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Dans cet article sont discutées les approches de la fixation d’objectifs macro et micro et privilégiées les relations entre ces objectifs, aux différents niveaux de l’organisation. Traduire les objectifs stratégiques de haut en bas de l’organisation est un processus assez complexe. On peut distinguer au moins un niveau intermédiaire entre les objectifs macros (c’est à dire empiriques de la validité du concept et de la construction d’une taxonomie de la motivation en fonction des traits de caractère, proposée par Kanfer et Heggestad (1997). 228 adultes ont rempli un formulaire abrégé du Questionnaire de Traits Motivationnels (MTQ), complété par une batterie de mesures de personnalité et capacités. Les rapports du MTQ aux mesures de personnalité attestent de la validité d’une convergence et d’une discrimination des traits de maîtrise personnelle, excellence compétitive et motivation, liés à l’anxiété. De plus, les résultats sur l’échelle MTQ étaient généralement non liés aux mesures composées d’intelligence fluide ou cristallisée. L’examen des différences d’âge a montré un schéma développemental avec déclin du complexe de réussite et non du complexe d’anxiété.

Empirical evidence on the conceptual and construct validity of the motivational trait taxonomy proposed by Kanfer and Heggestad is presented. 228 adults completed a shortened form of the Motivational Trait Questionnaire (MTQ), along with a battery of personality and ability measures. Relationships of the MTQ with personality measures show evidence of convergent and discriminant validity for trait constructs of Personal Mastery, Competitive Excellence, and Motivation Related to Anxiety. In addition, MTQ scale scores were generally unrelated to composite measures of fluid and crystallised intelligence. Examination of age differences showed a pattern of developmental decline in the achievement trait complex, but not the anxiety complex.
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INTRODUCTION

A crucial problem in contemporary work motivation theory and research pertains to how best to conceptualise and assess individual differences in motivational tendencies. Although most researchers agree on the existence of individual differences in motivational preferences or traits, the development of an adequate taxonomic structure of such traits has lagged far behind work in the ability traits domain. However, work motivation researchers have focused on a variety of constructs, ranging from broad constructs, such as need for achievement, to narrow trait-state constructs, such as mastery orientation. Similarly, measures of target constructs also vary widely and range from scales taken from multitrait inventories to situation-specific, customised scales. Not surprisingly, the slow progress in this area and the lack of coherence in research efforts aimed at elucidating these person influences on motivational processes has made it extremely difficult to aggregate results across studies.

Nonetheless, the maturation of work motivation theories over the past decade has prompted organisational researchers to focus greater attention on the identification of nonability person factors that may play a role in work motivation (Austin & Klein, 1996). Advances in personality psychology, along with increasing organisational needs to identify and develop worker motivational traits, provide further impetus for overcoming the taxonomic problem. Such developments have spurred the creation of an articulated nomological network of person constructs as they relate to the adoption of organisationally valued goals and the development of motivational skills for accomplishing work goals. In this paper we present the results of an empirical study aimed at further evaluating the validity of a theory-based measure of work motivation traits. First, though, we address the current “received” view of personality—called the Five-Factor Model (FFM)—in the context of motivational traits.

THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL (FFM) OF PERSONALITY VS. MOTIVATIONAL TRAITS

Advocates of the FFM of personality have argued that trait motivation variance is largely captured by individual differences in conscientiousness (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991; Schmidt & Hunter, 1992). However, a growing number of researchers have shown that important motivational trait elements can be linked to other factors, such as extroversion and neuroticism (e.g. Kanfer, Dugdale, & McDonald, 1994; Kuhl & Fuhrmann, 1999; Zuckerman, Joireman, Kraft, & Kuhlman, 1999).

The FFM provides an unsatisfactory taxonomy of motivational traits for both conceptual and empirical reasons. Conceptually, the FFM provides a structure of personality that encompasses far more than individual differences...

in motivational tendencies. Although the FFM may arguably provide the most parsimonious representation of the structure of personality as a whole, empirical research (see e.g. Barrick, Mount, & Stauss, 1993; Hough & Schneider, 1996) suggests that it is not an optimal structure for the evaluation of individual differences in motivational tendencies. Moreover, there is an additional question of the “consistency” or “specificity” of personality traits across domains of function (see e.g. Murtha, Kanfer, and Ackerman, 1996). In this paper, we adopt a midrange perspective that permits examination of motivational traits and tendencies in achievement settings, with respect to broader cross-situational measures of personality.

APPROACH/AVOIDANCE CONCEPTIONS VS. MOTIVATIONAL TRAITS

A number of social-personality researchers have recently suggested that individual differences in achievement motivation may be best conceptualised in terms of individual differences in goals (Cassidy & Lynn, 1989; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Elliott & Church, 1997). Although researchers differ in terms of the type of goals they study (e.g. classroom goals vs. life goals), most researchers in this area distinguish between appetitive (approach) and aversive (avoidance) motivational orientations. Results of studies of children in the classroom, adult work adjustment and job performance indicate a relationship between goal orientation (approach vs. avoidance), subsequent self-regulatory activities, and performance. VandeWalle (1997), for example, extended the approach/avoidance goal formulation to develop a self-report measure that assessed three aspects of adult work goal orientation (i.e. learning, performance prove, and performance avoid). Using the measure, VandeWalle, Brown, Cron, and Slocum (1999) found a positive relationship between (approach) learning goal orientation, effective self-regulatory activities, and performance. In contrast, individual differences in the measures of “performance prove” and “performance avoid” (avoidance) goal orientations were only weakly and inconsistently related to goal-striving measures and criterion performance.

The approach/avoidance goal taxonomy takes advantage of advances in achievement motivation and more recent motivation process research. Whereas the FFM conceptualisation embeds motivational traits in a comprehensive structure of personality, the goal orientation formulation embeds motivational traits in a narrow structure of goal striving that emphasises how approach and avoidance tendencies affect action in the context of goal-directed behaviour. Further, this line of research is fully consistent with classic approaches in terms of the presumed latent-trait structure of motivation. However, the measures developed in the goal-based framework suffer from many of the same problems as measures used in classic approaches,
including for example, concerns about the dimensionality of traits and the appropriate level of goal assessment.

THE MOTIVATIONAL TRAITS FORMULATION

In 1997, Kanfer and Heggestad (1997) reviewed the work and achievement motivation literatures and self-report measures of motivational traits. Based upon this review, they proposed a developmental theory that distinguishes between distal influences on action, in the form of relatively stable motivational traits, and proximal influences on performance associated with individual differences in self-regulatory, or motivational, skills. Two specific shortcomings identified by Kanfer and Heggestad (1997) pertained to the lack of attention to individual differences in strength of competitive excellence motives and to individual differences in aversively oriented motivational traits (such as worry and emotionality with respect to performance situations). Although a full description of the formulation lies beyond the scope of this paper, Kanfer and Heggestad (1997) argued that the success of a comprehensive account of work motivation would require that greater attention be paid to the motivational trait structure. In particular, they showed that: (a) there has been a substantial narrowing of focus for assessment of motivational traits over the past 30 years, and (b) that much of the motivational trait construct space was underrepresented in most current multitrait personality inventories.

THE MOTIVATIONAL TRAITS QUESTIONNAIRE (MTQ)

In a series of empirical investigations, Heggestad and Kanfer (e.g. Heggestad, 1997; Heggestad & Kanfer, 1999) developed a multiple trait motivational inventory designed explicitly to address those portions of the construct space frequently neglected in extant measures. The Motivational Trait Questionnaire (MTQ) long form contains 183 items that compose nine separate scales. These nine scales, in turn, load substantially on three underlying factors identified as: Personal Mastery, Competitive Excellence, and Motivation-Related Anxiety (for details on the development and validation of these scales, see Heggestad and Kanfer, 1999).

A short form of the MTQ was also developed to provide assessment of the three major motivational trait factors identified in the original investigations. The MTQ short form has 48 items taken from the original long form measure, and these comprise six of the original nine scales, as follows: Desire to Learn, Mastery, Other Referenced Goals, Competitiveness, Worry, and Emotionality. Descriptions of the scales and sample items are provided below, including Cronbach’s $\alpha$ internal consistency reliability estimates.
Personal Mastery

Desire to Learn. This scale is composed of items that focus on a need to achieve in the context of learning new skills or acquiring knowledge. (8 items; \( \alpha = 0.81 \); Example item: “I prefer activities that provide me the opportunity to learn something new.”)

Mastery. Items comprising this scale focus on personal goal setting and other aspects of the achievement context that represent an orientation toward continued task improvement or mastery—even when it is not required. (8 items; \( \alpha = 0.83 \); Example: “I set high standards for myself and work toward achieving them.”)

Both of the Personal Mastery scales are considered to assess approach-oriented motivational traits.

Competitive Excellence

Other Referenced Goals. Items on this scale involve comparisons to other performers (e.g. coworkers and peers) for the purpose of establishing a social reference context for the individual’s performance. (7 items; \( \alpha = 0.85 \); Example: “Whether or not I feel good about my performance depends on how it compares to the performance of others.”)

Competitiveness. This scale involves comparisons of personal performance with others—with the main focus on competition and performing better than coworkers or peers. (6 items; \( \alpha = 0.89 \); Example: “I would rather cooperate than compete.” [reverse-scored])

While Competitiveness is clearly represented as an approach-oriented trait, Other Referenced Goals involves both approach- and avoidance-related tendencies.

Motivation Related to Anxiety

Worry. This scale is composed of items that focus on worry and other aspects of evaluation apprehension in performance contexts. (10 items; \( \alpha = 0.88 \); Example: “Before beginning an important project, I think of the consequences of failing.”)

Emotionality. This scale focuses on emotions associated with performance in evaluation contexts. (9 items; \( \alpha = 0.79 \); Example: “I am able to remain calm and relaxed before I take a test.” [reverse-scored])

Both the Worry and Emotionality scales represent avoidance-related tendencies.

MTQ – PERSONALITY AND INTELLIGENCE RELATIONS

Initial investigations of the motivational trait structure involved administration of developmental versions of the MTQ long form and a battery of personality measures to three samples of college students. These investigations yielded results showing strong evidence of convergent and discriminant validity for the hypothesised trait clusters of Personal Mastery, Competitive Excellence, and Anxiety (Heggestad & Kanfer, 1999).

To provide additional construct validity information and extend these findings using the MTQ short form, we embedded the 48-item measure in a study of adult knowledge, intelligence, and personality. The study (reported in Ackerman, 2000), consisted of a sample of 228 adults recruited from flyers and newspaper advertisements at a large public university—78 men and 150 women (M age = 34.2 years, SD age = 10.6 years, age range of 21–62 years). The main inclusion criterion was completion of at least a baccalaureate level of education. Roughly half of the sample was between the ages of 21 and 30 (N = 111) and the other half was between the ages of 31 and 62 (N = 116). For the sake of convenience, the younger group was designated “young adult” and the older group was designated “middle-aged group”. In addition to the administration of the short form of the MTQ, we also administered four personality scales from Tellegen’s (1982) Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ; Social Potency, Social Closeness, Absorption, and Traditionalism). An extensive three-hour ability battery provided assessments of: (1) fluid intelligence (Raven Progressive Matrices, Spatial Analogy, Number Series, Diagramming Relations, Number Span, Problem Solving, and Necessary Facts); and (2) crystallised intelligence (Nelson–Denny Reading Speed and Comprehension, Multidimensional Aptitude Battery Comprehension, Multidimensional Aptitude Battery Synonyms, Word Beginnings, Vocabulary, and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale—Revised Information scale). For additional details about these measures, see Ackerman (2000).

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the MTQ scales, the MPQ scales, intelligence, age, and gender. Several aspects of these data are noteworthy with respect to issues of construct validity and conceptual clarity. These are discussed below in terms of: (a) the relations among MTQ scales, (b) the relations between MTQ scales and the personality-oriented MPQ scales, and (c) the relations among MTQ scales and intelligence, age, and gender.

MTQ Scale Intercorrelations

As hypothesised, substantial correlations were found between pairs of MTQ scales that purport to measure similar constructs (i.e. Desire to Learn and
Mastery, $r = 0.64$; Other Reference Goals and Competitiveness, $r = 0.64$; Worry and Emotionality, $r = 0.76$). These correlations are highly supportive of convergent validity of the scales. Discriminant validation was also demonstrated with the six MTQ scales, as shown by the small correlations between scales that were hypothesised to represent differentiated constructs (e.g. Desire to Learn and Other Referenced Goals, $r = 0.07$).

A particularly interesting pattern of results pertains to the relationships obtained among Competitive Excellence and Motivation Related to Anxiety measures. As conceptualised, the two measures comprising the Motivation Related to Anxiety factor were designed to tap the “aversive” (e.g. fear of failure) aspects of motivation. In contrast, the two measures comprising the Competitive Excellence factor were designed to capture the “appetitive” aspects of motivation described by Murray in terms of “to rival and surpass others” (Murray, 1938, p. 164). However, as shown in Table 1, although the two measures of each higher-order factor are substantially correlated, the two measures of Competitive Excellence are differentially related to the Motivation Related to Anxiety measures. Specifically, the Other Referenced Goals scale shows a pattern of positive correlations with the Worry and Emotionality scales ($rs = 0.34$ and 0.25, respectively), whereas the Competitiveness scale is unrelated to the Worry and Emotionality scales ($rs = -0.06$ and 0.08, respectively). One way of reconciling these seemingly inconsistent results is to recognise that individuals may compare their own performance to that of others for two very different reasons: (a) to evaluate whether they are performing better than others (e.g. competition), or (b) to evaluate whether others are doing better than they are (e.g. fear of failure). With this conceptualisation in mind, the pattern of correlations makes sense. That is, both appetitive and aversive aspects of motivation are captured in an individual’s tendency to reference other actors’ performance. Whether these two different aspects of the comparison process can be resolved with more refined measures is an open question that awaits further research.

**Motivational Trait (MTQ) and Personality Trait (MPQ) Relations**

Further evidence on the validity of the MTQ scales is provided by considering MTQ–MPQ scale correlations. In contrast to the FFM model, which provides only a broad assessment of the construct of extroversion, the MPQ has the advantage of separating two aspects of extroversion, namely: Social Potency and Social Closeness. As shown in Table 1, the appetitive motivational traits (i.e. Desire to Learn, Mastery, Competitiveness, and Other Referenced Goals) are positively and significantly correlated with Social Potency, but only the MTQ Mastery scale is significantly correlated with Social Closeness. With respect to the aversive motivational trait scales, Emotionality is not significantly related to either aspect of extroversion,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Desire to Learn</td>
<td>37.99</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Referenced Goals</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitiveness</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Worry</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emotionality</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Closeness</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Traditionalism</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td></td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fluid Intelligence (Gf)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Crystallised Intelligence (Gc)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Age</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Gender (1 = Male, 2 = Female)</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01.
whereas Worry is significantly and negatively related to both Social Potency and Social Closeness. Taken together, these results are consistent with previous suggestions that both appetitive and aversive motivational traits relate to extroversion.

Table 1 also shows significant positive correlations between the MPQ Absorption scale and the MTQ Personal Mastery scales—but not the Competitive Excellence Scales. Again, this pattern of results makes good theoretical sense, in that individuals are unlikely to be absorbed in a task at the same time that they are comparing their performance to that of others. Finally, it should be noted that Mastery was significantly and positively correlated with Traditionalism. Consistent with the positive correlation of this MTQ scale with Social Closeness, it appears that this scale may reflect aspects of a traditional work ethic construct, such as the desire for doing a job well and getting along well with others.

Motivational Traits and Intelligence

Overall, MTQ measures were generally unrelated to measures of crystallised and fluid intelligence. (Two significant correlations obtained between MTQ scales and measures of intelligence were generally modest in magnitude \[ r = 0.15 \text{ and } 0.16 \].) These results, obtained using an extensive battery of ability tests, are consistent with prior results showing little overlap between individual differences in motivational traits and ability traits—at least among samples of educated adults (see e.g. Kanfer, Dugdale, & McDonald, 1994; Kuhl & Fuhrmann, 1999). Using multiple correlation techniques, the MTQ scales were found to have only 5% shared variance with fluid intelligence \( r^2 = 0.05, P = 0.06 \), and 12% of shared variance with crystallised intelligence \( r^2 = 0.12, P < 0.01 \). Such results indicate that even though communalities among motivational traits and intellectual abilities are rather modest, the locus of most of the communality is in the domain of experiential and educationally-based abilities (see Horn, 1968 for a more extensive discussion of fluid and crystallised intelligence constructs).

Motivational Traits, Age, and Gender

As indicated in Table 1, significant negative correlations were obtained between age and the appetitive motivational traits (e.g. Mastery, Competitiveness). These findings are consistent with prior results showing that middle-aged and older adults are less likely to have the same achievement-oriented motive strength as younger adults (Heckhausen, 1997).

Results obtained for gender differences indicate that women reported significantly higher levels of Mastery and Emotionality than men do. As Kanfer and Heggestad (1997) suggested, individuals with simultaneously

high trait levels of appetitive and aversive motivational tendencies may experience increased conflict and problems in the workplace. For these individuals, the positive effects of adopting challenging goals may be substantially offset by intensified anxiety during goal striving. The results obtained in this study indicate that women are more likely to demonstrate this trait pattern than men are. Further research to investigate the generalisability of these findings in the larger population and across cultures appears warranted.

An ANOVA Summary. Because the sample was split into two approximately equal groups of participants under the age of 30 and over the age of 30 ($N = 111$ and $116$, respectively), it was possible to provide a contrast between these groups on the MTQ scales within an ANOVA framework. Even with recognition that these are cross-sectional data, and may thus be influenced by cohort differences, post hoc analyses of the age and gender data suggest that there may be interesting developmental patterns for several of the MTQ scales.

Table 2 shows the results of $2 \times 2$ ANOVAs for each of the six MTQ scales. As expected, the main effects mirror the correlational findings; namely significant gender differences (all with women having higher scores) for Desire to Learn, Mastery, and Emotionality, with the largest gender differences found for Mastery ($d = 0.61$). Also, significant age differences (under 30/over 30) were found for all but one of the appetitive trait scales (i.e. Mastery, Other Referenced Goals, and Competitiveness). Not surprisingly, younger adults showed higher average levels than middle-aged adults on each scale, with the largest age differences found for Competitiveness ($d = 0.53$). In contrast, no significant age differences were obtained for the aversive trait scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTQ Scale</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender × Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Desire to Learn</td>
<td>4.64*</td>
<td>.16 (.08)</td>
<td>.16 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery</td>
<td>20.28**</td>
<td>6.23* (.36)</td>
<td>.13 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Referenced Goals</td>
<td>.01 (.02)</td>
<td>7.03** (.41)</td>
<td>1.18 (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitiveness</td>
<td>2.07 (.21)</td>
<td>11.85** (.53)</td>
<td>4.12* (.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Worry</td>
<td>2.65 (.24)</td>
<td>.55 (.14)</td>
<td>.19 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emotionality</td>
<td>8.97** (.41)</td>
<td>.08 (.08)</td>
<td>.64 (.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$
All comparisons: $df = 1$ (numerator), $df = 221$ (denominator)
Finally, a significant Gender × Age interaction was found for Competitiveness. Specifically, middle-aged women showed the lowest level of Competitiveness compared to the other three groups. Together, these results suggest that women report higher trait levels for situations that provide opportunities for mastery, but report lower competition-seeking, especially as they transition from young adults to middle age. What may be perhaps problematic is that there is no concomitant decline in Worry or Emotionality scores for these middle-aged women—again suggesting a source of apparently conflicting motivational traits.

SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The findings reported here add to the corpus of evidence supporting the motivational trait taxonomy proposed by Kanfer and Heggestad (1997). Consistent with classic conceptions of achievement motivation, but in contrast to most contemporary trends in motivational trait measurement, the results indicate a clear differentiation between appetitive/approach traits related to Personal Mastery and Competitive Excellence. The MTQ scales pertaining to Personal Mastery appear to tap those aspects of achievement most commonly evaluated in extant personality and achievement-oriented individual differences measures. In contrast, the two Competitive Excellence MTQ scales appear to capture less well-understood aspects of approach and avoidance traits. In particular, the observed differential relationship of the two Competition Seeking scales with the Motivation Related to Anxiety trait scales is fully consistent with the notion that extrinsic motivational orientations may occur in concert with high levels of approach or avoidance-oriented traits (e.g. Harackiewicz, Sansone, & Manderlink, 1985). Further research to investigate the validity of these scales and their influence in work motivation processes clearly appears warranted.

A long-standing issue in the trait domain pertains to the extent to which motivational traits may be clearly distinguished from intellectual traits. The results of this study add to the growing body of evidence demonstrating the independence of individual differences in motivation and individual differences in intellectual abilities—as indexed by measures that aim primarily at assessing g. In this study, however, individual differences in intellectual abilities were evaluated with respect to fluid (Gf) and crystallised intelligence (Gc) (for a description of these constructs, see Horn, 1968). Given that the Gc measure of intelligence represents a central index of the results of lifelong learning, and that our measure of Gc (a composite of seven separate tests) was broad and extensive, the weak association between this composite and Personal Mastery scales of the MTQ is surprising. That is, although Gf and motivational traits may be unrelated, it seems reasonable to expect a slightly higher association between individuals’ cumulative level of knowledge (Gc)

and their trait tendencies toward learning and mastery. Additional research, to determine whether the specificity of an individual’s “desire to learn” affects this relation, appears warranted. From a pragmatic perspective, the extent to which specificity may influence this relation has potential implications for personnel selection and training, particularly among middle-aged workers.

The pattern of results obtained for MTQ scores as a function of gender and age suggests that work motivation researchers should pay greater attention to how demographic variables exert their influence on motivational processes and work outcomes. For example, our findings show a relative decline in trait strength related to mastery and learning among “middle-aged” (above 30) individuals. As such, it may be that motivational interventions designed to compensate for, rather than attempt to rekindle, lower levels of intrinsic motivation may be more effective among middle-aged workers.

From an assessment perspective, the MTQ short form demonstrates a number of desirable properties with respect to internal consistency scale reliabilities and construct validity. Together with previous results obtained with the MTQ long form, these findings suggest that the MTQ serves as a promising tool for use in theory and research investigating the influence of individual differences in motivational traits as they affect goal choice and striving in workplace/achievement settings.
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