



Work motivation among millennial employees with different life goals: Case of Serbian companies

Ivana Kovačević^[a], Jelena Anđelković Labrović^[b]

[a] PhD in Psychology (Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade University), Assistant professor at the Faculty of Organizational Sciences, HRM department (Belgrade University), Belgrade, Serbia, E-mail: kivana@fon.bg.ac.rs

[b] PhD in Organizational Sciences (Human Resource Management), Assistant professor at the Faculty of Organizational Sciences, HRM department (Belgrade University), Belgrade, Serbia, E-mail: jeca@fon.bg.ac.rs

Abstract

Millennials constitute the majority of today's workforce in global market as well as in Serbia. One of the main challenges of contemporary Human resource management is how to create environment where their abilities can be empowered and their potentials used. In that sense the purpose of this paper is to depict the motivational goals among Serbian millennials, to understand what motivates them, what are their most important needs that have to be satisfied in work environment. We questioned 363 employees from five different companies in Serbia using three questionnaires adapted according to the self-determination theory, considering goal orientations, level of motivation and need satisfaction in the working environment. It is shown that Serbian millennials are relatively similar to their peers in other countries. They mostly strive toward intrinsic goals, but include monetary aspect as well. Their type of motivation gravitate toward more autonomous extrinsic motivation, respectively toward motivation through identification. Regarding their need satisfaction, they are more satisfied with affiliative needs and needs for competency and least satisfied with existential needs. Also, results show that the main differences were not always defined by the opposition between intrinsic and extrinsic goals but rather, by the contrast formed between those who, almost unselectively strive toward goals, and those who did not expressed strong orientation toward either of goals. It is emphasized that Serbian millennials are not quite integrated category regarding their motivating profile; they differ according to the factor of their goal orientation, but most important is the level of strength of their goal orientation.

Keywords: Work motivation. Millennials. Need satisfaction. Intrinsic/extrinsic goals.

Introduction

Work motivation is one of the most intriguing issues in organizational psychology. Drive that leads employees toward fulfilling their professional goals fluctuates and depends on different factors. Those motivational factors form functional links between personal goals and needs of employees on one, and possible incentive, on the other side. So, it is important to take into a consideration what really matters to employee, does his requirements might be put somehow in line with organizational goals.

The situation becomes more complicated with the question of individual differences considering motivational structure based on personal characteristics, sometimes demographics, economics situation or even on period of life. As a matter of fact, studies often show that employees with different level of income or education manifest diverse needs. Also, people in different life phases put different needs as a priority.

It is fascinating that human resources could be clustered by specific goals and needs unique for one generation (Twenge, et. al., 2010). In our research we wanted to describe the motivation of employees popularly called millennials. That category consists from the work force that born between 1980`s and 2000, and due to that fact, in this moment, they constitute more than 34% of all working population, with the trend of raising in number (Pew Research Center, 2015).

As studies often explain there are particular characteristics commonly shared among the population, so called millennials` or y generation. It reflects motivational issues as well. Having in mind that Serbia in many social and economical domains were specific in that particular period, we found interesting to see does our millennials` do behave similar as those in the "rest of the world" considering motivation.

The goal of this study is to describe the level of motivation and motive satisfaction among millennials working in Serbian companies, with comparing their motivational profile with millennials all over the world. Not neglecting the potential individual differences in the domain of value system, we try to see is there any difference between millennial employees` strongly emphasizing intrinsic and those leaded by extrinsic goals. Considering the other factors that might influence motivation, we unify our sample by educational level, years` income and number of employees in company where they work.

So, the main objective of the study was to describe millennials` motivational profile and to see is there any difference between intrinsically and extrinsically motivated millennials` with high school education working in domestic companies with more than 100 employees, in respect to their motivational level and motive satisfaction in Serbian companies.

Of course, it might seem plausible to hypotheses that those who have intrinsic goals as their guideline would have higher level of autonomous motivation and those who share that values might satisfy their higher motive, and vice versa. Nevertheless, it depends on the context of their work.

Accordingly, this article consists of introduction into a topic and research problem, theoretical approach that provides academic background to the topic, followed by methodological approach that explains how empirical data, presented in

fourth part of the study, were collected. Finally, results were considered in the context of relevant theory, previous researches, potentials for implementation of ideas, as well as in the context of future studies that might overcome the limitations of this particular study.

Theoretical approach

The nature of work motivation

The importance of work motivation is probably the best defined through idea of Deci and Ryan, that motivation actually produces something, i.e. have some impact on reality (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 69). Among other factors, values are significant moderator of motivational processes (Tremblay, et al., 2009). Work orientation values are proved to be in relation with motivational outcomes, being in the same time related with personal goals and needs (Vansteenkiste, et. Al. 2007). So, in this study we analyze levels of motivation, satisfaction of personal needs and motives in concrete organizational context and individual goals.

Work motivation is perceived and measured in the framework of Deci and Ryan's Theory of Self-Determination (SDT) (Deci, Ryan, 2008). It was rather known fact that it is possible to ably their conception in the domain of work motivation (Majstorović, 2008; Gagne, Deci, 2005). Their theoretical explanation sees motivation from a multidimensional perspective, considering personality, context (life domain) and situational states (Vallerand, 2000), and that provide space for taking generational factors into account. Authors said that people are *"being more self-motivated, energized, and integrated in some situations, domains, and cultures than in others"* (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 68). We add that people are differently motivated regarding the context in which they grow up.

Governing by SDT, we defined quantity of motivation as a level of autonomy versus externally controlled, admitting the fact that there are mild transitions from extrinsic toward intrinsic via introjected motivation and motivation through identification, going toward integrated motivational state. Those types of motivation are also empirically confirmed as different due to the fact that they have different antecedents and they produce different outcomes (Gagne, et al., 2015).

Theory and empirical studies claim that intrinsic motivation, as well as the internalization processes, are the results of the basic need satisfaction occurred in the context. So, the important aspects of analysis, the level and quality of motivation, are seen in defining the concepts of needs.

The role of needs` and motives` satisfaction. SDT make a difference compared to "traditional" theories of motivation, abandoning the tendency to measure strengths of needs with the idea that the motivation stops when the need is satisfied (Maslow, 1943). Quite the opposite, it is believed that people are boost to work when they realize that the environment support their needs and offer possibility to satisfy them, so need satisfaction is seen as motivating (Marescaux, De Winne, & Sels, 2013).

Although SDT theory sees needs as basic and nutritive factors for personal survive and development, the content of their needs are rather close to the concepts of motives in the context of theories of some other authors. In the repertoire of SDT theory

there is only those three needs. Nevertheless, we believed that it is important to take into a consideration the expression of satisfaction of existential needs, needs for security (Maslow, 1943), and need for power (McClelland, 1985). Needs are considered to be the underlying motivational mechanisms that energizes and directs people's behavior (Van den Broeck, et. al., 2010) and they intervene between environmental factors and level of autonomy in motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Individual differences in aspirations and goals. They are explanatory concepts of, as Grouset says (Grouset, et al., 2005, p. 801) that goals are explanatory concepts of: *how people organize their lives and the types of aims for which* individual strive. As a matter of fact, aspirations are considered to be the specific contents of people's targets (Ryan & Deci, 2000) and they are used to guide activities of persons toward the goals. Nevertheless, in some situations they might fail to predict the concrete decision, as Milinkovic and colleagues (Milinkovic, Kovacevic, & Mihailovic, 2017) found in the research of career path preferences of college students. Sheldon and colleagues (Sheldon, Ryan, Deci, & Kasser, 2004) found that it matters if the process of attaining goal is autonomous or controlled. Further, it is believed that there are two different categories of goals that varies according to the consequences for those who pursuit them. In fact, there are intrinsic goals that are congruent with the psychological needs for relatedness, competence and autonomy, and there are extrinsic goals, oriented toward obtaining reward, social recognition. The important thing is that goals are often culturally shaped and they are frequently in line with the prevalent values in the environment where possessors dwell (Vansteenkiste, et. al., 2007).

The particularities of millennials in the context of work motivation

Who are millennials. In the majority of the similar researches (mostly done in U.S.A.) Millennials or Generation Y are identified as individuals born in or after 1980 (Ng, Schweitzer, & Lyons, 2010) or between 1980 and 2000 (Ivancević & Ratković, 2016). It is said that they are shaped by technology (The Council of Economic Advisers, 2014) so they are often called Net Generation, the Digital generation Nexters, N-Gens, Generation E and Echo Boomers as well (Tolbize, 2008). Ng et al (2010) described millennials as individuals that "want it all" and "want it now", regarding good compensations, fast career progression, work/life balance, interesting and challenging work (meaningful work experience), nurturing work environment and possibilities to make a contribution to society. It is very interesting what Tolbize (2008) have noticed that often millennials refer to themselves as the Non-Nuclear Family generation, the Nothing-Is-Sacred Generation, the Wannabees, the Feel-Good Generation, Cyberkids, the Do-or-Die Generation, and the Searching-for-an-Identity Generation. Generally, they have great expectations regarding their career. It is interesting that they expectation for promotion is within first 18 months on the job, meaning that they want fast career advancement as well as large pay increases (Ng, Schweitzer, & Lyons, 2010).

Millennials and work motivation. In the Survey Employee motivation by generation factor (2009) that was done across the generations on a question regarding their motivation Generation Y/millennials have identified that the most im-

portant goal in their job is Advancement in their career/profession/company and on a second place is Self-fulfillment/feeling good about what I do. 59% of the millennials said that their strategy for a goal fulfillment is in advancing skills and knowledge. Also, as a net generation it is no surprise that they use self-taught learning methods using different online resources especially wikis, blogs and social networking sites. In order to create motivating environment for a Millennial a company should create an atmosphere for: Jointly develop personalized learning paths with their leaders, Hone leadership skills by chairing community service projects, Use technology platforms to share knowledge gained in self-study exercises, Lead “after action reviews” at the completion of key projects to formalize on-the-job learning (Lunsford, 2009). Millennials value community, family and creativity in their work (The Council of Economic Advisers, 2014)

In the Deloitte's millennial Survey (2016) it is emphasized that one of the main challenges in work environment is loyalty. It is shown that 66% millennials would leave their employer in max 5 years. Why? Is this the consequence of their work motivation or something else? They perceive that their leadership skills are not being fully developed, but if the company supports leadership development loyalty will increase. Regarding their personal goals it could be said that they are mostly traditional, meaning that they strive to a good work/life balance, they wish to have their own home, life partner and of course financial security for a comfortable retirement. Also, they have a very high aspiration in making a constructive contribution to their organization (Deloitte., 2016).

As Millennials constitute most of the today's workforce we found interesting to investigate what motivates them, in general. Also it is important to know what are the needs that they perceive as most important to be fulfilled in work environment.

Research goals, objectives and hypotheses

As it was said in the introduction, the main objective of the research was to identify Serbian millennials regarding the motivational goals, satisfaction of needs at the workplace and type of their motivation. Comparing our millennials with motivational characteristics of millennials from different countries, we wanted to define the specificities of our millennial generation in the motivational domain. There is an objective to see if there are any differences between intrinsically and extrinsically motivated millennials, respect to their motivational level and motive satisfaction in Serbian companies.

The main research questions considered: (1) What are the specificities of millennials in Serbia regarding their goals, type of motivation and need satisfaction at the workplace, as well as the

(2) Differences in need satisfaction and type of motivation between millennials with highly emphasized goal of both categories, those with intrinsic and extrinsic goals, and those with low goal expression.

The main hypothesis (hyp1.) was that millennials in our sample would have intrinsic goals more emphasized than extrinsic, particularly considering the personal development then extrinsic. In that domain we believe that our millennials are simi-

lar to the members of their generation in other countries. Also, there was a hypothesis (hyp.2) that their motivation and need satisfaction would be different regarding the goal orientation.

Methodological approach

Measures and instruments

In order to answer to the questions of level and nature of millennials motivation in Serbia, we conducted research by applying three types of scale inspired by previously explained concepts of SDT theory.

Personal values and aspirations (life goals) were measured by the instrument inspired with Kasser and Ryan's (Kasser & Ryan, 1996) scale. The original scale is developed in the frame of SDT theory, postulating that life goals could be categorized in two domains: intrinsic and extrinsic. Our version has 12 questions of importance of 6 life goals (2 items per each): personal growth, relationships and community (intrinsic), and wealth, fame and image (extrinsic).

The example of items were following: Personal development: *To grow and learn new things*, Sense of belonging (relations): *To have good friends that I can count on*, Society (altruism): *To help others live better*, Wealth: *To have enough money to buy everything I want*, Self-image: *To continue looking young*, Admiration and fame: *To be a celebrity*.

Respondents agreed with the statements on the scale from 1 to 5. The strength of goal was defined by calculating average for each goal and then categorizing them into an intrinsic or extrinsic group, also determining its value by calculating average for three goals per category. Scale for intrinsic and extrinsic goal with internal reliability $\alpha=.73$, for intrinsic and Cronbach Alpha=.76 for extrinsic goals.

Similarly, **Scale of need satisfaction at work** was five degree Likert type, measuring by 12 questions, the satisfaction of six basic needs at work: existential needs (example: *Some assignments I perform at work may be dangerous to health*), need for security (example: *I often fear I could lose my job because of the economic situation*), need for power (example: *Other people and their work often depend on me*), relatedness (example: *I consider the persons I work with as my friends*), competence (example: *I have acquired a lot of new skills at work*) and autonomy (example: *I do not get many opportunities to decide about the manner in which the work will be performed*). Satisfaction for each need is based on calculating average of two items referring to a particular need. Internal reliability for different scales were about $\alpha=0.71$.

Scale structure was developed on the base of three theoretical models: McClelland's concept of motivation (McClelland, 1985) and types of basic motives, Maslow's conception of motivation and hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943) and Deci and Ryan's self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Finally, we assessed level and the type of motivation, based on 7 situations with 10 given explanations: 2 items for every type of motivation: external, externally introjected, motivation through identification and internal motivation. The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (Gagne et.al., 2010) was the model for measuring

motivation in our research. This scale explains typical intrinsic, integrated, identified, introjected, externally regulated motivation, for each and every (7) seven situations. Consequently, The Likert type scale measuring the level and the type of motivation (the level of self-determination and integration of the goal) had 56 items, with 7 questions representing the descriptions of the potential situation, with given reasons why someone does something. For every question 10 answers are offered with five degree scale for assessing the level of agreement with reason. Among 10 statements given for each question, 2 of them referred to one of 4 motivational states:

extrinsic motivation (2x7=14 items): externally regulated behavior to satisfy some external demand, reward of contingency, with some kind of compensation or for the sake of some praise and reputation (example: *I stay at work until the end of working hours: because I do not want to have problems with my superiors; I love my job: because I get my salary; I chose this job: because it provides a certain standard of living for me*). The internal reliability of constructed scale was shown to be $\alpha=.80$; N=14.

motivation regulated by introjection (2x7=14 items): behavior is initiated to avoid guilt or anxiety or to attain ego enhancements such as pride, regulation by contingent self-esteem, to demonstrate ability (avoid failure); taking in regulation but not fully accepting it as it is one's own (example: *I try to achieve good results: because I feel bad when I am not doing well; I stay at work until the end of working hours: because I would feel ashamed for leaving work earlier; I come to work every morning: because I want my colleagues to see I am a good*). The internal reliability of constructed scale was shown to be $\alpha=.77$; N=14.

Motivation regulated by identification (2x7=14 items): behavior based on consciously valuing goal and with action being personally accepted and feeling personally important and personally accounted for it. It could be ego-syntonic action but nevertheless extrinsic because of doing it with the separate outcome (example: *I try to do my job properly: because it is very important for me personally; I try to achieve good results: because it is important for me to be good at something; When I have problems at work, I try to overcome them: because this organization means a lot to me*). The internal reliability of constructed scale was shown to be $\alpha=.88$; N=14.

intrinsic motivation (2x7=14 items): engaging in activity for inherent satisfaction, for the enjoyment in process of doing it, or for the challenge it represents (example: *I come to work every morning: because I enjoy the work itself; I chose this job: because of the moments of pleasure it gives me; When I have problems at work, I try to overcome them: because it enables me to learn something new*). The internal reliability of constructed scale was shown to be $\alpha=.89$; N=14.

Sample

We excluded all respondents born before 1980. and those who have higher or lower level of education than high school. At the end, in our sample, 363 respondents left. They satisfied the proposition imposed to the relevant characteristics of the population. They all work in domestic companies with more than 100 employees. They are all in the age category we called previously millennials'. In order to control one more important factor, we decide to take into a consideration only employees

with high school level of education. Professionals, faculty or college educated were not included in our sample due to the fear that they might have some particularities that are not shared with others when motivational goals and motives come into the question. Also, according to Serbian Census from 2011 there are round 48.9% individuals with secondary education and 20.8% with just primary education. Also there is 10.6% population with University Education (Statistical office of the Republic of Serbia, 2016).

In our sample of 363 respondents, more than 81% were male (295) and only 19% were female. Years of service are between 2 and 16 years, with the average of 4 years of working.

Procedure

The study was conducted on employees from 3 manufacturing companies in Serbia with more than 100 employees. The questionnaire had four parts. Beside the formal introduction and questions considering demographics (gender, age, years of working, educational level) and the size of the company, there was a section with questions considering the importance of life goals. It was followed by the section that explains the nature and the level of motivation based on scaling the level of autonomy attributed to the work behavior. At the end, there was a scale with items considering the level of satisfaction of motives and needs in the particular working context.

After gathering the filled questionnaires we excluded respondents that did not satisfy the criteria for sample and those that did not answer the whole questionnaire. The rate of rejection was less than 2%.

Finally, we categorized our respondents in four categories regarding their life goals, in those who strongly emphasized the intrinsic, as well as the extrinsic goals, those who have only extrinsic goals emphasized, those who have intrinsic goals strongly emphasized, and those that emphasized neither intrinsic nor extrinsic goals. They were categorized according to the median for two scales.

Results

Life goals of Serbian millennials

According to descriptive statistical indicators, relations (M=9.21; SD=1.19; N=363), society (M=8.98; SD=1.32; N=363) and personal development (M=8.96; SD=1.46; N=363), are the most value goals for our respondents. Those three categories of goals are considered to be intrinsic goals. Nevertheless, they also value wealth (M=8.19; SD=1.73; N=363), that is the main extrinsic goal. Comparing that goal with other extrinsic goals of being famous (M=4.85; SD=2.15; N=363), and admired (M=6.67; SD=2.07; N=363), with having a good public image is shown to be not particularly important in the list of goals for millennials in our sample.

Table 1 - Intrinsic versus extrinsic goals of Serbian millennials

type of goals	Mean	SD	Mdn	Min	Max	N	t	df	Sig.
intrinsic	27.15	2.95	28	15	30	363	30.61	362	.000
extrinsic	19.71	4.57	20	8	30	363			

Source: the authors (2017)

As we can see from the Table 1., there were a significant differences between intrinsic and extrinsic goals among respondents in favour of intrinsic ones. According to the median and range of answers, we defined criteria for categorization respondents into a four categories regarding goals: high intrinsic ($21.7 < \Sigma < 30$), low intrinsic ($15 < \Sigma < 27$), high extrinsic ($20 < \Sigma < 30$) and low extrinsic ($6 < \Sigma < 19.6$). Combining those categories we formed four different categories: *ambigoal oriented* (highly expressing both extrinsic and intrinsic goals), *non goal oriented* (low pronounced both categories of goals), *intrinsically oriented* (low entrinsic and high extrinsic goals) and *extrinsically oriented* (low intrinsic and high extrinsic goals).

Table 2 - Number of differently goal oriented Serbian millennials

Goal orientation	Frequency	Percent
Ambigoal oriented	125	34.4
Intrinsically oriented	84	23.1
Extrinsically oriented	70	19.3
Non-goal oriented	84	23.1
Total	363	100

Source: the authors (2017)

On the level of descriptive data, our respondents are mostly *ambigoal*, they do not make much difference between intrinsic and extrinsic goals, both categories are valued and matter for them. In the context of individual goal, we might explain that fact by highly valued intrinsic factors and wealth as extrinsic one.

Type of motivation and level of satisfaction of Serbian millennials

On the whole sample external motivation through identification is found to be the prevalent type of motivation ($M=52.42$; $SD=10.61$; $N=363$). Nevertheless, other motivational types were also present, with external motivation being $M=48.58$ ($SD=9.85$; $N=363$), internal motivation of $M=47.91$ ($SD=10.76$; $N=363$) and finally,

introjected motivation ($M=47.07$; $SD=9.8$; $N=363$). So, the motivation style of respondents varies. They have tendencies toward all four categories, or levels of autonomy in motivation domain.

Table 3 - Descriptive measures for need satisfaction at workplace

need satisfaction	existential	security	power	affiliative	autonomy	competency
Mean	4.93	5.08	6.63	7.79	5.42	7.45
SD	2.02	2.25	2.16	1.98	2.12	2.17
N	363	363	363	363	363	363

Source: the authors (2017)

Level of need satisfaction at workplace is given in the Table 3, with our respondents experiencing that affiliative needs, and needs for competency are the most satisfying at their workplace. On the other hand, workplace does not give them opportunity to satisfy existential needs in the same amount.

Type of motivation and need satisfaction in the context of goal orientation

From the Table 4. we could conclude that differences in goal orientation exists in the domain of external motivation, motivation through identification and internal orientation, at the level of significance of $p<.01$, and on the lower level of significance for introjected motivation. Considering the need satisfaction, the differences for power, affiliative and competency needs, are significant.

Table 4 - Descriptive statistics and analysis of variance of type motivation and need satisfaction for differently goal oriented millennials

	Ambigolals			intrinsic			extrinsic			non-goal oriented			F	Si	d
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	S	N			
Exter- nal motiva- tion	51. 50	9.4 6	1 2	48. 21	10. 44	8 4	47. 79	9.3 6	7 0	45. 27	9. 13	8 4	7. 38	0	3
Intro- jected	48. 74	9.8 4	1 2	48. 00	10. 29	8 4	45. 46	9.6 2	7 0	45. 00	8. 94	8 4	3. 42	.0	3 2

motiva- tion	5														
Motiva- tion by identi- fication	55.	10.	1	53.	10.	8	49.	9.8	7	49.	9.	8	6.	0	3
	22	81	2	20	91	4	96	4	0	50	53	4	74		
Internal motiva- tion	5														
	50.	10.	1	49.	10.	8	45.	11.	7	45.	9.	8	5.	0	3
	28	80	2	35	39	4	26	03	0	20	90	4	93		
Existen- tial needs	4														
	4.9	2.0	1	4.9	2.1	8	5.3	1.8	7	4.6	1.	8	1.	.2	3
	2	2	2	3	5	4	1	7	0	2	97	4	52	1	
Security needs	5														
	5.2	2.2	1	4.8	2.2	8	5.4	2.3	7	4.8	2.	8	1.	.1	3
	3	7	2	1	6	4	5	1	0	2	12	4	63	8	
Power needs	5														
	7.2	2.0	1	6.5	2.1	8	6.3	2.2	7	6.0	2.	8	5.	0	3
	2	7	2	6	3	4	3	0	0	8	14	4	53		
Afflia- tive needs	5														
	7.8	2.0	1	8.3	1.7	8	7.1	2.0	7	7.5	1.	8	5.	0	3
	8	1	2	9	7	4	9	4	0	4	91	4	54		
Auton- omy needs	5														
	5.5	2.1	1	5.7	2.2	8	5.3	2.0	7	5.0	1.	8	1.	.2	3
	3	2	2	0	9	4	4	9	0	5	97	4	5	1	
Compe- tence needs	5														
	7.7	2.1	1	7.8	1.9	8	6.8	2.3	7	7.0	2.	8	4.	0	3
	9	0	2	2	9	4	6	5	0	8	17	4	51		

Source: the authors (2017).

According to post hoc analysis (Scheffe), for external motivation the differences are between millennials who have highly expressed both categories of goals, and those who does not express either goals much (Mean difference=6.23; $p<.01$; SE=1.4).

Post hoc analysis for external motivation through identification showed differences between ambigol oriented and extrinsic (Mean difference=5.27; $p<.05$; SE=1.5) as well as intrinsic motivation (Mean difference=5.72; $p<.01$; SE=1.5).

For intrinsic motivation there is a difference between highly evaluated both categories of motivation and those with extrinsic goals (Mean difference=5.03; $p<.05$;

SE=1.6) and those with both categories low profiled (Mean difference=5.08; $p<.05$; SE=1.5).

In the domain of need satisfaction that workplace offers to participants, the difference is found for affiliative needs between intrinsically and extrinsically motivated (Mean difference=1.21; $p<.01$; SE=.3) and for intrinsic and non goal oriented ones (Mean difference=0.86; $p<.01$; SE=.3). In the context of satisfying need for power the differences found between goal oriented in both directions and non goal oriented (Mean difference=.113; $p<.01$; SE=.3). For other needs there were no statistically significant differences.

Discussion

Our results indicate that Serbian millennials are relatively similar to their peers in other countries. According to other studies of millennials goal orientations they mainly strive toward intrinsic goals, as personal development are. Similarly, our respondents strive toward establishing good interpersonal relationship, personal development, society, but they also include monetary aspect as well. It is also similar with previous research. For example, Kultalahti and Viitala (2014) also found that millennials have more intrinsic than extrinsic motivators. According to Borges and colleagues (Borges, et. al., 2010) they strive toward achievement and affiliation. So, in the domain of goals our millennials are “typical”.

Accordingly, the type of motivation gravitate toward more autonomous extrinsic motivation, respectively toward motivation through identification that implies someone's being motivated by the fact that they see their work as personally important but not bringing inherent enjoyment in activity (as in internal motivation) (Gagne, Deci, 2005). So, work is still business and drive by external factors. Nevertheless, all other types of motivation were also present.

In the domain of need satisfaction, it might be concluded that the effect of working context was influential. In our research millennials were least satisfied with existential needs. On the other side, they were more satisfied with affiliative needs and needs for competency compared with other needs offered. It might look that the ambience of their work were perceived relatively satisfying in the domain of basic needs. It is important in the context of researches that showed that need satisfaction in organization represents the motivational base for work (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Consequentially, it influenced the level of motivation. Also, it is significant in the perspective of their higher scores on motives for achievement and affiliation (Borges, et. al., 2010).

Regarding the goal orientation in the context of other motivational variables, our results indicated that the main differences were not always defined by the opposition between intrinsic and extrinsic goals, but rather, by the contrast formed between those who, almost unselectively strive toward goals, and those who did not expressed strong orientation toward either of goals. Differences were strong between them in the domain of external motivation, which is more characteristic form of regulating behavior among those with lower emphasizing goals.

For motivation driven by identification, emphasizing both goals was found more between those who insist on both categories of goals comparing to extrinsic and

intrinsic goal oriented millennials. As it might be expected, emphasizing both goals more frequently led toward internal motivation, compared with extrinsically orienting and lack of goals, but not with intrinsic goals.

Further, only satisfaction with affiliative and need for power were influenced by the difference in goal orientation. Satisfaction in the domain of affiliation at the workplace was characteristic for intrinsically motivated, while the main difference for need for power was between none selectively goal oriented and those with no goals, who had lower satisfaction.

These results indicate some characteristics of Serbian millennials working in local companies with more than 100 employees and with secondary level of education. They are relatively similar with worldwide millennials but they are not quite unified category when it comes to the question of their motivating profile. As a matter of fact, they differ according to the factor of their goal orientation. In the context of this research, the main factor on which we should pay attention is the level of strength of goal orientation. It is more important than the direction in which goal strives (intrinsic or extrinsic), as great body of research insist on (Vansteenkistee, et. al., 2007).

Nevertheless, our results give relatively restrictive picture of the generation Y due to the fact that lot of different factors that were not considered might make an impact on motivation. For example, there may be differences between employees from different companies. Also, leadership relation was proven to be of importance for motivation (Kuvaas, 2009). So, the question of different impact on the particular generation in the context of their relation with authority might influence (Thomson, Gregory, 2012). They are often labeled with stereotypes that they need constant feedback and less formal work environment, with being disloyal to organization more than other generations.

Finally, the question if millennials in Serbia are really millennials, or they are somehow different, goes beyond this research. Also, there is an important question of difference of the structure of motivation between employees according to the differences in educational level? Maybe. Do young employees with high school have less intrinsic aspirations then those with faculty? Not necessarily. This is something that should be also analyzed in some of the following studies.

Conclusion

Concluding the previously said, we believe that Serbian millennials` motivational profile might be important factor for determining the characteristics of work environment. Suppose the goals are provided and that they are consistent with identified individual goals, organization might provide mechanisms for more autonomous motivation. Similarly, by satisfying needs, with improvement especially in the domain of existential, we could achieve more motivating setting. On the other side, for those having lack of goal orientation, there should be further activities conducted with the aim to develop individual goals among them. As Amabile (1993) said for supporting competence, autonomy and relatedness, organization must provide an optimal challenge, informational feedback, interpersonal involvement and feeling recognition. For millennials in particularly, Kultalahti and Viitala (2014) suggest that

HRM practices include flexibility, work-life balance, convenient social relationships, need for coaching-based leadership and developing opportunity.

As our millennials have similar characteristics than those mentioned in different researches, we might advocate the more personalized approach respecting the diversities in their level of goal expressiveness.

References

- Amabile, T. M., Hill, K. G., Hennessey, B. A., & Tighe, E. M. (1994). The Work Preference Inventory: Assessing Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivational Orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66 (5), 950-967.
- Borges, N., Manuel, S., Elam, C., & Jones, B. (2010). Differences in motives between Millennial and Generation X medical students. *Medical Education*, 44, 570-576.
- Deloitte. (2016). The 2016 Deloitte Millennial Survey: Winning over the next generation of leaders. Retrieved June 28, 2016 from: <http://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/millennialsurvey.html>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. (2008). Self-determination theory: A Macrotheory of Human Motivation, Development, and Health. *Canadian Psychology*, 49 (3), 182-185.
- Gagne, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331-362.
- Gagne, M., Forest, J., Gilbert, M.-H., Aube, C., Morin, E., & Malorni, A. (2010). The Motivation at Work Scale: Validation Evidence in Two-Languages. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70 (4), 628-646.
- Gagne, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkistee, M., Crevier-Braud, L., van den Broeck, A., Aspeli, A. K., et al (2015). Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24 (2), 178-196.
- Grouset, F. M., Ahuvia, A., Youngmee, K., Ryan, R. M., Schmuck, P., Kasser, T., et al (2005). The Structure of Goal Contents Across 15 Cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89 (5), 800-816.
- Ivancević, S., & Ratković, T. (2016). Millennials in the workplace. XV International symposium Reshaping the Future Through Sustainable Business Development and Entrepreneurship SymOrg 2016 (pp. 733-737). Zlatibor: Faculty of organizational sciences.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 280-287.
- Kultalahti, S., & Viitala, R. L. (2014). Sufficient challenges and a weekend ahead – Generation Y describing motivation at work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27 (4), 569 - 582.
- Kuvaas, B. (2009). A test of hypotheses derived from self-determination theory among public sector employees. *Employee Relations*, 31 (1), 39-56.
- Lunsford, S. (2009). Survey Analysis: Employee Motivation by Generation Factors. Retrieved June 16, 2016 from: <http://achieveglobe.co.uk/assets/resources/leadership/ra-motivation-by-generation-factors.pdf>

- Majstorović, N. (2008). Primena teorije self-determinacije u istraživanjima radne motivacije. *Primenjena psihologija*, 1 (1-2), 5-18.
- Milinković, I., Kovačević, I., & Mihailović, D. (2017). What Do Freshmen Want? Career Path Preferences Among Students. *Management Journal Of Sustainable Business And Management Solutions In Emerging Economies*, 22(1), 37-45.
- Marescaux, E., De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2013). HR practices and HRM outcomes: The role of basic need satisfaction. *Personnel Review*, 42 (1), 4-27.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 5 (4), 370-396.
- McClelland, D. C. (1985). How Motives, Skills, and Values Determine What People Do. *American Psychologist*, 40 (7), 812-825.
- Ng, E. S., Schweitzer, L., & Lyons, S. T. (2010). New Generation, Great Expectations: A Field Study of the Millennial Generation. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 281-292.
- Pew Research Center. (2015). Labor Force Composition by Generation. Retrieved June 29, 2016, from: http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/11/millennials-surpass-generations-as-the-largest-generation-in-u-s-labor-force/ft_15-05-04_genlaborforcecompositionstacked-2/
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. *American Psychologist*, 55 (1), 68-78.
- Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L., & Kasser, T. (2004). The independent effects of goal contents and motives on well-being: it's both what you pursue and why you pursue it. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30 (1), 475-486.
- Statistical office of the Republic of Serbia. (2016). Statistical pocketbook of serbia 2016. Retrieved June 14, 2016, from: http://webrzs.stat.gov.rs/WebSite/repository/documents/00/02/07/26/Statisticki_kalendar_2016.pdf
- The Council of Economic Advisers. (2014). 15 Economic Facts About Millennials. Retrieved June 12, 2016 from: https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/millennials_report.pdf
- Thompson, C., & Gregory, J. B. (2012). Managing Millennials: A Framework for Improving Attraction, Motivation, and Retention. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 15, 237-246.
- Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. G., & Villeneuve, M. (2009). Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Its Value for Organizational Psychology Research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 41 (4), 213-226.
- Tolbize, A. (2008). Generational differences in the workplace. Retrieved June 16, 2016 from: http://rtc.umn.edu/docs/2_18_Gen_diff_workplace.pdf
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., Lance, C., E. (2010) Generational differences in work values: A review of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Management*.
- Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory: A View From the Hierarchical Model of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11 (4), 312-318.
- Van den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., Soenens, B., & Lens, W. (2010). Capturing autonomy, competence, and relatedness at work: Construction and initial validation of the Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 981-1002.

Vansteenkiste, M., Neyrinck, B. N., Soenens, B., De Witte, H., & Van den Broek, A. (2007). On the Relations among Work Value Orientations, Psychological Need Satisfaction and Job Outcomes: A Self-Determination Theory Approach. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 80, 251-277.

Received: 07/07/2017

Approved: 10/05/2017