Is work motivation is a mediator of basic need satisfaction-engagement relationship among business and technical education university lecturers?
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ABSTRACT

The study establishes a link between the basic psychological needs satisfaction of employees and their engagement in other administrative organizations. However, there is a need for more studies in the educational organizations in general, and vocational education in particular because of the job demands in vocational education. This study, therefore, determined the relationship between work-related basic need satisfaction (WBNS), work engagement and work motivation in vocational education. The participants were 299 business and technical education lecturers of the vocational education programme in Nigeria universities. The study utilized three scales, which were embedded in a questionnaire for data collection. The face and construct validity of the scales were established. Data analysis was performed with correlation, and regression of paths by applying 2000 re-samples bias-corrected (BC) bootstrapping method. The result showed a positive significant relationship between WBNS, work motivation and work engagement. However, work motivation could not mediate the relationship in the study’s model.
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INTRODUCTION

Realizing a healthy work situation in the educational institution, in the midst of the varying task has become so imminent in the present high knowledge-seeking environment. One tier of education that has complex and multiple work situation is university education (Lester and Costley, 2010). In the university education, the field of vocational and technical education is obliged to training the required skilled manpower needed in the business sectors and the industries, as well as allied teachers (Federal Republic of Nigeria, FRN, 2013). Thus, we deemed it fit in this study to consider this category of lecturers (Business and technical/technology education lecturers). According to Chukwuedo and Ighinedion (2014), vocational education lecturers perform three core tasks, which includes, teaching, research, and administration. The teaching task requires the lecturer to make use of both the regular classroom, laboratories, studios, and workshops for successful training of the students. Thus, it becomes necessary to consider the work-related need satisfaction, motivation, and work engagement of the lecturers.

The concept of need is fundamental in educational institutions for teachers’ development (Latham and Budworth, 2006). Because of the multiple job tasks of the vocational educators, with particular emphasis on business and technical/technology education lecturers in the context of this study, it is necessary to determine the work-related needs of the lecturers in higher education. Bakker and Schaufeli (2008) noted that positive organizational behavior (POB) research is a necessity for human development in every organization. There is need for today’s educational organizations to increasingly create work conditions that promote and sustain employee motivation and well-being, to attract and retain competent and qualified employees (Bakker et al., 2011). These work conditions are psychological and physiological needs that are fundamentally necessary for effective work engagement.
and the commitment of lecturers.

Basic psychological needs significantly predict an individual’s function in life (van de Broeck et al., 2008). According to Silman (2014), there is a close association between basic need satisfaction and self-determination theory (SDT). Within the context of SDT, basic psychological needs satisfaction is an essential ingredient needed by humans to fulfill their potentials and maintain their growth, integrity, and health in the educational institutions (Van den Broeck et al., 2008). These needs at the workplace, especially in vocational education programmes, are to be fulfilled for effective teaching/learning. Studies on SDT have shown that the need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness suggest basic psychological need (Deci and Ryan, 1985, 2000, 2002; Deci and Vansteenkiste, 2004; Janssen et al., 2013; Brien et al., 2012).

In the context of SDT, the need for autonomy requires an individual to choose freely and organize one’s life, thought, and activities in the educational institution (van de Broeck et al., 2010). The need for competence has to do with an individual interacting with the environment so as to reach the desired outcome of teaching and learning (Brien et al., 2012). While the need for relatedness is the desire for an individual to be loved and to love others within and outside the work environment (Ryan and Deci, 2000). One compelling issue of a higher educational institution which can affect vocational education lecturers is that the school system in Nigeria and other parts of the world is controlled by the government to a large extent. The instability in the political situation about higher education policy may adversely affect the work, basic needs and satisfaction of the lecturers, which may, in turn, affect their job engagement (Ogbuanya and Chukwuedo, 2017).

Research has shown that there is a relationship between autonomy, competence and relatedness, and job performance. For instance, Silman (2014) revealed that work-related basic need satisfaction predicts work engagement. Similarly, Mueller and Lovell (2013) also showed that relatedness needs satisfaction to enhance the performance of senior executives. Additionally, in the motivational process, the absence of job resources impacts employees' motivation and therefore contributes to disengagement and withdrawal (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). This situation can equally happen in Nigeria where vocational education lecturers find it difficult to harness resources together to achieve organization goals as a result of mirage influences. Work engagement is a motivation concept that has to do with the controlled allocation of individual resources focused on the range of tasks demanded by a particular occupational role (Christian et al., 2011). Thus, engagement is a function of energy, participation, and efficacy. Schaufeli et al., (2002) study demonstrated that engagement and burnout are not the same and should be measured differently and separately. When an employee, especially lecturer, is not burned-out, this does not necessarily mean that the lecturer is engaged in his work; and vice versa (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003). Hence the three dimensions of work engagement are vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakker and Schaufeli, 2008).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theories underpinning this study are the self-determination theory (SDT) and the Job Demand-Resources (JD-R) model.

Self-determination theory (SDT)

Self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985) is a theory of human motivation and an organismic-dialectical theory which suggests that humans have three essential work needs. These needs are autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Janssen et al., 2013; Fernet et al., 2013). In the context of organizational activities, Gillet et al., (2013) suggest that SDT is particularly suitable for determining the relationship between motivation and engagement.

SDT verification has gone several progressive stages (Deci and Ryan, 1980, 1985). In this context, Kuvaas (2009) stated that the focus of SDT is not individual differences in the strength of the needs, but the degree to which they are satisfied. Studies on SDT supported the postulate of the theory (example. Andreessen et al., 2010; Cankaya, 2009; Baard et al., 2004; Gagne et al., 2000). This theory applies to our study that the work-related basic needs satisfaction and motivation are a function of basic psychological needs.

Job demand resource (JD-R) model

The JD-R model is another theory for this study, which recognizes job demand and job resources. The JD-R model states that every job is connected with a particular physiological or psychological demands. JD-R model asserts that job resources are the physical, emotional, and organizational features of a job that enable employees to complete their tasks successfully. Hence, Bakker et al., (2007) found that job resources increase work engagement when job demands are high. In JD-R model, job resources foster employees' growth and development and prevent ill-being (Crawford et al., 2010). In educational organizations, job demands take more of lecturers' mental and physical energy, and these usually result in strain reactions and health challenges (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007). Since job resources enhance work motivation and promote adaptive work behaviors such as work engagement (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Hakanen, Bakker., 2006), this theory applies to this study.

Conceptual framework

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship
Figure 1: Conceptual model: the mediating role of intrinsic work motivation.

between work-related basic need satisfaction, work motivation, and work engagement. Thus, the basic understanding and relation of the concepts are presented as follows:

**Work-related basic need satisfaction**

In SDT, basic psychological need satisfaction represents the need to satisfy autonomy, competence, and relatedness among employees (lecturers). When an individual fulfills the need for autonomy, the individual feels free to choose and organize his action, whereas the necessity of competence involves an individual's inherent desire to feel useful in interacting with the environment (Deci and Ryan, 2000). When the lecturer's need for competence is satisfied, he/she feels skilled enough to carry out a task to the best of one's ability and thus reach one's goal. The need for relatedness refers to the desire to establish mutually caring bonds and working alliances with others (Deci and Ryan, 2002). Therefore, when the need for relatedness is satisfied, one feels to love and care for others. Conversely, one feels being cared for and loved by others.

**Work engagement**

Work engagement is characterized by energy, involvement, and efficacy (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003). The dimensions of work engagement are vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor is characterized by high levels of enthusiasm and mental resilience while working. It is the willingness of a lecturer to invest effort in one's work, not being easily fatigued, but to be persistent even in the face difficulty. Dedication has to do with procuring a sense of importance from one's work, by exhibiting enthusiasm and pride about one's job. Lastly, absorption is being totally and happily immersed in one's work and having difficulties detaching oneself from by his/her work, hence time passes quickly, and one forgets everything else that is around (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Storm and Rothmann, 2003).

**Work motivation**

Work motivation are energetic forces that originate both within and beyond an individual's reality, to initiate work-related behavior, and determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration (Tremblay et al., 2009). It measures intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, as well as amotivation (Kanfer et al., 2008; Tremblay et al., 2009). Within the context of this study, it was proposed that work motivation will have significant relationship with WBNS and work engagement. Since previous studies have established that WBNS could lead to work motivation (Liga et al., 2018; Del Valle et al., 2018) and a motivated employee will be highly engaged (Silman, 2014), we propose that work motivation will mediate the relationship between WBNS and work engagement (c.f. Ogbuanya and Chukwuedo, 2017).

**The current study and research model**

The model depicted in Figure 1 represents the purpose of this study. Thus, the specific purpose is to determine the relationship between WBNS, work motivation, and work engagement.

The path diagram in Figure 1 illustrates the mediation model for this study. The mediator, predictor, and predicted variables are work motivation, work-related basic need satisfaction, and work engagement respectively. Therefore to test hypotheses 1 to 3, we consider the paths that are unmediated. The paths that are mediated, which are direct and indirect effects. Hence, hypothesis 4 was formulated to test the mediating role of work motivation. Thus, the hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** Work-related basic need satisfaction is a significant positive predictor of work engagement.

**Hypothesis 2:** Work-related basic need satisfaction is a
significant positive predictor of intrinsic work motivation.

**Hypothesis 3:** Intrinsic work motivation is a significant positive predictor of work engagement.

**Hypothesis 4:** Intrinsic work motivation is a significant positive mediator between work-related basic needs satisfaction and work engagement.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Research design**

This study is a cross-sectional correlational survey that is meant to collect data from a single questionnaire administration (Gay et al., 2011), while the relationship of the variables upon which the data were collected are then established. This design is considered suitable because the questionnaire used for data collection was administered to the respondents once for the data, and the relationship between the variables (work-related basic need satisfaction, work motivation, and work engagement) was established.

**Participants**

The participants of this study were 299 business education (n = 199) and technical/technology education (n = 100) lecturers who were drawn from public or government-owned Universities in four out of the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria. The multi-stage sampling technique to ensure that the six geopolitical zones are proportionally covered and represented.

**Measures**

Work-related basic need satisfaction was measured with an adapted Work Basic Need Scale (WBNS) (van de Broeck, et al., 2010), which has 16 item on 5-point frequency scale ranging from never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), often (4) to always (5). This scale has three subscales that measure the need for autonomy (6 items, for example, I feel like I can be myself at work), need for competence (4 items, for example, I really master my tasks at my job) and need for relatedness (6 items, for example, at work, I feel like I am part of a group). Work engagement was measured with the UWES 17 item scale (Schaufeli, et al., 2002) rated on a 5-point scale ranging from never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), often (4) to always (5). This scale has three subscales that measure vigor (6 items, for example, at my job I am very resilient mentally), dedication (5 items, for example, my job inspires me) and absorption (6 items, for example, I am immersed in my work). Lastly, work motivation was measured with six items, one from each of the six subscales of work motivation scale (Tremblay et al., 2009) to form a single scale for the work motivation scale used in this study. This was also supported by the face validation of the instrument. The items (for example, because I derive much pleasure from learning new things, because this type of work provides me with security, and I don’t know why too much is expected of us) were rated on a 5-point response option ranging from corresponds not all (1) via corresponds moderately (3) to corresponds exactly (5).

**Validation of measures**

Face validity and construct validity of the questionnaire was determined because the (1) scales were adapted by using a 5-point response option instead of a 7-point response option, and (2) scales were developed and tested among Nigerian lecturers in general and vocational education in particular. The face validity was conducted with three experts, while the construct validity was determined using the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA, as recommended by Anderson and Gerbing, 1984) - the ratio of chi-square to the degree of freedom ($\chi^2/df \leq 2.50$), Comparative Fit Index (CFI ≥ 0.90), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI ≥ 0.90) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA ≤ 0.08), p > .01). The three-factor model of the WBNS ($\chi^2/df = 2.51$, CFI = 0.902, GFI = .899, RMSEA = 0.078, p < 0.001) and the three-factor model of work engagement ($\chi^2/df = 2.46$, CFI = 0.911, GFI = 0.909, RMSEA = 0.080, p < 0.001) yielded relatively good data fit. While the one-factor model of work motivation yielded excellent data fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.13$, CFI = 0.935, GFI = 0.926, RMSEA = 0.072, p > 0.01). These two approaches showed that the scales used for the questionnaire items questionnaire are valid for this study.

**Reliability of measures**

The internal consistency of the scales was established with Cronbach’s alpha. The reliability coefficient of the WBNS scale ($\alpha = 0.868$) and its subscales – autonomy ($\alpha = 0.878$), competence ($\alpha = 0.891$), and relatedness ($\alpha = 0.846$) were found satisfactory. Similarly, the reliability coefficient of the work engagement scale ($\alpha = 0.893$) and its subscales – vigor ($\alpha = 0.877$), dedication ($\alpha = 0.859$), and absorption ($\alpha = 0.849$) were also found satisfactory. Lastly, the work motivation scale also gave rise to a satisfactory reliability coefficient ($\alpha = 0.856$).

**Data collection procedure**

The questionnaire was conveniently administered to
business and technical/technology education lecturers in the fields of vocational and technical education. Alongside the researchers, four research assistants were used for the data collection. The research assistants were briefed by the researchers on how to administer and retrieve the questionnaires. The administration and retrieval of the questionnaire lasted for 13 weeks, because of the wide coverage of the geopolitical and the distant aspects of the universities studied.

Statistical data analysis

The data analyses were conducted using SPSS and PROCESS macro, by employing mean, standard deviation, Cronbach’s alpha (α), correlation and regression analyses, and 2000 re-samples bias-corrected (BC) bootstrapping (Hayes, 2013). The SPSS was applied for mean, standard deviation, Cronbach’s alpha, and correlation and regression analyses, while PROCESS macro was used to conduct path analysis alongside BC bootstrapping at 95% confidence interval (CI).

RESULTS

The outcomes of the data analysis are presented hereafter.

Establishing a relationship between variables

We conducted a preliminary data analysis to determine the significant level of correlations among the variables to enable us authenticate the need for mediation analysis.

The results presented in Table 1 reveal the correlations between the study variables and the dimensions. The table also shows the mean responses, standard deviation, and Cronbach’s alpha of the study variables. The association among work-related basic need satisfaction, work engagement and intrinsic work motivation (r = 0.463, 0.545 and 0.277) are statistically significant (p < 0.01). The table also revealed a relative statistical significant between the dimensions of the study variable. In all, the results depict that WBNs and work engagement, WBNs and work motivation, and work motivation and work engagement have significant positive relationships.

Test of hypotheses of unmediated pathways

To substantiate the results in Table 1, we performed regression analysis (Mackinnon et al., 2004), as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 depicts the simple linear regression analysis to test hypotheses 1 to 3. First, we found that WBNs significantly predicts work engagement ($β = 0.545$, $F(1, 297) = 125.592$, $ΔR^2 = 0.295$, $p < 0.001$). The $ΔR^2$ depicts that WBNs may account for 29.5 percent of the variance in work engagement within the model of this study. Similarly, the results of Table 2 showed that WBNs significantly predicts work motivation ($β = 0.463$, $F(1, 297) = 81.147$, $ΔR^2 = 0.212$, $p < 0.001$). The $ΔR^2 = 0.212$ indicates that WBNs may explain the 21.2 percent of the variance that occurs in work motivation in our model. Finally, work motivation positively predicts work engagement ($β = 0.277$, $F(1, 297)$

### Table 1: Mean, standard deviation, and correlation of the study variables (scales and subscales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Autonomy</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>1</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. Competence</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>1</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. Relatedness</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vigor</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dedication</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Absorption</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Amotivation</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work basic need</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Work motivation</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Work engagement</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ***p < .001 level (2-tailed); **p < .01 level (2-tailed); *p < .05 level (2-tailed). SD = standard deviation.

### Table 2: Simple linear regression of the predictor, mediator and outcome variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction → Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>125.592***</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction → Intrinsic Work Motivation</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>81.147***</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Work Motivation → Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>24.685***</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ***p < .001 level; degree of freedom (df) = 1, 297.
Table 3: Summary of BC bootstrapping mediation effect of intrinsic work motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.764***</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>0.743***</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>0.020 (ns)</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ***p < .001, ns – not significant.

Figure 2. Mediation test of work motivation in WBNS-engagement relation.

Note. (1) a1 is the total effect of WBNS on work engagement when the mediator (work motivation) has not been added to the model. (2) a2 is the direct effect of WBNS on work engagement when the mediator has been added to the model. (3) b is the indirect effect of WBNS on work engagement when the mediator has been added to the model. ***p < .001, ns means not significant

Test of hypothesis of mediated pathways

Since the correlations between the variables were significant (see Table 1), we performed the mediation analysis for the direct and indirect pathways in our model using the 2000 re-samples BC bootstrapping method (Preacher and Hayes, 2008; Hayes, 2013).

Table 3 reveals that the total effect result (β = 0.764, SE = 0.068, p < 0.001) and the direct effect results (β = 0.743, SE = 0.077, p < 0.001) of the relationship between WBNS and work engagement are statistically significant via work motivation. Conversely, the indirect effect (β = 0.020, SE = 0.051, CI: LL = -0.026 and UL = 0.090) is not significant. Hence, the work motivation did not significantly mediate the relationship between WBNS and work engagement in this study. This result is further illustrated schematically in Figure 2.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY

The current study determined the mediating role of work motivation in the relationship between WBNS and work engagement business and technical/technology education lecturers in the field of vocational education. Our proposed model could not confirm that work motivation is the mechanism in establishing WBNS and work engagement relationship. Thus, work motivation is not a mediator of the relationship in this study. These findings called the attention of vocational organizational administrators, managers and career guidance on recognizing the relevance of work motivation on fostering the vocational education lecturers’ workplace conditions. Work engagement has empirically proved to promote job performance (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008), hence educational stakeholders should not neglect WBNS and work motivation of any form
in work behaviors of employees.

Considering hypothesis 1, we expected and found that WBNS is a significant positive predictor of work engagement. This result implies that increased WBNS (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) leads to increase in work engagement (vigor, dedication, and absorption). Literature showed that there are various research in other organizations, but a paucity of empirical investigation on WBNS and work engagement relationship in the educational institutions (Demerouti and Bakker, 2011; Klassen et al., 2013; Luthans, 2002; Silman, 2014). The finding is in consonant with previous studies (example. Silman, 2014; Van de Broeck et al., 2008), that work satisfaction of work related basic need leads to high work engagement (c.f. Ogbuanya and Chukwu, 2017).

From the findings hypothesis 2 was confirmed; thus WBNS is a significant positive predictor of work motivation. Because of paucity of empirical findings on the relationship between WBNS and work motivation, this is one novelty of this study. Hence, a contribution to the existing knowledge and literature (Deci and Ryan, 2002; Gagne and Deci, 2005) which also supports the tenets of the theory of self-determination. Hence, the work motivation of teachers inadvertently, indirectly and predictably increases as a result of satisfaction of work-basic needs. Thus, the finding complements previous findings (example. Deci and Ryan, 2008; Gagne and Deci, 2005; Garland and Lam, 2008; Tremblay et al., 2009), which illustrates that the element and dimensions of self-determination theory explain work motivation, attitude, and behaviours.

The analysis performed to test hypothesis 3 revealed that work motivation is a significant positive predictor of work engagement. This result explains that employees work motivation enhances work engagement. Although this result may not be surprising, employers of labour, vocational organizational managers, and school administrators place more emphasis on the drives and mechanisms that promote employees’ intrinsic motivation (Olorunsola and Bamiyoko, 2005; Muogbo, 2013) rather than the entire components of work motivation. Consequently, less attention is on the mechanisms that will inevitably improve employees’ intrinsically motivated work (Backhaus and Surinder, 2004; Schuler and Jackson, 2014; Wairimu, 2014; Arar and Massry-Herzlha, 2016; Vanlommel et al., 2016). Intrinsic work motivation facilitates work engagement, which in turn improves employee’s job performance. This call brings to mind, the need for vocational education institution to always consider intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as well as amotivated teachers work and career outcomes.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although this study has provided some findings that can be of great benefit to the educational organizations, it is not void of limitations. Because the study population is distinct (business and technical education lecturers) and relatively small, caution must be exercised in making causal inferences and generalizing the findings of the survey to other employees. However, we have made attempt to control and minimize this effect by applying 2000 re-sample bootstrapping method which gives room for relative generalization of findings (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). Additionally, this study is a cross-sectional survey design, which does not ultimately allow causal inference to be made in any study. We, therefore, recommend that longitudinal or experimental research should be conducted in future research compare are findings. Finally, the study used self-report measures which usually give rise to potential common method bias. Thus, alternate measures are suggested in a allied future studies.
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