from those I express publicly *
Mark: endcast en oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

66. In order for me to get rewarded around here, it is necessary to express the right attitude *
Mark: endcast en oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

Feedback
In this section we want to know your opinions regarding feedback. Please choose one answer that fits
you the best. If you do not have a supervisor, please consider your closest source of feedback instead.

Favourable feedback

67. When I do a good job at work, my supervisor praises my performance *
Mark: endcast en oval.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Strongly disagree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Strongly agree

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1vMUxZH3p0RDL4bvM4TKL2vYC7C5jeLu6AJRmkSNF/TFQ/edit
68. I seldom receive praise from my supervisor *
Markera endast en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. I frequently receive positive feedback from my supervisor *
Markera endast en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfavourable feedback

70. When I don’t meet deadlines, my supervisor lets me know *
Markera endast en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. My supervisor tells me when my work performance does not meet organizational standards *
Markera endast en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72. On those occasions when I make a mistake at work, my supervisor tells me. *
Markera endast en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source availability

73. My supervisor is usually available when I want performance information *
Markera endast en oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
74. My supervisor is too busy to give me feedback *

   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  Strongly agree

75. I have little contact with my supervisor *

   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  Strongly agree

76. The only time I receive performance feedback from my supervisor is during my performance review *

   Markera endast en oval.

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly disagree  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  Strongly agree

Fortsatt till Thank you for your participation!

Thank you for your participation!

We appreciate that you took your time to answer this survey. Have a nice day!

Sluta fylka i det här formuläret.

Thank you

You are unfortunately not part of the population we seek to examine but thank you for your participation!
## APPENDIX 2: MULTICOLLINEARITY TEST

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
<td>0,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>0,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source availability</td>
<td>0,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
<td>0,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>0,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source availability</td>
<td>0,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0,653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Work-life balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
<td>0,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>0,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source availability</td>
<td>0,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Organizational commitment
### Coefficients

#### Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source availability</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source availability</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>1.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>1.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>1.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Favourable feedback*

#### Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source availability</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source availability</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>1.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>1.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>1.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>1.708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Unfavourable feedback*

#### Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source availability</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>1.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>1.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable feedback</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable feedback</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Source availability*