

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Long-Term Reward Patterns Contribute to Personal Goals at
Work Among Finnish Managers**

**Hyvönen, K., Räikkönen, E., Mauno, S., Dragano, N., Matthewman,
L.J. and Feldt, T.**

This is an author's accepted manuscript of an article published in the Journal of Career Development, July 21, 2016 0894845316659699. The final definitive version will be available online at:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0894845316659699>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

Journal of Career Development

Long-term Reward Patterns Contribute to Personal Goals at Work among Finnish Managers

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>Journal of Career Development</i> |
| Manuscript ID | JCD-2015-0171.R1 |
| Manuscript Type: | Empirical |
| Keywords: | resources, rewards, personal work goals, career stability, promotions, managers |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Submitted on the 29th of April, 2016

Long-term Reward Patterns Contribute to Personal Goals at Work among
Finnish Managers

Abstract

The research addresses the impact of long-term reward patterns on contents of personal work goals among young Finnish managers ($N = 747$). Reward patterns were formed on the basis of perceived and objective career rewards (i.e., career stability and promotions) across four measurements (years 2006 –2012). Goals were measured in 2012 and classified into categories of competence, progression, well-being, job change, job security, organization, and financial goals. The factor mixture analysis identified a three-class solution as the best model of reward patterns: *High rewards* (77%); *Increasing rewards* (17%); and *Reducing rewards* (7%). Participants with *Reducing rewards* reported more progression, well-being, job change and financial goals than participants with *High rewards* as well as fewer competence and organizational goals than participants with *Increasing rewards*. Workplace resources can be in a key role in facilitating goals towards building competence and organizational performance.

Keywords: resources, rewards, personal work goals, career stability, promotion, managers

Long-term Reward Patterns Contribute to Personal Goals at Work among
Finnish Managers

Resources in the work environment are crucial factors in determining positive employee and organizational outcomes (e.g., Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014; Hobfoll, 2011; Tsutsumi & Kawakami, 2004). Resources can be necessary in sustaining resilience and engagement of employees in modern work environments in which resource pools are often characterized by loss (Hobfoll, 2011). For instance, low resources in terms of rewards have been found to be particularly disadvantageous among managers (Peter & Siegrist, 1997). The present study utilizes the effort-reward imbalance model (the ERI model; Siegrist, 1996; Siegrist et al., 2004) to investigate the contribution of societal rewards in the work environment on pursuit of personal work goals. Personal work goals can provide a fresh perspective as an outcome of rewards since they describe employees' future-oriented, work-related aspirations (e.g., Hyvönen, Feldt, Kinnunen, & Tolvanen, 2009; Hyvönen, Feldt, Tolvanen, & Kinnunen, 2010; Grant, Little, & Phillips, 2007). Personal work goals can give an indication how employees are adjusting to the changing work contexts that require greater individual agency, adaptability, and proactivity (e.g., Briscoe & Hall, 2006; Inkson, 2006).

The reward component of the ERI model, which describes employees' perceptions of esteem, career opportunities and job security at the workplace (Siegrist et al., 2004), has shown to be a particularly significant contributor on the contents of personal work goals and more significant than the effort component (Hyvönen et al., 2010). Higher rewards associated with goals related to organizational performance (Hyvönen et al., 2010) and an increase in rewards associated with engaging with goals related to competence and organizational performance in a two-year follow-up study (Hyvönen, Feldt, Kinnunen, & Tolvanen, 2011). A decrease in rewards, in turn, was associated with becoming engaged in

goals related to finding a new job or disengaging from goals related to competence. For this reason, the present study focuses on the rewards of the ERI model.

The present four-wave, six-year study adds to previous research by investigating – in addition to the long-term contribution of perceived rewards – also objective self-reported career rewards (career stability and promotions). A further contribution of the research is that a mixed methods approach (e.g., Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007) is utilized including advanced statistical methods (person- and variable-centered analyses) and thematic categorization of participants' responses to an open-ended question on their work goals. We examine the development of rewards during the study period in a general level and therefore Factor Mixture Analysis (FMA) was chosen since the development in rewards is not assumed to follow a functional form with respect to time (see Lanza & Collins, 2006). Labor market changes can be reflected in the career line of the participants and this approach can identify groups characterized by different perceived rewards and career events (i.e., the absence of events, the presence of events and anything in between).

Societal Rewards in the Work Environment and Career Events

Siegrist (1996) developed the occupational stress model of effort–reward imbalance (the ERI model) which is based on reciprocal principles of costs and gains in the workplace. Employees invest effort in order to meet the demands and responsibilities at work, such as interruptions, work load, and overtime. In return of their efforts at work, employees expect rewards such as money, esteem, job security, and career opportunities. The lack of reciprocity is described by the imbalance of effort and reward at work. Detrimental imbalance (high effort with low reward) might occur in situations when employees have fewer employment options (e.g., due to skills deficits or a poor job market), but also when an employee has strategic ambitions, such as career progression (Siegrist et al., 2004). The present study focuses on the reward component of the ERI model since it has shown strongest

relationship with changes in personal work goals (Hyvönen et al., 2011). Lower rewards have been associated also with lower professional autonomy (Siegrist et al., 2010), higher turnover intentions and lower work engagement (Kinnunen et al., 2008).

A notable contribution of the present study is that self-reported, actual career rewards are taken into account which can also impact on personal work goals. For instance, participants with career disruptions (e.g., lay-offs) were more likely to focus on personal work goals related to job security in a previous cross-sectional study (Hyvönen et al., 2009). Previous studies indicate that different types of career instability (e.g. unemployment spells, lay-offs) relates negatively to employees' health and well-being and may also bear negative consequences for career-related motivation (e.g., Friedland & Price, 2003; Mauno, Feldt, Tolvanen, Hyvönen, & Kinnunen, 2011). Furthermore, a lack of promotions might be crucial in managers, the group we study, because they are often highly committed to their work and career (Feldt, Hyvönen, Mäkikangas, Kinnunen, & Kokko, 2009). Because personal goals reflect contextual demands and an individual's life situation, it is plausible that these career events are related to personal work goals. Thus, we extend the reward aspects of the ERI-model by examining career stability and promotions in relation to personal work goals.

Theory and Research on the Contents of Personal Work Goals

The construct of personal work goals in this study is derived from previous research and theory on personal action constructs (see Little, 2007). In line with Little's (2007) revised social ecological model of well-being, personal work goals can describe the employees continuous negotiation between their personal and contextual features in order to pursue the central goals in life. In line with Little's model (2007), there is an indirect effect from personal and contextual features through personal goals on outcome measures such as well-being and adaptation in addition to the direct effect of personal and contextual features on well-being.

1
2
3 The present research describes a thorough analysis of the contents of personal
4 goals related to the work context. In this six-year follow-up study, we expect to find the same
5 categories of personal work goals that were found in the baseline study in 2006 and two years
6 later in 2008 with the same sample of managers (Hyvönen et al., 2011; Hyvönen et al., 2009):
7 competence (professional development and training; 28%), career progression (promotion
8 and advancement; 21.7%), well-being (self-concerns, managing stress, job satisfaction,
9 motivation; 13.9%), and job change (finding a new job or setting up a company; 12.6%). The
10 less frequently mentioned goals related to job security (continuing working, a permanent
11 employment contract; 6.8%), organization (success and performance of the project, team,
12 department, or company; 5.1%) and to finance (pay rise, bonus; 3.6%). Similar goals have
13 been found among higher level managers ($N = 811$) in addition to prestige/influence goals
14 and career-ending goals, which described personal work goals that are typical among
15 managers in higher management positions and older in age (Huhtala, Feldt, Hyvönen, &
16 Mauno, 2013).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Unlike in previous studies in which only the most important goals have been
35 analyzed, the present research takes into account three most important self-articulated goals
36 of participants at the last measurement time in 2012. Considering an individual's various
37 goals can reveal the prevalence of the goals in the person's goal hierarchy, which can be
38 important in terms of the well-being of the employee, as well as work performance (see
39 Salmela-Aro & Nurmi, 2004). In the occupational domain, employees are navigating through
40 changing work contexts that create various opportunities and demands during their career.
41 That is, personal work goals can reflect managers' adaptive strategies, choices and
42 development in meeting the challenges and unpredictability of the modern working life
43 (Baard, Rench, & Kozlowski, 2013; Savickas et al., 2009).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Present Study and Hypotheses**

57
58
59
60

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

6

1
2
3 In modern working life, employment opportunities are less bound to the
4 organization and job prospects can be unpredictable (Savickas et al., 2009). Savickas and
5 colleagues (2009) distinguish so-called core employees who work in the organization on a
6 permanent basis. In contrast, the peripheral employees are managing multiple transitions in
7 shorter term contracts. Marginalized employees have fewer career prospects due to barriers
8 and constraints and their opportunities might be restricted to only day labor. The study period
9 of six years (years 2006–2012) has been a challenging time in the Finnish labour market. In
10 2006, the Finnish economy was still marked by strong growth but by 2008 the labour market
11 and economy were seen to have taken the turn to the worse (Lyly-Yrjänäinen, 2015). For
12 instance, lay-offs and redundancies became more common in 2009 and fewer employees
13 believed that they would find a job that matches their skills and experience if they were made
14 redundant. The rate of unemployment was the lowest in 2007 when it was 6.9% but had risen
15 to 8.4% in 2010 and has remained high (Official Statistics of Finland, 2015). It is therefore
16 possible that the participants – who at the study baseline in 2006 were all in employment –
17 have experienced lay-offs and unemployment during the 6-year study period.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 The first research question relates to whether there are distinctive long-term
37 patterns of rewards depicted through perceived rewards and career rewards (career stability
38 and promotions) during the study (2006–2012). Due to the exploratory nature of the person-
39 centered analyses, we cannot set firm hypotheses on the number of career patterns or the
40 changes in mean levels of perceived rewards or career rewards in these patterns. However,
41 we expect to find more than one long-term pattern of rewards that relate to differing levels of
42 perceived rewards and career rewards because of the heterogeneity of the sample and long
43 follow-up period. There could be a pattern that reflects unfavorable levels of perceived
44 rewards and career rewards (less career stability and fewer promotions). It is also reasonable
45 to assume that there will be a pattern that relates to favorable levels of perceived rewards and
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

7

1
2
3 career rewards since managers generally are shown to have a good level of job resources (e.g.,
4
5 Feldt et al., 2009). Because we use a longitudinal design, we are also able to examine changes
6
7 in reward patterns, and can expect that some reward patterns may reflect positive or negative
8
9 development in this heterogeneous sample, for instance, due to labor market changes.
10

11
12 The second research question focuses on investigating whether the long-term
13
14 patterns of rewards relate to contents of personal work goals that participants focus on at the
15
16 last measurement in 2012. A cross-sectional study indicated that participants with lower
17
18 rewards are more likely to focus on goals related to progression, well-being, job change, job
19
20 security or finance instead of organizational performance (Hyvönen et al., 2010). Job change
21
22 or well-being goals also related to the lowest level of occupational well-being (Hyvönen et al.,
23
24 2009; Hyvönen et al., 2010). Further evidence was received from a two-year follow-up study
25
26 with this same dataset, which showed that reducing rewards related to engaging in job change
27
28 goals (Hyvönen et al., 2011). In turn, the highest level of reward and low effort–reward
29
30 imbalance (Hyvönen et al., 2010) and better organizational culture (Huhtala et al., 2013),
31
32 associated with focusing on organizational goals in cross-sectional studies. Similarly, in a
33
34 two-year follow-up study with this sample of managers, an increase in perceived rewards
35
36 related to engaging in competence and organizational goals (Hyvönen et al., 2011).
37
38
39

40
41 Since favorable psychosocial work environments have been connected to higher
42
43 occupational well-being (e.g., Kinnunen et al., 2008), it could be that these participants have
44
45 better personal and work resources to focus on their leadership task and developing
46
47 competence. This suggestion is also in line with the conservation resource (COR) theory by
48
49 Hobfoll (e.g., 2011), according to which organizational settings can create resource
50
51 passageways through which organizational support, stability and safety can be fostered and
52
53 shared. These resource passageways can sustain, develop and promote employees'
54
55 engagement and resilience. In turn, a threat of or an actual resource loss, could instigate goal
56
57
58
59
60

reconstruction or adjustment to new contextual demands. Based on theories by Hobfoll (2011) and Little (2007), as well as previous research (Hyvönen et al., 2010; Hyvönen et al., 2011), we expect that the rewards – or lack of rewards – in the work context will be reflected in the contents of personal work goals:

H1: We expect that participants with favorable reward patterns characterized by high perceived rewards (high or increasing) and positive career rewards (career stability and more promotions) will have more goals towards competence and organization in 2012.

H2: We expect that participants with unfavorable reward patterns characterized by low perceived rewards (low or reducing) and fewer or no career rewards (i.e., more career instability and fewer promotions) will have more job change goals in 2012.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The questionnaire study was conducted with four measuring points: spring 2006 (T1), spring 2008 (T2), spring 2010 (T3), and spring 2012 (T4). The sample was selected from the membership registers of two Finnish national trade unions. The original sample consisted of 1904 members who were all younger than 36 years and whose professional title referred to management position. Questionnaires were sent to the home addresses of the participants and 933 questionnaires were returned. Of the respondents, 186 were not in management or in employment and therefore were excluded from the final sample ($N = 747$). The response rate was 43.4% in 2006 (for more detail and attrition analyses, see Hyvönen et al., 2009).

At T2 in 2008, the questionnaires could be sent to 621 participants who had participated at T1. At T1, 126 participants had indicated that they no longer wished to participate in the research and therefore they were excluded from the follow-up study at T2. At T2, 433 questionnaires were returned, which resulted in a response rate of 69.7% of the

1
2
3 available sample. That is, of the initial sample ($N = 747$) in 2006, 58.0% of participants also
4
5 responded at T2. At T3 in 2010, the questionnaires could be sent to 595 participants since 26
6
7 further participants had declined from further participation at T2. At T3, 380 questionnaires
8
9 were returned and the response rate was 63.9%. When compared to the initial sample ($N =$
10
11 747), 50.8% of participants responded at T3. At T4 in 2012, the questionnaire was sent to 575
12
13 participants since 20 further participants had indicated at T3 that they no longer wished to be
14
15 contacted. At T4, 333 participants responded, yielding a response rate of 57.9%. That is,
16
17 44.6% of the initial participants ($N = 747$) responded still at T4. Of the 333 participants at T4,
18
19 17 participants had not named a goal. Participants' age, gender, and managerial level at T1
20
21 are shown in Table 1.
22
23

24 25 Measures

26
27 **Perceived reward** was measured with the ERI scale (Effort-Reward Imbalance;
28
29 Siegrist et al., 2004). The good construct and discriminant validity of the Finnish version of
30
31 the scale has been reported previously by Kinnunen et al. (2008). The factorial group and
32
33 time invariance of the ERI scale have been supported in white-collar samples including also
34
35 the sample used in this study (Rantanen, Feldt, Hyvönen, Kinnunen, & Mäkikangas, 2013).
36
37 Reward included 11 items describing esteem (5 items, e.g., "I receive the respect I deserve
38
39 from my superiors"), career opportunities (4 items, e.g., "Considering all my efforts and
40
41 achievements, my salary/income is adequate"), and job security (2 items, e.g., "My job
42
43 security is poor"). If the respondent answered the question negatively (or affirmatively in the
44
45 item of job security), they were asked to rate the degree of distress from "not at all distressed"
46
47 to "very distressed". The scale ranged from 1 to 5: 1) Agree, 2) Disagree, and I am not at all
48
49 distressed, 3) Disagree, and I am somewhat distressed, 4) Disagree, and I am distressed, 5)
50
51 Disagree, and I am very distressed. The items were recoded so that a higher mean sum score
52
53 of reward indicates more rewards perceived at work. The Cronbach's alphas for reward
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

10

1
2
3 were .86 at T1, .90 at T2, .90 at T3, and .89 at T4. The means and standard deviations for
4
5 reward at each measurement time are shown in Table 1.

6
7 **Career stability** was explored with questions designed to gather information on
8
9 participants' experiences of unemployment or lay-offs in this study. At T1, the participants
10
11 were asked: "Have you been unemployed or laid off since your graduation?" The responses
12
13 were given on a dichotomous scale (Yes/No). At T2, T3 and T4, the participants were asked
14
15 the same question again but now covering the subsequent study phases: "Have you been
16
17 unemployed or laid off in the last two years (since Spring 2006)?" Thus, four dichotomous
18
19 variables (yes/no career stability) were formed on the basis of the four measurement points:
20
21 Career stability prior T1, Career stability T1–T2, Career stability T2–T3, and Career stability
22
23 T3–T4. The percentages of participants reporting career stability at each study phase are
24
25 shown in Table 1.
26
27

28
29 **Promotions** were asked with the question designed for this study: "Have you
30
31 been promoted in the last two years (since spring 2006)?" at T2. The same question was
32
33 presented again at T3 and T4 covering the subsequent study phases. However, promotions
34
35 were not asked at the study baseline at T1 and therefore three dichotomous variables (yes/no
36
37 promotions) were formed on the basis of the four measurement points: Promotions T1–T2,
38
39 Promotions T2–T3, and Promotions T3–T4. The percentages of participants' promotions are
40
41 shown in Table 1.
42
43

44
45 – Table 1 about here –
46

47 **Personal work goals** at T4 were asked with an open-ended question: "Write
48
49 down your personal goals that relate to your work or career in order of importance"
50
51 (Hyvönen et al., 2009; Hyvönen et al., 2010). The question was followed by three empty lines
52
53 where participants could write down their responses for personal work goals. Two
54
55 independent coders used the same seven categories of goals (competence, progression, well-
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 being, job change, job security, organization, and finance) which have been used with this
4
5 sample of participants in previous study phases (for further detail about the different stages of
6
7 coding, see Hyvönen et al., 2009). Cohen's kappa coefficients were .94, .95, and .96 for the
8
9 contents of the first, second, and third personal work goals categorized, respectively. These
10
11 kappa statistics indicated "almost perfect" strength of agreement between the coders (Landis
12
13 & Koch, 1977). The same goal categories were also found in 2006 and 2008 (Hyvönen et al.,
14
15 2009; Hyvönen et al., 2011) and no new categories emerged. For each participant, a sum
16
17 score of the number of mentions to a given goal category was computed. Theoretical range
18
19 for each of the seven sum scores was 0–3 mentions. Distributions of sum scores for each goal
20
21 category are presented in Table 2.
22
23

24
25 – Table 2 about here –
26

27 **Background variables** measured at T1 included gender (male/female),
28
29 management level (upper/middle/lower), and age in years. On the basis of a previous
30
31 longitudinal study with this sample of participants (Hyvönen et al., 2011) as well as with
32
33 another managerial sample (Huhtala, et al., 2013), these background variables related to the
34
35 personal work goals and therefore, were also controlled for in this study.
36
37

38 **Analytical Strategy**

39
40 The analyses were conducted in two phases. First, the long-term patterns of
41
42 rewards were examined using a series of Factor Mixture Analyses (FMA; Lubke & Muthén,
43
44 2005). In FMA, two types of latent variables are combined: a categorical latent variable
45
46 indicating participants' class membership and one or more continuous latent factors that
47
48 capture the covariance between observed variables. In the FMA, a repeated measures latent
49
50 class analysis model (RMLCA; Lanza & Collins, 2006) was combined with 2 continuous
51
52 common factors (1 factor for reward residuals, 1 factor for career rewards and promotions).
53
54 RMLCA enables the identification of patterns of participants who are homogenous in their
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pattern of behavior over time in reward variables. Behavior is not assumed to follow any
4
5 functional form, as for example in general growth curve mixture modeling.
6

7
8 A continuous measure of reward and categorical measures of career rewards
9
10 (career stability and promotions) were used in the FMA. Four measurements (2006, 2008,
11
12 2010, and 2012) of each of these measures were included. The FMA was based on all
13
14 available data ($N = 747$). The parameters of the RMLCA part of the FMA model are for
15
16 proportions of participants within each of the reward patterns (i.e., reward pattern
17
18 probabilities) and their distribution across the indicator variables in a reward pattern (i.e.,
19
20 means for continuous variables and conditional probabilities for categorical variables)
21
22 (Nylund, Asparouhov, & Muthen, 2007).
23

24
25 Three different criteria were used to decide the optimal number of latent classes
26
27 (Marsh, Lüdtke, Trautwein, & Morin, 2009). First, practical usefulness (i.e., number
28
29 managers in each class) and theoretical interpretativeness of the solution was considered. In
30
31 line with previous research (Marsh et al., 2009), groups comprising less than 5% of the
32
33 managers were considered as too small. Second, the goodness-of-fit of the models were
34
35 evaluated Bayesian information criterion (BIC; Schwartz, 1978), sample size adjusted BIC
36
37 (aBIC; Yang, 2006), the parametric Bootstrapped Likelihood Ratio Test (BLRT; Nylund et
38
39 al., 2007), and Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio (VLMR) test (Lo, Mendell, &
40
41 Rubin, 2001). The lower values of the information criteria indices indicate better model fit.
42
43 BLRT and VLMR p -values above 0.05 indicate a good fit of the FMA model, while values
44
45 below 0.05 indicate that the number of classes should be increased by one.
46
47
48

49
50 The third criterion for optimal number of classes was the classification quality
51
52 that can be determined by entropy and Average Latent Class Posterior Probabilities (AvePP).
53
54 The entropy illustrates the accuracy of the overall classification whereas the AvePP evaluates
55
56 how probably an observation ends up in a particular pattern. Values of entropy and AvePP
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 range from 0 to 1, with values close to 1 indicating a distinct classification (Celeux &
4
5 Soromenho, 1996). An AvePP greater than 0.7 for all groups is recommended (Nagin, 2005).
6

7
8 In the second phase, the personal work goals were classified on the basis of
9
10 content on categories identified in the study baseline in 2006 (T1). At T1, the participants'
11
12 most important personal work goals were coded into one of the seven categories based on
13
14 goal contents: competence, career progression, well-being, job change, job security,
15
16 organization, and finance. The goals varied from shorter term (e.g., finishing a project) to
17
18 long-term goals (e.g., getting promoted within the next three years).
19

20
21 To examine whether membership in the reward patterns relate to personal work
22
23 goals, regression analyses were conducted. The seven goal outcomes were analyzed
24
25 separately using the 3-step procedure implemented in Mplus (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014).
26
27 The procedure takes into account the measurement error related to the classification of
28
29 participants into the latent classes when examining the differences between reward patterns in
30
31 the goal outcomes. We chose the manual 3-step instead of using the automatic version in
32
33 conjunction with AUXILIARY function to control for gender, age, and management level.
34
35 Each goal outcome was regressed on the most likely latent class variable while fixing the
36
37 measurement error to the pre specified values determined from the FMA output. Poisson
38
39 regression was used, as the outcomes were count variables. Poisson regression analysis
40
41 models the log of the expected count of the mentions to a given goal category as a function of
42
43 the independent variables. For the ease of interpretation, regression coefficients were
44
45 presented as incident rate ratios (*IRR*) which were obtained by exponentiating the Poisson
46
47 regression coefficients. For example, for a dichotomous independent variable, the *IRR*
48
49 represents change in the estimated rate of mentions to a given goal category when the value
50
51 of the independent variable changes from 0 to 1. An *IRR* greater to one indicates how many
52
53 times greater the expected rate of mentions to a given goal category is for those participants
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for whom the value of the independent variable is 0. In contrast, an *IRR* greater than one
4
5 indicates that the expected rate of mentions to a given goal category is greater for those
6
7 participants for whom the value of the independent variable is 1. Each pattern was set by
8
9 turns as a reference group.
10

11 All analyses were conducted using the Mplus statistical package (version 7.3;
12 Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012). The method of estimation was that of full information
13 maximum likelihood with robust standard errors (MLR) implemented in Mplus. The missing
14 data analysis method (i.e., the standard missing at random approach) was used to utilize all
15 available data.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Results

23 Long-term Patterns of Rewards

24
25 Fit statistics for the estimated models of latent patterns showed that the 2-, 3- and 4-class
26 models received some support (Table 3). However, none of these three solutions received
27 consistent support from all of the fit indices. The 2-class model was supported by VLMR
28 whereas BIC supported the 3-class and aBIC the 4-class model. As BIC and aBIC have been
29 shown to be among the most effective goodness-of-fit indexes in choosing the model that best
30 recovers the sample's true parameters in mixture models (e.g., Nylund et al., 2007; Yang,
31 2006), the final decision was made between 3- and 4-class models. When comparing the
32 patterns of rewards across these two multi-class solutions, there were patterns which
33 remained consistent across the solutions and were theoretically meaningful. First, we found a
34 pattern that comprised the largest number of participants and who reported high and stable
35 perceived rewards across three the multi-class solutions. Also, the second largest pattern in
36 the three multi-class solutions was similar and described increasing perceived rewards with
37 more career stability and promotions. Finally, there was a small pattern that comprised
38 participants who had low and decreasing perceived rewards with less career stability and
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 promotions (pattern covered 6.6% of all participants in the 3-class model and 5.5% in the 4-
4
5 class model). In the 4-class model, there was another small pattern that comprised of
6
7 participants (4.7% of all participants) whose perceived rewards and career stability seemed to
8
9 be in a flux during the follow-up period. Since the 3-class model comprised a pattern that
10
11 described unfavorable trend in rewards but did not produce small patterns (comprising less
12
13 than 5% of all participants; Marsh et al., 2009) as were observed in the 4-class model, we
14
15 concluded that the interpretability of the 3-class model was better than that of the 4-class
16
17 model. Also the BIC value was the lowest for the 3-class model. Therefore, we chose the
18
19 more parsimonious 3-class model as the final model (Marsh et al., 2009).
20
21

22
23 – Table 3 about here –
24

25
26 Table 4 presents the latent patterns and the means and conditional probabilities
27
28 of the chosen 3-class model. Members of the largest pattern, *High rewards* (77%) represented
29
30 a favorable pattern of rewards. These participants typically had high, stable levels of
31
32 perceived rewards and they were more likely to have promotions at T2–T4. Members of the
33
34 second largest pattern, *Increasing rewards* (17%) represented the increasing pattern of
35
36 rewards: at T1 they had relatively low level of perceived rewards but after that, they seemed
37
38 to reach the level of perceived rewards of those in *High and stable rewards* pattern. They had
39
40 more career stability and were more likely to experience promotions between T2 and T4 than
41
42 the members of the other patterns. Members of the smallest pattern, *Reducing rewards* (7%)
43
44 represented the unfavorable pattern of rewards. They typically had low, decreasing levels of
45
46 perceived rewards throughout the study period. They had fewer promotions during the study
47
48 than the members of the other two patterns.
49
50

51
52 – Table 4 about here –
53

54
55 Results of multinomial logistic regression analysis for the association between
56
57 reward patterns and covariates (gender, age, and management level) with the MPlus indicated
58
59
60

that participants in the *High rewards* (Odds ratio = 5.20, 95% Confidence Interval [2.18; 12.37]) and *Increasing rewards* (Odds ratio = 3.05, 95% Confidence Interval [1.15; 8.09]) patterns were more likely men than women, whereas participants in the *Reducing rewards* pattern were more likely women than men. No differences between reward patterns were found in regard to management level and age.

Reward Patterns in Relation to Personal Work Goals

As seen in Table 5, participants in the *High rewards* pattern reported less goals related to Progression, Well-being, Job change and Finance than participants in the *Reducing rewards* pattern. In contrast, participants in the *Reducing rewards* pattern reported less goals related to Competence, Job security and Organization than participants in the *Increasing rewards* pattern. That is, the study hypotheses received some support since participants in the *Increasing rewards* pattern reported more goals towards competence and organization than participants in the *Reducing rewards* (H1), whereas participants in the *Reducing rewards* pattern reported more goals towards job change than participants in the *High rewards* (H2).

Furthermore, participants in the *High rewards* pattern reported less goals related to job security than participants in the *Increasing rewards*. The *IRR* for Organization between participants in *High* and *Reducing rewards* patterns was big, suggesting that participants in the *High rewards* pattern reported more goals related to Organization than participants in the *Reducing rewards*. However, the difference did not reach statistical significance since the standard error of the *IRR* was large. The large *IRR* was due to the low number of Organizational goals among participants in the *Reducing rewards* pattern.

– Table 5 about here –

Discussion

This research revealed the contribution of reward patterns on striving of personal work goals. Findings from this research offer a valuable step forwards from previous

1
2
3 studies on the relationship between career-related rewards and personal work goals by
4
5 utilizing a person-centered approach in a six-year, four wave follow-up data among young
6
7 Finnish professionals. As expected, there was heterogeneity over the follow-up period in the
8
9 levels and changes in perceived rewards and prevalence of objective career rewards (career
10
11 stability and promotions) which were represented as three long-term patterns of rewards.

14 **Favorable Career-related Resources**

15
16 It is an encouraging finding that more than 90% of participants belonged to the
17
18 reward patterns describing beneficial development of resources over the follow-up period.
19
20 The resources in these patterns were characterized by rewards that were perceived as high
21
22 and stable or increasing in esteem, professional status, salary, as well as offering good
23
24 prospects for job security and promotion. This was coupled with actual promotions reported
25
26 especially among participants with increasing rewards and fewer career disruptions during an
27
28 unstable time in the national and global labor market. Participants in these reward patterns
29
30 may represent the young managers in their early career who have reached a reasonably good
31
32 labor market position and opportunities which can facilitate career stability and progression.
33
34 The higher perceived rewards reported by the participants could be associated with better
35
36 occupational well-being, professional autonomy and physical and mental functioning as
37
38 suggested by previous studies (Kinnunen et al., 2008; Siegrist et al., 2010). These
39
40 psychological and social resources can accumulate and contribute towards “resource
41
42 caravans” in line with the COR theory by Hobfoll (2011).
43
44
45
46

47 The finding regarding more personal work goals related to job security goals
48
49 among participants with increasing rewards was intriguing. In a previous cross-sectional
50
51 study, participants with job security goals as their most important personal goal reported
52
53 favorable psychosocial work environment and the lowest level of burnout when compared to
54
55 other participants in the study baseline (Hyvönen et al., 2010). The participants with
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 increasing rewards in the present study had initially a low level of rewards and through an
4
5 increase of rewards these participants may perceive that their expectation regarding career
6
7 opportunities are met in the current work environment. Therefore, they may also consider
8
9 employment in the current organization as advantageous and are aiming to sustain it.
10

11
12 Participants with increasing rewards also reported more competence goals
13
14 which parallels the notion of the COR theory (Hobfoll, 2011) since individuals, who appear
15
16 to have a good level of resources, set personal goals to further improve their competence and
17
18 skills and meet the demands of the work tasks. The competence goals can also reflect the
19
20 challenges faced by so-called core employees who strive to sustain their position through
21
22 adapting and developing of professional skills (Savickas et al., 2009). In addition, these
23
24 participants had more goals towards organizational performance than participants with
25
26 reducing rewards. These findings are in line with the previous two-year follow-up study, in
27
28 which an increase in perceived rewards, and particularly in the career opportunities sub-scale
29
30 of rewards, was associated with engaging with competence and organizational goals as the
31
32 most important personal work goal (Hyvönen et al., 2011). These goals have also been
33
34 associated with better occupational well-being (Hyvönen et al., 2009). The present study gave
35
36 further evidence with a person-centered analysis to support the contribution of the reward
37
38 aspects of psychosocial work environment – as well as career rewards such as career stability
39
40 and promotions – on the pursue of personal work goals. For the first time, also multiple
41
42 personal work goals were investigated highlighting the importance of favorable career-related
43
44 resources in stronger orientation towards goals which can be beneficial for employee well-
45
46 being as well as for the organization.
47
48
49
50

51 **Unfavorable Changes in Career-related Resources**

52
53
54 Almost a fifth of the participants belonged to the reward pattern that reflected
55
56 unfavorable development of resources during the study with reducing perceived rewards,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 fewer promotions and more lay-offs or unemployment particularly in the aftermath of the
4 financial crisis in Europe. This combination of higher psychosocial stressors can be a notable
5 strain in the long-term on the occupational health and well-being of these participants.
6
7

8
9 Lacking rewards at work has been associated with negative well-being and health effects in
10 previous studies (Kinnunen et al., 2008; Siegrist et al., 2010). Furthermore, many studies
11 have confirmed that negative career events or unstable career are related to lowered well-
12 being and health (e.g., Friedland & Price, 2003; Mauno et al., 2011). It could be that during
13 unstable market conditions the peripheral position of some employees (Savickas et al., 2009)
14 becomes more apparent through career disruptions, for example due to fixed-term contracts,
15 and fewer possibilities to progress on career (see also Kallenberg, 2009).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Our present study adds to these consequences personal work goals. As opposed
26 to the participants with favorable reward patterns (*High rewards* and *Increasing rewards*), the
27 participants with reducing rewards had fewer personal work goals on competence, job
28 security and organization, and in turn, had more goals towards progression, job change,
29 finance and well-being. These findings are also in line with previous research in which a
30 decrease in perceived rewards related to engaging with job change goals (Hyvönen et al.,
31 2011). Job change and well-being goals were also related to lower occupational well-being in
32 the first study phase in 2006 with this sample of managers (Hyvönen et al., 2009).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 These findings are interesting from the perspective of the COR-theory (e.g.,
44 Hobfoll, 2011) since these goals can reflect the type of behaviors that managers engage in the
45 face of perceived or actual resource loss. The higher prevalence of progression, job change,
46 finance, and well-being goals can be seen as strategies to resolve and improve the person –
47 environment interaction (e.g., Little, 2007). For some of these participants, there could be
48 opportunities for progression within their current job, but also some might be more inclined
49 to move to a better position in another company. That is, the participants' goals reflected
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 focus on improving one's own labor market position and coping efforts an employee up-takes
4
5 in order to manage and adjust situational career-related events.
6

7
8 In practice, some of these participants may have only few resources available or
9 they could be using the available resources more appropriately in order to attain their salient
10 goals (see Halbesleben et al., 2014). That is, in the present study, participants with reducing
11 rewards may have fewer resources in personal life and at work to direct towards competence
12 (e.g., training) or organizational performance. If resources are reducing, it may discourage
13 further investment of resources in work-related pursuits and reinforce the loss spiral of
14 resources. As suggested by the COR theory (e.g., Halbesleben, 2014; Hobfoll, 2011),
15 management training and induction programs, especially in challenging labor market
16 conditions, could be targeted to maximize the fit between the available resources and the
17 environment. The interventions could be oriented towards providing tools and learning skills
18 to prevent further losses occurring and building resilience to persist on personal goals through
19 which participants' can develop their skills as well as focus on the success and performance
20 of their organization. In addition, rewards such as outlined in the ERI model (e.g., Siegrist,
21 1996), as well as opportunities for promotion and career stability can be important passage
22 ways through which resources can be distributed in organizations that facilitate focus on
23 employee competence and organizational performance.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Limitations and Future Directions**

44
45 Our study contains several limitations which should be acknowledged before
46 making inferences based on these findings. First, owing to the relatively small sample size in
47 the unfavorable reward pattern, our study may have suffered from limited statistical power.
48 This may have resulted in an inability to detect subtle links between latent patterns and goal
49 outcomes in Poisson regression analyses. Second, although repeated measures latent class
50 analysis provides a tool for exploring the interconnections among a set of continuous and/or
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 categorical variables, one should be cautious about attaching too much meaning to a latent
4
5 class or to a label assigned to it. Third, reward patterns and personal goals should be
6
7 investigated with a gender-balanced, larger range of employees from various fields to get a
8
9 more representative picture of different career paths and their contribution on the contents of
10
11 personal work goals also in other countries. Fourth, the study is based on questionnaire data,
12
13 and therefore, additional objective data (e.g., records of salary) should be collected in order to
14
15 avoid the limitations of self-report data and same-source bias.
16
17

18
19 In conclusion, these findings highlight how participants' rewards at work can
20
21 contribute to their personal work goals. Optimally, good opportunities for perceived, as well
22
23 as objective career rewards, such as professional status, salary, job security and promotion,
24
25 can encourage engaging in developing professional competence and focus on organizational
26
27 performance and success. These rewards can be seen as important resource passageways
28
29 (Hobfoll, 2011) promoting beneficial goal pursuit in organization that could be utilized in
30
31 organization when designing development and career programs for managers. In the long
32
33 term unfavorable reward development can instigate goal striving for changing the situation
34
35 better for oneself, for instance, through promotion, or in turn, seeking a new job opportunities
36
37 elsewhere which can have detrimental outcomes on both organizational performance as well
38
39 as employee well-being (Hyvönen et al., 2009; Hyvönen et al., 2011).
40
41
42

43 References

44
45 Asparouhov, T. & Muthén, B. (2014). Auxiliary variables in mixture modeling: Three-step
46
47 approaches using *Mplus*. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 21, 329–341.

48
49 doi:10.1080/10705511.2014.915181

50
51
52
53 Baard, S. K., Rench, T. A., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2013). Performance adaptation: A
54
55 theoretical integration and review. *Journal of Management*, 40, 48-99.

56
57 doi:10.1177/0149206313488210
58
59
60

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

22

- 1
2
3 Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. (2006). The interplay of boundaryless and protean careers:
4
5 Combinations and implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 4–18.
6
7 doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.002
8
9
- 10
11 Celeux, G., & Soromenho, G. (1996). An entropy criterion for assessing the number of
12
13 clusters in a mixture model. *Journal of Classification*, 13, 195-212. doi:
14
15 10.1007/BF01246098
16
17
- 18
19 Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods*
20
21 *research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
22
23
- 24
25 Feldt, T., Hyvönen, K., Mäkikangas, A., Kinnunen, U., & Kokko, K. (2009). Development
26
27 trajectories of Finnish managers' work ability over a 10-year follow-up period.
28
29 *Scandinavian Journal of Work Environment & Health*, 35(1), 37-47.
30
31
- 32
33 Friedland, D. S., & Price, R. H. (2003). Underemployment: consequences for the health and
34
35 well-being. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 32, 33-42.
36
37
- 38
39 Grant, A. M., Little, B. R., & Phillips, S. D. (2007). Personal projects and organizational lives.
40
41 In B. R. Little, K. SalmelaAro & S. D. Phillips (Eds.), *Personal project pursuit. Goals,*
42
43 *action, and human flourishing* (pp. 221-246). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
44
45 Associates.
46
47
- 48
49 Halbesleben, J. R. B., Neveu, J-P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014).
50
51 Getting to the “COR”: Understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources
52
53 theory. *Journal of Management*. doi: 10.1177/0149206314527130
54
55
- 56
57 Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). Conservation of resource caravans and engaged settings. *Journal of*
58
59 *Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84, 116–122. doi:10.1111/j.2044-
60

1
2
3 8325.2010.02016.x
4
5

6 Huhtala, M., Feldt, T., Hyvönen, K., & Mauno, S. (2013). Ethical organisational culture as a
7 context for managers' personal work goals. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114, 265-282.
8 doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1346-y
9
10

11
12
13
14 Hyvönen, K., Feldt, T., Kinnunen, U., & Tolvanen, A. (2011). Changes in personal work
15 goals in relation to the psychosocial work environment: A two-year follow-up study.
16 *Work & Stress*, 25, 289-308. doi:10.1080/02678373.2012.630587
17
18

19
20
21
22 Hyvönen, K., Feldt, T., Salmela-Aro, K., Kinnunen, U., & Mäkikangas, A. (2009). Young
23 managers' drive to thrive: A personal work goal approach to burnout and work
24 engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75, 183-196.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

32 Hyvönen, K., Feldt, T., Tolvanen, A., & Kinnunen, U. (2010). The role of goal pursuit in the
33 interaction between psychosocial work environment and occupational well-being.
34 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76, 406-418. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2009.10.002
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

40 Inkson, K. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers as metaphors. *Journal of Vocational
41 Behavior*, 69, 48-63. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.004
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

45 Kallenberg, A. (2009). Precarious work, insecure workers: employment relations in transition,
46 *American Sociological Review*, 74, 1-22. doi: 10.1177/000312240907400101
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

50 Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., & Mäkikangas, A. (2008). Testing the effort-reward imbalance
51 model among Finnish managers: The role of perceived organizational support. *Journal
52 of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13, 114-127. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.13.2.114
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

24

1
2
3 Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical
4
5 data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159-174.
6
7

8
9 Lanza, S. T. & Collins, L. M. (2006). A mixture model of discontinuous development in
10
11 heavy drinking from ages 18 to 30: The role of college enrollment. *Journal of Studies on*
12
13 *Alcohol*, 67(4), 552-561.
14
15

16
17 Little, B. R. (2007). Prompt and circumstance: The generative contexts of personal projects
18
19 analysis. In B. R. Little, K. Salmela-Aro & S. D. Phillips (Eds.), *Personal project pursuit.*
20
21 *Goals, action, and human flourishing* (pp. 3-49). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence
22
23 Erlbaum Associates.
24
25

26
27 Lo, Y., Mendell, N., & Rubin, D. (2001). Testing the number of components in a normal
28
29 mixture. *Biometrika*, 88, 767-778. doi: 10.1093/biomet/88.3.767
30
31

32
33 Lubke, G. & Muthén, B. (2005). Investigating population heterogeneity with factor mixture
34
35 models. *Psychological Methods*, 10, 21-39. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.10.1.21
36
37

38
39 Lyly-Yrjänäinen, M. (2015). *Työolobarometri Syksy 2014: ennakkotietoja [The working*
40
41 *conditions barometer Autumn 2014: Preview]*. Reports by the Ministry of Employment
42
43 and the Economy, 9. Retrieved from <https://www.tem.fi/files/42242/barometri.pdf>
44

45
46 Marsh, H., Ludtke, O., Trautwein, U., & Morin, A. (2009). Classical latent profile analysis of
47
48 academic self-concept dimensions: Synergy of person- and variable-centered approaches
49
50 to theoretical models of self-concept. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary*
51
52 *Journal*, 16(2), 191-225.
53
54

55
56 Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Tolvanen, A., Hyvönen, K., & Kinnunen, U. (2011). Prospective
57
58 relationships between career disruptions and subjective well-being: evidence from a
59
60

1
2
3 three-wave follow-up study among Finnish managers. *International Archives of*
4
5 *Occupational and Environmental Health*, 84, 501-512. doi: 10.1007/s00420-010-0583-6
6
7

8 Muthén, L., & Muthén, B. (1998-2012). *Mplus user's guide*. Los Angeles, California: Muthén
9
10 & Muthén.
11

12
13
14 Nagin, D. S. (2005). *Group-based modeling of development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard
15
16 University Press.
17

18
19
20 Nylund, K. L., Asparouhov, T., & Muthen, B. O. (2007). Deciding on the number of classes
21
22 in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A monte carlo simulation study.
23
24 *Structural Equation Modeling*, 14, 535-569.
25

26
27
28 Official Statistics of Finland (2015). Työvoimatutkimus 2015, huhtikuu [*Workforce Survey*
29
30 *2015, April*]. Statistics Finland. Retrieved from
31
32 http://www.tilastokeskus.fi/til/tyti/2015/04/tyti_2015_04_2015-05-27_fi.pdf
33

34
35
36 Peter, R., & Siegrist, J. (1997). Chronic work stress, sickness absence, and hypertension in
37
38 middle managers: General or specific sociological explanations? *Social Science &*
39
40 *Medicine*, 45, 1111-1120. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(97)00039-7
41

42
43
44 Rantanen, J., Feldt, T., Hyvönen, K., Kinnunen, U., & Mäkikangas, A. (2013). Factorial
45
46 validity of the effort–reward imbalance scale: evidence from multi-sample and three-
47
48 wave follow-up studies. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental*
49
50 *Health*, 86, 645-656. DOI 10.1007/s00420-012-0798-9
51

52
53
54 Salmela-Aro, K., & Nurmi, J-E. (2004). Employees' motivational orientation and well-being
55
56 at work: A person-oriented approach. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*,
57
58 17, 471-489. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534810410554498>
59
60

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

26

- 1
2
3 Savickas, M. L., Nota, L., Rossier, J., Dauwalder, J., Duarte, M. E., Guichard, J., . . . van
4
5 Vianen, A. E. M. (2009). Life designing: A paradigm for career construction in the 21st
6
7 century. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75, 239-250. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2009.04.004
8
9
- 10 Schwartz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6, 461-
11
12 464.
13
14
- 15 Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of*
16
17 *Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 27-41. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.1.1.27
18
19
- 20 Siegrist, J., Shackelton, R., Link, C., Marceau, L., von dem Knesebeck, O., & McKinlay, J.
21
22 (2010). Work stress of primary care physicians in the US, UK and German health care
23
24 systems. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71, 298-304. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.03.043
25
26
27
28
- 29 Siegrist, J., Starke, D., Chandola, T., Godin, I., Marmot, M., Niedhammer, I., & Peter, R.
30
31 (2004). The measurement of effort–reward imbalance at work: European comparisons.
32
33 *Social Science & Medicine*, 58(8), 1483-1499. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00351-4
34
35
36
- 37 Tsutsumi, A., & Kawakami, N. (2004). A review of empirical studies on the model of effort–
38
39 reward imbalance at work: Reducing occupational stress by implementing a new theory.
40
41 *Social Science & Medicine*, 59, 2335-2359. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.03.030
42
43
44
- 45 Yang, C. (2006). Evaluating latent class analyses in qualitative phenotype identification.
46
47 *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 50, 1090-1104.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables and Covariates. Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) Are Reported for Continuous Variables, and Percentages for Categorical Variables.

| Latent class indicators | <i>N</i> | Mean (sd)/% |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|
| Reward T1 | 747 | 4.05 (0.74) |
| Reward T2 | 422 | 4.13 (0.73) |
| Reward T3 | 368 | 4.08 (0.78) |
| Reward T4 | 323 | 4.15 (0.75) |
| Career stability prior T1 (yes/no) | 745 | 68.72/31.28 |
| Career stability T1–T2 (yes/no) | 402 | 94.03/5.97 |
| Career stability T2–T3 (yes/no) | 353 | 72.80/27.20 |
| Career stability T3–T4 (yes/no) | 333 | 85.89/14.11 |
| Promotions T1–T2 ¹ (no/yes) | 414 | 65.70/34.30 |
| Promotions T2–T3 (no/yes) | 361 | 72.30/27.70 |
| Promotions T3–T4 (no/yes) | 333 | 78.08/21.92 |
| Covariates at T1 | | |
| Gender (male/female) | 745 | 85.50/14.50 |
| Age in years (range 24–36 years) | 740 | 30.96 (3.21) |
| Managerial level (upper/middle/lower management) | 731 | 42.68/48.84/8.48 |

Note. ¹Promotions were not asked at T1.

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

Table 2

The Frequency of the Contents of Personal Work Goals (0, 1, 2, or 3 Times) Mentioned by Participants in Percentages (n = 316)

| Number of goals | 1. Competence % | 2. Progression % | 3. Well-being % | 4. Job change % | 5. Job security % | 6. Organization % | 7. Finance % |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 0 | 49.05 | 72.15 | 63.29 | 73.73 | 84.81 | 72.47 | 78.16 |
| 1 | 35.76 | 26.27 | 28.16 | 21.20 | 14.56 | 16.46 | 21.20 |
| 2 | 13.92 | 1.27 | 7.91 | 4.43 | 0.63 | 6.96 | 0.63 |
| 3 | 1.27 | 0.37 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 4.11 | 0.00 |

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

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

Table 3

Fit Indexes for Alternative Reward Patterns

| Number of latent classes | Log-likelihood value | Scaling correction factor | Number of estimated parameters | AIC | BIC | aBIC | BLRT <i>p</i> -value | VLMR <i>p</i> -value | Entropy |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 1 | -3454.10 | 1.18 | 27 | 6962.19 | 7086.83 | 7001.09 | | | |
| 2 | -3376.97 | 1.21 | 39 | 6831.95 | 7011.97 | 6888.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.82 |
| 3 | -3332.11 | 1.30 | 51 | 6766.22 | 7001.64 | 6839.69 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.78 |
| 4 | -3299.79 | 1.48 | 63 | 6725.58 | 7016.39 | 6816.34 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| 5 | -3261.56 | 1.37 | 75 | 6673.11 | 7019.32 | 6781.16 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.70 |
| 6 | -3235.76 | 1.33 | 87 | 6645.52 | 7047.12 | 6770.86 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.71 |

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

Table 4

Means, Conditional Probabilities, and Latent Class Probabilities. Latent Class Probabilities are Proportions of Individuals within each of the Latent Class and Conditional Probabilities Are Their Distribution across the Indicator Variables in a Given Latent Class.

| Indicator variables | Latent classes | | | |
|---|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | High and stable rewards | Reducing rewards | Increasing rewards |
| Reward T1 ² | | 4.35 | 3.75 | 2.84 |
| Reward T2 ² | | 4.27 | 3.36 | 4.00 |
| Reward T3 ² | | 4.25 | 2.91 | 4.15 |
| Reward T4 ² | | 4.38 | 2.56 | 4.13 |
| Career stability prior T1 ³ | Yes | 0.68 | 0.76 | 0.72 |
| | No | 0.32 | 0.24 | 0.28 |
| Career stability T1–T2 ³ | Yes | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.98 |
| | No | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Career stability T2–T3 ³ | Yes | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.81 |
| | No | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.19 |
| Career stability T3–T4 ³ | Yes | 0.87 | 0.82 | 0.88 |
| | No | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.12 |
| Promotions T1–T2 ³ | No | 0.73 | 0.69 | 0.73 |
| | Yes | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.27 |
| Promotions T2–T3 ³ | No | 0.85 | 0.97 | 0.69 |
| | Yes | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.31 |
| Promotions T3–T4 ³ | No | 0.84 | 0.92 | 0.73 |
| | Yes | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| Class N ¹ | | 574 | 49 | 124 |
| Latent class probabilities ¹ | | 0.77 | 0.07 | 0.17 |
| AvePP | | 0.93 | 0.83 | 0.85 |

Note. ¹Values obtained from classification of individuals based on their most likely class membership. ²Means are presented for Reward variables. ³Conditional probabilities are presented for Career stability and Promotions. AvePP = Average Posterior Probability.

REWARD PATTERNS AND PERSONAL WORK GOALS

Table 5

Results of Poisson Regression Analysis for the Association between Reward Patterns and Personal Goals. Poisson Regression Coefficients Are Presented as Incident Rate Ratios (IRR).

| | Competence | Progression | Well-being | Job change | Job security | Organization | Finance |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|
| | <i>IRR</i> | <i>IRR</i> | <i>IRR</i> | <i>IRR</i> | <i>IRR</i> | <i>IRR</i> | <i>IRR</i> |
| Female (0) vs. Male (1) | 0.72** | 1.48 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 2.07 | 1.08 | 1.20 |
| Age | 0.98 | 0.95 | 1.03 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 1.05 | 1.04 |
| Lower management | 1.05 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 1.42 | 2.15 | 0.54** | 1.07 |
| Middle management | 1.08 | 0.73 ⁺ | 0.76 | 1.36 | 1.72 | 0.92 | 1.00 |
| Upper management ^a | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pattern 1 vs. Pattern 3 ^a | 0.91 | 1.39 | 0.98 | 1.16 | 0.56* | 1.40 | 1.35 |
| Pattern 2 vs. Pattern 3 ^a | 0.37*** | 2.45 | 1.41 | 2.54 | 0.42 ⁺ | 0.12*** | 2.64 |
| Pattern 1 vs. Pattern 2 ^a | 2.50 | 0.57** | 0.70 ⁺ | 0.46** | 1.34 | 11.60 | 0.51*** |

Note. Pattern 1 = High and stable rewards, Pattern 2 = Reducing rewards, Pattern 3 = Increasing rewards.

^aA reference class.

⁺*p* < 0.10, **p* < 0.05, ***p* < 0.01, ****p* < 0.001.