Hedonic and Eudaimonic Job-Related Well-Being: Enjoyment of Job and Fulfillment of Job Purpose

Teresa J. Rothausen
Working Paper

Running Head: Job-Related Well-Being

Hedonic and Eudaimonic Job-Related Well-Being:

Enjoyment of Job and Fulfillment of Job Purpose

Teresa J. Rothausen
University of St. Thomas, Minnesota

Under review.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Teresa J. Rothausen; Department of Management; Opus College of Business; 1000 LaSalle Avenue; TMH 443; Minneapolis MN 55403; USA; 651-962-4264; tjrothausen@stthomas.edu

Abstract

The concept of job-related well-being is developed based on theories of the self and the life course, and well-being and meaning of work literatures. Job-related well-being is the contribution of the job to well-being through enjoyment of the job by the individual (hedonic job-related well-being) and fulfillment of the purposes of the job for the individual (eudaimonic job-related well-being). Although it is an individual attitude, extant conceptualizations of job satisfaction are limited within the boundaries of the workplace, essentially leaving out meaning of jobs, and therefore represent a partial conceptualization of hedonic job-related well-being. Fulfillment of job purpose comprises six facets: self-expression, development and growth, role in society, financial subsistence and thriving, impact on family as self-defined, and impact on life construction. Implications of job-related well-being for research related to general well-being, life satisfaction, job satisfaction, engagement, presenteeism, retention, and performance behaviors, as well as implications for practice, are discussed.

Key Words: Hedonic, Eudaimonic, Well-being, Job satisfaction, Purpose, Meaning of work

"I get up every morning determined both to change the world and to have one hell of a good time. Sometimes, this makes planning the day difficult." This E.B White quotation captures two enduring longings in human life—to enjoy it and to have it matter. Well-being is an individual's internal sense of the state or condition of being well. The two primary meanings of "well," from which this term derives, are being "in a desirable or pleasing manner" and "in a good or proper manner" (Webster's, 1959: 1209). These in turn relate to ancient and contemporary philosophical positions in which meaning derives from pursuit of a pleasant or enjoyable life (hedonia) or a morally good or purposeful life (eudaimonia), with proponents advocating each perspective (Waterman, 1993). Research reinforces these same two factors. In recent years there has been a "crystallization of themes" in well-being literatures, foremost of which is the understanding of two related but distinct factors—hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001: 142); these are sometimes referred to as happiness and purpose, or subjective and psychological well-being, respectively (Diener, Scollon, & Lucas, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989). Although there is heated debate between those who claim that well-being defined one way or the other is superior, empirical work has shown that they are distinct but related, as when people experience doing well, feeling happy, finding meaning, and acting with integrity (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Waterman, 1993).

Having one's job matter and enjoying it are both important to engagement, motivation, and other job-related outcomes (Grant, 2008; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010; Rothausen, Malshe, & Arnold, 2012). As industrial-organizational psychologists, work psychologists, and management scholars, however, we have only partially conceptualized job-related well-being. Job satisfaction is widely acknowledged to be a conceptualization of "enjoyment of the job" or hedonic job-related well-being (Dik, Duffy, &

Eldridge, 2009; George & Jones, 1996). The primary purpose of this paper is to develop a theoretically based, holistic conceptualization that includes global and facet elements of both hedonic and eudaimonic job-related well-being. This conceptualization includes six facets of eudaimonic job-related well-being: self-expression, development and growth, role in society, financial subsistence and thriving, impact on family as self-defined, and impact on life construction; and together with re-conceptualized hedonic satisfaction with the general-level job facets of work tasks, process, and product; social context; and institutional context, this comprises facet job-related well-being.

It is important to note that there is a potential difference between a job "mattering" and "meaningful work." The latter directly "makes a difference" to someone or "changes the world" in however small a way. A job may have meaning to the individual because it involves meaningful work. However, a job may also have purpose, significance, and meaning to the individual because it enables the individual in non-work life domains. For example, the meaning of my job may be that it allows me to contribute financially to my family financially and spend quality time with loved ones. This does not imply that I do not take pride in my work and find it meaningful as well (see Hulin, 2011). Presumably, if a job is meaningful in both senses, overall job-related well-being will be higher than if a job is meaningful in one sense but not the other, although this is an empirical question. Thus, here meaning includes meaningfulness as well as other meanings jobs may have for people in their lives.

After developing theoretical foundations for job-related well-being, I articulate global and facet job-related well-being, and compare job-related well-being as conceptualized here with attitudes commonly used in research on and the practice of industrial and organizational psychology, work psychology, and management, including job satisfaction, organizational

commitment, work involvement, engagement, and presenteeism. Finally, I briefly discuss future research to encourage a "re-start" in our growth of understanding about human well-being related to jobs.

Jobs, Job-Related Well-Being, and Purposes of Jobs in Individuals' Lives

As Freud famously theorized, virtually all people pursue work and love. For most people across cultures, job / work / career is one of two primary domains of life (with relationship / family / social; three to five other domains are also generally important; Andrews & Robinson, 1991; Diener et al., 2009; Erdogan, Bauer, Truxillo, & Mansfield, 2012; Rath & Harter, 2010). Jobs also provide opportunities to get some social needs met, and people also do work in social/relationship-primary settings.

In order to further refine job-related well-being and the theoretical basis on which it rests, it is important to define *work* and *job*. *Work* can be thought of as energy purposefully expended to produce a product, service, or other impact of value, within a context (Barley & Kunda, 2001; Budd, 2011; Phillips & Lawrence, forthcoming). Work done in a specific social and institutional context in turn defines a specific job. Thus a *job* is work done to produce a product, service, or impact in a particular socio-institutional setting. Similar sets of tasks to produce similar outcomes may be done in a variety of settings, defining different jobs. For example, an individual may undertake a set of financial analysis and investing tasks for an employing organization, a community organization, and family. The first may be a "paid job," the second a "volunteer job," and the third a "job around the house."

For many people, a majority of waking hours are spent and a significant portion of work lives occur in an employing organization. Therefore, job-related well-being in the employment setting is important to understand for those interested in optimal lives, healthy human

functioning, and human performance. In organizations and societies, there is increasing interest in happiness and well-being outcomes as equally important alongside economic and financial measures such as GDP, quarterly profits, and performance, the latter of which perhaps have been overemphasized in the past at the expense of the former (Diener & Seligman, 2004; Erdogan et al., 2012; Hulin, 2011; Oishi, 2012; Rothkopf, 2011). As a key part of most societies, business organizations need a sound and holistic conceptualization of job-related well-being in order to gauge the contribution of the jobs they provide to human well-being.

As applied to jobs, hedonia and eudaimonia reflect distinct and related assumptions about what drives human efforts toward jobs (i.e., efforts to take a job, do it, or do it well): pleasure and enjoyment—hedonic reasons, or meaning and purpose—eudaimonic reasons. The hedonic focus emphasizes the job itself or its facets as enjoyable or pleasurable to have or do, whereas the eudaimonic focus is on the job as instrumental to one or more larger outcomes or purposes, whether undertaken as part of identity expression, to help others, to provide financially for dependents, or to learn and grow (Deci & Ryan, 2008; George & Jones, 1996; Grant, 2008; Rothausen et al., 2012). Thus, *job-related well-being is an individual's internal sense of the level of the contribution of the job to the individual's well-being through of enjoyment of the job by the individual and fulfillment of the purposes of the job for the individual.*

In European research (e.g., Stride, Wall, & Catley, 2007), the term "job-related well-being" refers to a loosely connected set of constructs including job satisfaction, job-related mental health, and job-related depressive symptoms. Worker well-being in stress literatures indicates a similar collection of physical and emotional health-related constructs, including attitudes and objective health measures (e.g., Ganster & Perrewé, 2011). In work and health psychology, work-related well-being also refers to a collection of constructs such as "work-

related satisfactions, non-work related satisfactions as affected by work, and general health"
(Guest & Conway, 2009: 15). However, I am not aware of any holistic, global measure of job-
related well-being per se.

An individual takes up any given job for a variety of purposes. For example, in addition
to enjoyment of the set of financial analysis and investing tasks in the earlier example, and the
social and institutional settings in which they are conducted, the individual may perform the paid
job to have an important role in society or as an expression of skills and abilities; the volunteer
job for further development and growth or to express values and interests; and the home-based
job to help loved ones or for economic stability. Thus, an individual may enjoy (nor not enjoy)
work, social, and institutional facets of jobs done for a variety of purposes, which are met (or not
met) by the job including self-expression, growth, financial health, role and identity in the
community or society, for loved ones, or as part of constructing a desired life. I develop these
facets of jobs and of job purposes further below.

First, however, I develop the theoretical foundations of job-related well-being, and
explicate its defining elements as an attitude. Theories that seek to explain the individual within
a life course suggest that well-being related to the job includes the meaning derived from the job
as one element of life. At least four streams of literature support this, including theories and
research on well-being and stress, the self, the life course, and person-environment fit.

Theoretical Foundations of Job-Related Well-Being

Conservation of Resources (COR)Theory (Hobfoll, 1989) posits that individuals aim to
build key resources throughout life that make their lives fulfilling and enjoyable. When people
experience a surplus of these resources, they experience positive well-being; when they
experience an inability to gain these resources, they experience stress or a lack of well-being

(Hobfoll, 1989: 517). This theory, which has garnered empirical support (see Ganster & Perewe, 2011; Griffin & Clark, 2011), posits that much of human behavior is explained by attempts to build, protect, gain, or prevent the loss of these key resources.

Some researchers (e.g., Griffin & Clarke, 2011) categorize resources as primary and secondary, where secondary resources are valued primarily because of their potential to contribute to the building of, or to the prevention of loss of, one or more primary resources. Primary resources include self-esteem, mastery, status, intimacy, and the protection and enhancement of the self (Hobfoll, 1989). These elements are very similar to those that comprise psychological well-being. Ryff's model and research (Keyes et al., 2002; Ryff, 1989) shows that psychological well-being results from successfully managing existential challenges encountered in life, including self-acceptance—people strive to feel good about themselves and accept their limitations; mastery—people strive to shape their environment to meet personal needs and desires; positive relationships—people strive to develop and maintain warm and trusting interpersonal relationships; self-determination / autonomy—people strive to sustain individuality in a larger social context; purpose in life—people strive to make meaning of their efforts and challenges; and personal growth (similar to ability utilization, self-actualization, or reaching potential)—people strive to make the most of their talents and capacities. These may be considered primary resources that when gained and maintained in surplus, contribute to a sense of well-being. These resources are also very similar to those posited by self-determination theory, which suggests that autonomy, mastery, and relatedness have longer-term motivation impacts than external incentives in many cases (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Secondary resources help people attain one or more primary resource, and can include objects, relationships, conditions, or personal characteristics that serve as a means for attaining

ultimate goals (Hobfoll, 1989). Viewed from these person-centered theories, the condition of holding a job serves the attainment of ultimate goals such as service, growth, autonomy, and purpose. This suggests that assessments of job-related well-being are different from more focused assessments of the job itself as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" because the latter may be an assessment of a secondary resource whereas the former is of the contribution of the job toward building primary resources. One's assessment of a job (e.g., as a "good" or "bad" job) exists separately from an assessment of the impact of that job on one's well-being (e.g., "it is a good job but it isn't right for me" or "it is a bad job, but it works in my life right now").

Theories of the self and the life course also suggest that jobs are valued because of their contribution to highly valued aspects of self and domains of life. Life course / life span literatures have established that individuals construct lives that are comprised of fundamental domains common to many individuals (Hansen, 1997). For example, Super (1990) and Levinson (1978) described major adult life domains derived from empirical research, and related life domains have been investigated by others (e.g., England & Whitely, 1990; Fave et al., 2011). One key human challenge over the life course is to construct a life that facilitates involvement in all desired domains, whether concurrently or over time; having a job that does not conflict with or that facilitates involvement in these desired domains contributes to well-being (Hansen, 1997). The primary life domains identified in these literatures are very similar to the primary domains in well-being and life satisfaction literatures (Diener et al., 2009; Erdogan et al., 2012; Rath & Harter, 2010). Common domains across these literatures include: (a) job / career / work, (b) social / family / marriage / support, (c) income / wealth / financial / standard of living, (d) fun / leisure / recreation, (e) health, and (f) housing / community / government / safety, and some models also include (g) spiritual well-being.

Extensive research has explored relationships among and between job, family, and life satisfactions and these with behaviors of interest (e.g., Erdogan et al, 2012; Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989). This research has conceptualized and measured satisfactions in different domains separately. However, psychology literatures point out that each person strives for "*a coherent sense* of one's roles and occupational pathway, one's self in relation to others, and one's values and purpose in life" (LaGuardia, 2009: 91, emphasis mine), and for a holistic or congruent sense of her or his overall life (Ryan & Deci, 2001: 146). Thus, for example, if a worker moved to a community for a job, or was a native of a community in which she or he wanted to stay, then having strong family and community relationships may be not only related to, but may be an integral part of what comprises job-related well-being. This notion returns to an older insight about job satisfaction. In his ground-breaking book on job satisfaction over 75 years ago, Hoppock (1935: 5) noted that understanding job satisfaction,

> …is complicated by the…nature of satisfaction. Indeed there may be no such thing as job satisfaction independent of the other satisfactions in one's life. Family relationships, health, relative social status in the community, and a multitude of other factors may be just as important as the job itself in determining what we tentatively choose to call job satisfaction.

Theories of the self suggest that a person makes sense of self through participation in these life domains (Farmer & van Dyne, 2010; Deci & Ryan, 2008). In each domain, individuals take on a role or roles, such as parent, sibling, or spouse / partner in the social / family domain; doctor or bus driver in the work / career / job domain; environmentalist or conservative in the community domain. Much of the research on identity formation and roles explores identity issues separately in one domain; for example, formation of the identity of "doctor" (Pratt, Rockmann, & Kaufmann, 2006) or "father" (Roy, 2006). However, each individual strives for a

coherent sense of self, values, and purpose and for a holistic or congruent sense of her or his life across roles as well (LaGuardia, 2009; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Rothausen et al., 2012).

From this congruent sense of self across domains comes a sense of holistic identity. In psychology, identity is conceptualized as a "system of affective cognitive structures (i.e., schemata) that organize and lend coherence to…self-relevant (life experiences)" and similarly in sociology the self is conceptualized as the result of relationships with others in different life domains (Farmer & Van Dyne, 2010: 504). Thus, the sense-making process with the self as its target is both analytic and synthetic; people form identities in separate life domains but also need to put these together in a narrative that allows for a self with a coherent, holistic, congruent set of purposes, meanings, and values.

When considering job-related well-being, the job / work / career domain is highly salient. However, in healthy individuals, job-related identities and roles do not exist in isolation but as part of, and instrumental to, a coherent, positive sense of a whole self. Consider, for example, this conclusion from an eight-country study on the meaning of work.

> Working seems, then, to be of general significance to individuals because it occupies a great deal of their time, because it generates economic and sociopsychological benefits and costs, and because it is so interrelated with other important life areas such as family, leisure, religion, and community (England & Whitely, 1990: 66).

Thus, one might reasonably expect job-related well-being to comprise satisfaction with the job fulfilling economic, social, and psychological needs and fitting family, leisure, and religion.

Fit between person and environment has been shown to predict attitudes toward the target environment, for example person-job fit is related to attitudes toward the job and person-organization fit to attitudes toward the organization (Chatman, 1989; Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). Research has shown the salience of fit, however fit research has also been criticized for treating a person as an amalgam of "parts," thus overlooking important patterns of the whole and facets of

meaning (Guion, 1992; James & James, 1992; Weiss & Rupp, 2011). This can cause misleading conclusions, such as when the resulting needs or values are seen primarily as stable individual differences, rather than as the result of the evolving human quest over time for increased esteem, mastery, individuality, intimacy, growth, and purpose.

For a century, scholars have argued that job-related attitudes, and in particular job satisfaction, are a function of the individual (dispositional), the environment (situational), or the match between the two on aspects such as the individual's needs with the rewards of the job, the individual's met expectations of or desires from the job, or values fulfilled by the job (Brief, 1998; Chatman, 1989; Dormann & Zapf, 2001; Locke, 1969; Moore, Gunz, & Hall, 2005; Parsons, 1909), or on all three aspects: person, environment, and fit (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989; Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). More holistically, Guion (1992) notes that these are essentially ways of saying the same thing: people desire, want, expect, and need things from their jobs. I refer to this collective of desires, wants, expectations, and needs as the *purposes* of jobs from individual workers' perspectives. This is depicted on the right side of Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Jobs, and the social and organizational systems in which jobs are embedded in different countries and cultures, structure opportunities to get these purposes met (Dawis, Pinto, Weitzel, & Nezzer, 1974; Dormann & Zapf, 2001; Moore et al., 2005; Weitzel, Pinto, Dawis, & Jury, 1973). This is depicted on the left side of Figure 1. In addition, people may form or craft opportunities that meet their purposes for working a job (Phillips & Lawrence, forthcoming; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), as represented by the two-sided arrow in Figure 1.

I argue that job-related well-being includes evaluations of the way the job satisfies discriminable facets of job purpose in the job-holder's life. In a following section, I develop the notion that extant job satisfaction conceptualizations represent a partial conceptualization of the left side of Figure 1, however the right side may be equally or more important as an outcome in itself and for understanding and predicting other important outcomes. Thus, the whole self, situated in a life, is foundational to holistic job-related well-being.

Job-Related Well-Being as a Holistic, Evaluation-Based Attitude

Individuals' internal sense of the contribution of jobs to their well-being is an attitude. There is general agreement that attitudes are "a person's internal state preceding and guiding action, comprising feelings, beliefs, and behavioral inclinations" (Solinger, van Olffen, & Roe, 2008: 72). This tri-partite model of attitudes suggests that attitudes comprise affect, cognition, and behavioral readiness or behavior intentional aspects (Schleicher, Hansen, & Fox, 2011). Two problems plaguing attitude conceptualization, measurement, and research are the confounding of the three elements, especially of affective and cognitive elements, and the confounding of more stable and more variable components of attitudes toward any given target. The latter problem is exacerbated because stable and variable elements of both affective and cognitive components interact with each other in complex ways (Schleicher et al., 2011; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

A defining element of attitudes is that they have a focus; that is, people have attitudes toward a target—an object or behavior, which impact behaviors related to or directed at that target (Schleicher et al., 2011; Solinger et al., 2008). Affective events theory suggests that an accumulation of positive or negative emotions and moods—more variable elements of attitudes—from specific events on the job and in life impacts the overall assessment of the job's

contribution to well-being—more stable elements—over time, and that the overall assessment also can impact affective responses to daily events (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996; Yu, 2009).

Thus it is possible that over the course of a week or month, an individual will feel elated by events on the job one day and depressed by events a second day, but stably assess their overall job-related well-being at generally equivalent levels on both days. Similarly, events occurring in life may impact mood or emotion related to the job that day. For example, an ill elderly parent may make the job feel like a frustration or block to what one wants to do that day (e.g., care for the parent), but it may be a source of joy when asked to participate in "career day" at a child's school. When asked to assess the overall impact of the job on well-being however, an individual accesses a relatively stable assessment-based attitude. Responsibility for the care of a chronically ill parent may lead to this overall assessment falling over time, and a new partner's pride in one's job may lead to the overall assessment rising over time.

Job-related well-being is this relatively stable, cognitively based attitude. However, a key element in the process of the formation of this attitude is likely an interplay between more variable mood and emotion in response to daily events at work (e.g., conflict with a boss, praise from a client) and in life (e.g., adopting a baby, completing a marathon) with this more stable, evaluative attitude. Events on the job or in life likely trigger recall of one's overall assessment, especially if the mood or emotion resulting is counter to one's general attitude of job-related well-being. Over time, repeating disparities likely lead to changes in job-related well-being.

As stated above, holistic job-related well-being includes enjoyment and purpose. Along with others (e.g., Guion, 1992; James & James, 1992; Weiss & Rupp, 2011), I suggest that what jobs mean in the lives of the people doing them indicates facets vital to understanding attitudes towards jobs. Brief and Nord (1990a: xiii) state that "what work means to people cannot be

disentangled from what their lives mean to them." Although this is relatively unexplored terrain for job attitude map builders (Erdogan et al., 2012), philosophers and scholars have investigated it over millennia (Budd, 2011; Meilaender, 2000). In the next section I develop facets of fulfillment of job purpose by integrating these literatures, before revisiting satisfaction with job facets, which together comprise facet job-related well-being.

Eudaimonic Job-Related Well-Being: Facets of Fulfillment of Job Purpose

Guion (1992: 265) noted that meaning in work can be defined multiple ways, including the definition I adopt, that the meaning of a job is the personal relevance of the job to the individual, or what jobs mean to the people who do them. Two elements of this are (a) *why* people work a job or the purpose of the work (England & Whitely, 1990) and (b) what people *understand* about the job; the sense they make of it before, during, and after it occurs (James & James, 1992). As Brief and Nord (1990: 13) state, "the meaning of all human activities is derived from two basic sources—intent and understanding." Across multiple literatures and cross-culturally, common meanings of work are identified, as represented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

The meaning of work in life has been studied by philosophers and theologians for millennia, and in the most recent century by humanities and social science scholars, including sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, and ethicists (Budd, 2011; Meilaender, 2000; Moore et al., 2005; Nord, Brief, Atieh, & Doherty, 1990). Themes exist along a spectrum nested on one end in the self and identity and on the other end in primary life and relationship interdependencies. This spectrum is shown in the leftmost column of Table 1. Brief and Nord (1990) argued that purpose comes from a combination of two things: *personal development* and one's perception of past, present, and future *events and needs*. These are similar to the

continuum anchors identified here; the self to personal development, primary life and relationship interdependencies to events and needs. Similar conclusions are drawn in identity, careers, and work-life literatures, where scholars suggest that finding meaning in work is part of constructing both an identity and a larger life (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Meilaender, 2000; Moore et al., 2005; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001).

Six separable themes or facets of purposes for jobs are identified in the middle column of Table 1. Themes related to the individual include *expression* of the self and *development* or growth of the self. Themes related to primary life and relationship interdependencies include *financial* subsistence and thriving, primary life *relationships*, and overall *life* construction. One theme captures aspects of self and interdependencies—that of having a *role* in society or in a something larger than self. Specific expressions of these six themes vary across the literatures that explore the meaning of jobs and work. Some of the primary expressions within each theme or facet are listed in the final column of Table 1. The literatures reviewed in developing these facets of job purpose are summarized below.

Throughout history, cultural meanings of work have shifted, and contradictory meanings are found within an era, including primarily hedonic and primarily eudaimonic perspectives (Nord et al., 1990; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin & Schwartz, 1997; Ryan & Deci, 2001). In Western philosophy, work has been understood as: a curse, waste of time, or necessary evil that makes the pursuit of truth and virtue difficult; a punishment for sin; a drudgery to be thankful for because it provides a way to atone for sin or lack by contributing to society; a natural but unexplainable aspect of the human condition; a "disutility" to be bartered for utility; a noble calling set by a divine entity; a means of personal fulfillment; and a way to occupy oneself or to avoid sin and corruption (see Brief & Nord, 1990, Budd, 2011, and Meilaender, 2000 for

reviews). Although contradictory, most of these ideas are found in Western and other societies today (Muirhead, 2004; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997).

The most studied dimension of difference in cultural values between Western and many Eastern and indigenous cultures is individualism-collectivism (Enriquez, 1989; Judge et al., 2002; Triandis, 1995). Collectivist cultures emphasize social relationships and family, group, and organizational interests and identity over individual goals and identity (Gelfand, Bhawuk, Nishii, & Bechtold, 2004; Hofstede, 1991). In comparison with individualist cultures where people see themselves as unique and look out for their individual goals over group goals, people with collectivist values self-define through, and identify with, social groups, including work groups, organizations, and especially family and kin (Enriquez, 1989; Gelfand et al., 2004; Spector et al., 2004). Collective concerns are also pivotal in feminine identity formation and values across cultures (Eagly & Chin, 2010; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011).

Careers literatures explicitly consider jobs from individuals' perspectives, although reviews of this field have also called for attention to work's meaning (Gunz & Peiperl, 2005), a call to which there has been a recent response (see Dik et al., 2009). The career literature focuses on "the evolving sequence of a person's work experiences over time," the definition of career adopted by two major handbooks appearing almost two decades apart (Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence, 1989: 8; Gunz & Peiperl, 2005: 4). Because of the focus on *a person's* work over time, careers research has been inclusive of jobs' impacts on other aspects of self and life.

Some sociology and psychology research explores the meaning of work or its impact on well-being per se. Evidence suggests that self-regard, wealth, friends, and family are important for well-being across cultures, but patterns of emphasis vary (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Tay & Diener, 2011). For example, the Meaning of Work International Research Team (MOW; England &

Whitely, 1990) studied the content of the meaning of work across eight industrialized Western and Eastern countries. Their primary findings were that workers clustered into groups both by reasons given for work (intent) and by definitions of work (understanding), the two elements of meaning identified by Brief and Nord (1990: 13). Eight groups emerged that existed in all eight countries, although proportions of each differed by country.

The MOW groups valued (1) *family*, *leisure*, and interpersonal *relationships*, work necessary but not important, (2) *family* and *religion*, work necessary but not important (3) *financial* benefits, work not important otherwise (4) *financial* benefits balanced with *duty*, *contribution*, and a sense of *belonging*, work moderately important (5) *status and prestige* identified with *the work and its products*, work highly important (6) *duty* and social *service* to society, work highly important (7) *self expression* identified with *interesting work and its products*, work highly important and (8) balanced emphasis on *financial* benefits and *self expression* with *interesting* work and high *pay*. Another finding of the MOW research was a strong relationship between having positive attitudes toward work and seeing the positive *contribution* of one's work to others, whether to a customer, a boss, a family, or a society (England & Whitely, 1990), which echoes the findings of Grant and colleagues (e.g., Grant, 2008). Specific facets of the purposes of jobs are explicated below, reflecting their place in the MOW findings and additional primary sources.

Positive Expression of Self

MOW found self-expression and positive reflection of self to be primary meanings of work across cultures, in terms of status as well as other expressions of individual identity (England & Whitely, 1990). This echoes one stream in philosophy and theology in which work is considered a calling set by a divine entity; the emphasis is on the fulfillment of the purpose for

which the individual was put on earth by this entity. A second stream emphasizes approval of the worker's efforts on the part of the entity as indicated by earthly signs of success (Nord et al., 1990). Today, religious and secular versions of this thinking exist in notions of work being a calling or contribution, the importance of finding a job that best fits one's abilities, interests, and skills—that one was "meant to do," and high pay or fast promotion being seen as signs of nonhuman approval because it is "what the market pays" or "what the organization values," thus reflecting back the value of the worker.

The importance of self-expression is also reflected in one of the primary psychological approaches to careers, which focuses on the fit of the individual to work over time. The emphasis is on work as a source of ongoing, developing self-expression, identifying with or expressing the self through the work process or product, and the job as a major arena for positive achievement. Work can be one arena for developing primary psychological needs fundamental to well-being centered on the self found by Ryff and colleagues, including self-acceptance, mastery, self-determination, and purpose (Keyes et al., 2002; Ryff, 1989); self-esteem and status are important primary resources in COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989).

Growth and Development of Self

A second primary psychological approach to careers builds on earlier developmental stage models from Freud and Jung to Levinson and Super, focusing on the dynamic development of the individual over the life span (Moore et al., 2005). Similarly, personal growth is one of six elements found to be core to psychological well-being, which can be met in part by a job (Keyes et al., 2002; Ryff, 1989). Life span theories emphasize the development of the individual over time, and the domain of job as one arena in which to grow (e.g., Super, 1990). Although MOW

did not find growth to be a meaning of work per se, related elements were found, such as on-going interest in work, the process of work, and its product (England & Whitely, 1990).

While careers literatures have long emphasized the importance of growth and development over the life course as one of the key contributions of work to individuals' lives, as Arnold (2002) points out growth is also important for additional reasons now. US workers have experienced downsizing, mergers, layoffs, and restructurings, which contributed to a fundamental shift in implicit psychological contracts between employees and employers. In general, these contracts have moved from emphasizing stability, loyalty, security, and linear career growth, to emphasizing flexibility, change, employment security through acquisition of skills, and life-long learning (Schalk & Rousseau, 2002). These changes have made becoming and staying marketable or employable, and attendant needs to acquire up-to-date experiences and skills, more important (Arnold, 2002; Power & Rothausen, 2003).

Role in Society

The MOW research team found that making a difference through playing an important role, making a contribution, or helping others was a job purpose important to many workers across cultures, and it was expressed in notions of service to society, duty, contribution, and having a sense of belonging. In addition, even if the job does not provide an important role in and of itself, having the job can nonetheless provide its holder with specific, important roles in family and community, for example the roles of breadwinner or contributing citizen.

Having a role in a society, in part through the job, relates to the "purpose in life" element of psychological well-being identified by Ryff and colleagues (Keyes et al., 2002; Ryff, 1989), as people strive to make meaning of their efforts and challenges including those directed at paid work. The importance of contribution has long been emphasized in motivation theories. The

classic job characteristics model posits the importance to work motivation of seeing the contribution of one's tasks (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). More recently, this aspect of work motivation has been highlighted in work by Grant and his colleagues; for example, importance of making a difference to or helping others is central to identity and motivation (e.g., Grant, 2008).

A sociological stream in careers emphasizes constraints to free choice in work, the importance of jobs to individuals' relational identities, and sense of role within a social order (Moore et al., 2005). This is evocative of philosophies of work as a necessary part of the human condition; it is a secular version of the idea of being born to a given type of work or class, having little choice about it, and developing individual and collective identities and roles in society as a result. Work is also seen as an arena for making a contribution to society in theology. If the process of work is an act of redemption or the product of work a way of contributing to society, then qualities of the role, process of work, and work's product are elevated.

Financial Subsistence and Thriving

Economic models of work focus on the financial meaning of work almost exclusively and it is these models that have dominated our concepts of the rewards of work in management and industrial-organizational psychology and in business more generally (Budd, 2011; Khurana, 2007). These economic models are reflective of philosophical and theological traditions in which work is a waste or punishment necessary to sustain life. From this perspective, the only reasons to take a job are to enable trade for economic goods of consumption or leisure, whether for subsistence or status. In addition to sustaining themselves, workers may sustain the lives of dependents, family, or community members. Consumption and leisure reflect status on oneself and on one's family, and approval of the value of same to society or the divine (Nord et al., 1990).

MOW found the financial impact of work on one's life to be important to many but not all groups of workers, however it was unclear whether the workers to whom it was less important had higher levels of financial security, such that this need was less salient (England & Whitely, 1990). The importance of income has been shown to differ over the life course, with younger individuals generally more concerned about financial independence and status (Hansen, 1997).

Impact on Family as Self-Defined

The work-family literature has shown decisively that one's job and one's primary life relationships impact each other directly and indirectly (e.g. Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Life span, work-family, and work-life research also suggests that work/career and home/family are the two most important domains of life for many people (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Hansen, 1997; Levinson, 1978; Super, 1990). Intimate relationships are a primary valued resource in COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), and intimacy one of the six primary facets that make up psychological well-being (Keyes et al., 2002; Ryff, 1989), thus intimacy from these family and family-like relationships is a primary resource for the individual. MOW research revealed that family is important for many workers (England & Whitely, 1990) and thus the impact of a job on one's family is likely to be of central concern.

A job can be a reflection on one's family—primary life partner, any dependents, and often extended family—through economic provision, and also through reflected status in society, being identified with an organization with a good reputation, or being seen as a contributor. Recent research in the work-family arena has shown how the two domains can enhance each other (e.g., Grzywacs, Carlson, Kacmar, & Wayne, 2007). The enhancement of family is one important meaning of a job. Non-financial aspects of this are emphasized in collectivist and feminine value sets (Eagly & Chin, 2010; Gelfand et al., 2004; Hofstede, 1991; Koenig et al.,

2011), and include that the job may enable the physical and emotional care of dependents in nuclear and extended families, facilitate family pride within the community, and create feelings of belonging in a larger group, whether community or extended family.

A note about this facet's label is important. This category largely comprises family, but family is defined differently in different cultures and across time. I adopt a broad notion that includes people related by marriage, biology, adoption, or shared household, as well as through affection, obligation, dependence, or cooperation (Karraker & Grochowski, 2006: 7). This is a functional rather than legal definition of family (Rothausen, 1999).

Construction of a Life

As reviewed earlier, six to eight discriminable domains of life are found across literatures including job and family, and also financial, leisure, health, community, and spiritual facets. MOW revealed that domains of life such as religion and leisure are important for many workers (England & Whitely, 1990) and thus the impact of work on these other life domains is of central concern to many workers. The meaning of a job in a given individual's life is affected the number and quality of other domains in which the individual is involved or desires involvement, and how heavily involved in each (Fave et al., 2011; Super, 1990). Conflict between life domains and roles can lead to decreased satisfaction and well-being, whereas domains can also enhance each other, enriching life and causing increased well-being (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Hansen, 1997). Thus, a job may have meaning because of its impact on other life domains and on the construction of the life the individual wants.

Thus, in summary, satisfaction with fulfillment of job purpose includes satisfaction with the general levels of expression, development, role, financial subsistence and thriving, impact on family as self-defined, and impact on life construction. These facets comprise purposes of jobs,

and the satisfaction or fulfillment of these facets likely leads to a sense of eudaimonic job-related well-being. I now turn to a brief review of hedonic job-related well-being, before discussing the relationships between job-related well-being and other attitudes commonly used in research.

Hedonic Job-Related Well-Being: A Review and New Look at Facet Job Satisfaction

Facets of hedonic job-related well-being are suggested by the definition of job used earlier. That is, an individual may enjoy work tasks (including process and product), social context, and institutional setting. This specification of facet categories is similar, but not identical, to facet job satisfaction as measured by the two instruments most used in job satisfaction literatures (the Job Descriptive Index or JDI, Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire or MSQ, Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The JDI measures satisfaction with the work itself, supervisor, co-workers, pay, and advancement, and the MSQ measures twenty facets inclusive of these. Although a thorough review of job satisfaction is beyond the scope of this paper, a brief review highlighting hedonic job-related well-being is salient.

Facet and Global Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most frequently measured and used constructs in organizational research (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Judge et al., 2002; Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim, & Carson, 2002; Schleicher et al., 2011), despite findings that the link between job satisfaction and organizational outcomes "is not as strong as originally thought" (Schleicher et al., 2011: 148). The exploration of links between job satisfaction and outcomes such as performance are well documented and weaker-than-expected links remain one of the long-standing puzzles in the fields of industrial and organizational psychology and management

(e.g., Judge et al., 2002; Schleicher et al, 2011). This may be caused by "missing pieces of the puzzle" such as incomplete conceptualizations (Judge et al., 2002).

An influential conceptualization of job satisfaction is Locke's (1976: 1300): "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences." Locke (1969: 330; parenthetical material original) wrote, a "job is not an entity but an abstraction referring to a combination of tasks performed by an individual in a certain physical and social context for financial (and other) remuneration…," which is suggestive of key job facets with which workers could be satisfied or dissatisfied. Locke's (1976) review of the development of these facets shows how they derived directly from earlier research on work tasks (e.g., job characteristics), physical conditions (e.g., the Hawthorne studies), and social contexts of work (e.g., studies in the Human Relations stream). There is a notable emphasis on pleasure over fulfillment of purpose here, and the locus of job satisfaction does not go beyond the boundaries of the workplace.

That job satisfaction is constricted primarily to enjoyment is illustrated by a conclusion from a review on vocation in which authors state, "job satisfaction is…an important outcome, but the sense of contribution and purpose that comes from working…is (also) valuable and beneficial for (workers)" (Dik et al., 2009: 629). Similarly, in a study exploring causes of turnover intention, George and Jones (1996: 320) equate job satisfaction to whether the job is "…enjoyable in the present." Thus, job satisfaction as currently conceptualized does not capture eudaimonic elements.

Job satisfaction is measured with separate facet satisfactions, as a sum of satisfaction with separate facets, and with globally worded items (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989). Global and facet satisfactions may tap the same underlying general job attitude (Cranny,

Smith, & Stone, 1992; Hunter & Schmidt, 2008; Judge et al., 2002), but both theory (Brief, 1998; Dawis & Lofquist, 1984; Law, Wong, & Mobley, 1998; Locke, 1969, 1976; Spector, 1997) and empirical evidence (Kerr, 1985; Kinicki et al., 2002) suggest that facet satisfactions are not the same, and critical reviews and meta-analyses show that facets are distinct from each other and from overall job satisfaction (Ironson et al., 1989; Kinicki et al., 2002). For example, satisfaction with work tasks relates to task performance but not organizational citizenship behavior, whereas satisfaction with supervision relates strongly to citizenship behavior but only weakly to task performance (Edwards, Bell, Arthur, & Decuir, 2008; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Kinicki et al., 2002). Kinicki et al. (2002) found absenteeism was related to satisfaction with pay, promotion, and work tasks, but not to satisfaction with co-workers or supervision. Rothausen and colleagues (Rothausen, 1994; Rothausen, Gonzalez, & Griffin, 2009) found that facet satisfactions related differently to intention to quit than to global job satisfaction. Facet satisfactions also relate differently to customer perceptions of service quality (Snipes, Oswald, LaTour, & Armenakis, 2005). Some facets predicted outcomes beyond what was predicted by global job satisfaction for some workers in two studies that explored this issue (Ironson et al., 1998; Rothausen et al., 2009). All this evidence suggests facets are related but separable.

Although some findings have been mixed, the empirical evidence suggests that job satisfaction as currently conceptualized is related positively to engagement and commitment (Griffin, Parker, & Neal, 2008; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2008), individual task performance and citizenship behavior (Carr, Schmidt, Ford, & DeShon, 2003; Dalal, 2005; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Riketta, 2008), and organizational performance and profitability (Ostroff, 1992; Schneider, Hanges, Smith, & Salvaggio, 2003), and negatively to counterproductive organizational behaviors (Hershcovis et al., 2007) and turnover and withdrawal (Griffeth, Hom,

& Gaertner, 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Job satisfaction is also related to general well-being through its relationships to positive family outcomes (Ford et al., 2007; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998) and individuals' mental and physical health and overall life satisfaction (Kossek & Lambert, 2005; Loscocco & Roschelle, 1991; Tait et al., 1989). Meta-analyses using data from panel studies suggest that job attitudes, including satisfaction, are more likely to cause individual performance than the reverse (Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006; Krause, 1995; Riketta, 2008), supporting Harter et al.'s (2002: 268) assertion "that changes in management practices that increase employee satisfaction may increase business-unit outcomes, including profit."

Dissatisfaction with Job Satisfaction?

Despite this, researchers continue to note the puzzling inconsistency of findings and the lower than expected relationship strengths between job satisfaction and many outcomes of interest. This may be due in part to the often criticized lack of ongoing theoretical development of job satisfaction (Kinicki et al., 2002; Meyer & Maltin, 2010). Recent keen interest in newer constructs such as engagement (Rich et al., 2010) and presenteeism (Johns, 2010) have been led by practitioners in need of a different kind of worker attitude measure (Frese, 2008).

Only after engagement was adopted broadly by practitioners did academics study it on any kind of scale (Griffin et al., 2008; Rich et al., 2010). The concept of engagement grew out of dissatisfaction with the use of traditional predictors of employee performance and membership behaviors (Frese, 2008), and at least one conceptualization of engagement suggests that one element missing is the meaning or purpose of the job to the individual (Kahn, 1990; Rich et al., 2010). Although some evidence suggests that engagement is separate from related constructs such as job satisfaction (e.g., Rich et al., 2010), others argue that engagement is simply "old wine in new bottles" (Newman & Harrison, 2008); it may be a "re-packaging" of old constructs such

as job satisfaction, positive and negative affect toward work, and motivation, effort, or initiative elements of performance. Nonetheless, a sense of missing pieces of the puzzle of links between personal and organizational characteristics and outcomes is clear.

The concept of presenteeism suggests a similar sense of missing pieces. Presenteeism has evolved to mean being physically at work but unable to concentrate. In a sense it is the opposite of engagement while falling short of absenteeism (Brooks, Hagen, Sathyanarayanan, Schultz, & Edington, 2010). It was developed primarily in the medical literatures and was originally defined as the state of being physically present at work while sick (Johns, 2010, 2011). More recently, presenteeism has come to mean being physically at work but not fully involved or engaged in work physically, emotionally, or cognitively due to a variety of work and life factors that are also related to lack of well-being (Prochaska et al., 2011). Like engagement, presenteeism has also been both lauded as a more proximal indicator of behaviors of interest (e.g., Brooks et al., 2010) and criticized as a re-packaging of old concepts, in many cases conflated with already existing constructs (e.g., Johns, 2010). Also similar to engagement, among causal elements hypothesized for presenteeism is lack of meaning or purpose in jobs and an absence of well-being in life (Prochaska et al, 2011).

Thus, a sense of fulfillment of job purpose may be partially captured in some of these newer constructs, but the strength of relationships of job satisfaction to constructs such as withdrawal and performance found in research may be attenuated because workers are responding a conceptualization of well-being that does not include fulfillment of job purposes. For example, George and Jones (1996) found that adding a measure of the instrumental aspects of jobs to enjoyment aspects explained turnover intentions better than enjoyment alone.

Another issue related to lack of ongoing theoretical development of job satisfaction is that if researchers continue to measure the same sets of facets, we will continue to find that only these facets are important, potentially causing misleading conclusions. For example, Cascio (2003) reports on a study by the National Research Council done in 1973 and repeated in 1996 asking respondents to rank the five JDI job facets in order of importance. Because rank orderings were similar, it was concluded that Americans sought the same characteristics in jobs over two decades. However, an alternative explanation is that each of these characteristics became less (or more) important over time but the rank ordering stayed the same. In addition, there could be facets of even higher importance to many workers had respondents had the opportunity to rank them, as some evidence suggests (e.g., flexibility; Rothausen, 1994; Scarpello & Campbell, 1983).

Revisiting Job Facet Content

The same literatures reviewed throughout this article suggest facets of jobs that could be important, which are not included in currently used conceptualizations of job satisfaction. Changes in technology, workforce demographics, family roles of workers, and the economy suggest movement back toward the weaving of work into other spheres of life for populations of workers who may have segmented them in the past (Barley & Kunda, 2001; Casio, 2003). Facets of jobs that facilitate this weaving are thus likely more important to those workers, such as adequate utilization of technology, flexibility of and control over work hours and locations, and family and partner benefits (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Valcour & Hunter, 2005).

Career researchers have studied differences in work experiences over time for newer and growing groups of workers in the US, including women and people of color, noting the importance to them of protections against unfair discrimination (Arthur et al., 1989) and

inclusive organizational practices (Gunz & Peiperl, 2005) regarding job assignments, pay, promotions, norms, and standards. In the work-family literature, there has been a recent surge of research showing the importance to workers of organizational elements such as work-family supportive culture (Grandey, Cordeiro, & Michael, 2007) and work-family facilitation (Grzywacs et al., 2007). These findings suggest that facets of jobs important today include elements that support and demonstrate respect for other aspects of life, including important life roles, core identity, and social identities. Thus, relevant facets of jobs may include flexibility, support, autonomy, control, and inclusion, in jobs that are recognized and rewarded fairly.

All this suggests specific facets of jobs that could be, and perhaps should be, added to the set of facets of the job enjoyed, thus broadening job facets considered. However, as Ironson et al. (1989: 194, emphasis original) pointed out memorably, "One could easily construct facet scales with even more specific items grouped in even more specific groupings, for example, *quiet*, *adequate lighting*, and *rough toilet paper* as items in a working conditions scale." Although this might be taking it a bit far, first- and second-level sub-facets merit further exploration in research.

General-level Facets and Sub-Facets

As stated above, general-level facets are suggested by the definition of *job* adopted here: work tasks, process, and product; social context; and institutional context. Level of specificity is an important but underdeveloped consideration in facet job satisfaction (Guion, 1992). Extant facet job satisfaction conceptualizations focus at the level of satisfaction with job facets such as tasks, supervisor, pay, and promotions. Examination of the items and facet definitions of the JDI and MSQ indicate that they conceptualize facets at different levels of generality, with the JDI being more general, for example with "supervision" and "work" facets, where the MSQ

measures both "supervision-technical" and "supervision-human relations" as well as "recognition" which in many jobs is largely attributable to a supervisor, and many specific facets of work tasks, such as ability utilization, creativity, and variety. JDI and MSQ facet content overlaps as demonstrated empirically by Kinicki et al. (2002).

A review of the surge of job satisfaction research during the era when the JDI and MSQ emerged reveals two important findings that have been less emphasized since. First, support was found for the *general-level* job facets work tasks, work relationships, organization, and rewards (e.g., Friedlander, 1963; Weitzel et al., 1973), and second, different patterns of satisfactions with sub-facets *within these general-level facets* was found across different organizations and different groups, or profiles, of workers (e.g., Dawis et al., 1974; Weitzel et al., 1973).

The concept of "rewards," broadly considered, includes tangible and intangible rewards for doing a job, and as such has much in common conceptually with facets of job purpose. As argued above, economic subsistence and thriving is one of six primary purposes of work rather than simply a job facet. Locke's working conditions category, although important, is similarly one part of the organizational contexts in which work tasks and relationships occur, which also includes physical surroundings, technology utilization, leadership and management, programs and policies, stability, reputation, organization culture, and training and development programs, among others. Finally, work relationships suggest people the individual comes most in contact with while working, often subordinates, co-workers or teammates, and direct supervisors or managers, but also potentially customers, suppliers, the press, and other community members.

Although in some studies, authors purposefully adopt a particular facet level of specificity (e.g., Rothausen, Gonzalez, Clarke, & O'Dell, 1998; Williams, McDaniel, & Nguyen, 2006), more often this issue is unaddressed, which may also hamper theory development. As

Guion (1992: 265) noted, "a measure at one level of generality is not interchangeable with a measure at another, and…the choice of generality level depends on the level of generality of the variable to be predicted." Sub-facets may be selected that are most relevant within these general-level job facets for particular populations of workers, specific organizations, or the purpose of specific research studies. Examples of sub-facets from the JDI, MSQ, and other measures, and from the literatures reviewed above, for each of the general-level facet proposed, are listed for illustration in the first three columns of Table 2. The final column of Table 2 is discussed below.

Insert Table 2 about here

Job-Related Well-Being and Other Job Attitudes: Relationships and Measurement

In proposing new constructs, the standard is high. Some scholars have argued that we already have too many job-related attitudes and this proliferation hampers our understanding of their relationships to each other and to other outcomes. Along with others, I argue that it is more a lack of ongoing development of constructs from a strong theoretical foundation that hampers our understanding. Over time in a research literature, conceptualizations of constructs can experience declining relevance due to narrow operationalization (Suddaby, 2010). Judge et al. (2002) noted that job satisfaction research is declining, and Kinicki et al. (2002) noted that ad hoc scales are frequently used in research, which together suggest the possibility that existing conceptualizations or their related measures, or both, are becoming less relevant to contemporary research questions. This situation also hampers theory development because ad hoc scales are difficult to meaningfully compare.

Differences between job attitudes can be delineated by considering their targets. Differences between key job attitudes commonly used in the theory and practice of management

are summarized in Table 3. In line with a general model of attitudes (e.g., Solinger et al., 2008),

I argue that both engagement and presenteeism are in fact orientations toward specific

behaviors—expending energy and concentration on the job, respectively, and that levels of both

enjoyment of and fulfillment of purpose by the job will predict these behavior-targeted attitudes.

Insert Table 3 about here

Generally, attitudes with broader targets will have relationships with more general

outcomes of interest and with a wider range of outcomes, whereas attitudes with specific targets

will primarily relate to narrower behaviors. Thus including both hedonic and eudaimonic job-

related well-being may predict general job attitudes and behaviors better than hedonic or

eudaimonic job attitudes alone. There is some preliminary evidence that considering why people

work as well as their enjoyment of jobs better explains behaviors like voluntary turnover than

does enjoyment alone (George & Jones, 1996; Rothausen et al., 2012). However, these are

empirical questions, and investigation of them will require development of measures of job-

related well-being.

Here we can learn much from already existing measures of job satisfaction and well-

being. For example, items modeled on MSQ items are included in the right-most column of

Table 2 for the general-level facets proposed here. I use MSQ items because, as Kinicki et al.

(2002) showed, MSQ facets result in stronger internal consistency reliabilities than the JDI. In

addition, this item style can be modified to get at any sub-facet and is easily adaptable to

eudaimonic elements. Global measures can be developed considering current global job

satisfaction, life satisfaction, and well-being measures, in addition to more recently developed

measures of eudaimonic well-being (e.g., Waterman, 1993). Thus, for example, items for global

hedonic job-related well-being may be, "Overall, I enjoy my job" and "I experience pleasure in

doing my job," whereas items for global eudaimonic job-related well-being may be, "Overall, my job fulfills my primary reasons for working" and "My job fulfills purposes in my life."

Thus, facets of holistic job-related well-being include satisfaction with facets of the job and with facets of job purpose. Satisfaction with facets of the job are workers' emotional reactions to their cognitive processing of experiences with job facets. Satisfaction with facets of purpose are workers' emotional reactions to their cognitive processing of whether and how well their jobs fulfill the reasons they work. This conceptualization of job-related well-being, being more complete, will likely relate more strongly to general outcomes such as retention, overall life satisfaction, and performance behaviors than will satisfaction with job facets alone, as some evidence suggests (e.g., George & Jones, 1996).

Discussion

A holistic conceptualization of job-related well-being is important, perhaps especially now in the face of an ever increasing variety of workplace situations and diversity in workers, potentially making narrower conceptualizations of job satisfaction less relevant. Changes to careers and psychological contracts indicate that jobs and facets of jobs are in flux more now than at any time in recent history (Arnold, 2002; Schalk & Rousseau, 2002), potentially making sustainable elements of fulfillment more important to workers. Business organizations have been criticized for promoting self-interest in framing incentives during recent decades (e.g., Khurana, 2007), whereas focusing on jobs in the context of their meaning for individuals' lives could enable a more well-rounded approach (Budd, 2011). Practitioners lament pent-up "demand for turnover," which leads to negative outcomes at work now and eventually may cause workers to quit in droves as the economy improves (e.g., Fisher, 2003; Picoult, 2010). A deepened and broadened conceptualization of job-related well-being could help deter this

"turnover storm" and perhaps more importantly, improve conditions at work that may be causing pent-up demand for turnover.

At the societal level, there is increasing discussion of the need to focus on measures of happiness and well-being in balance with economic and financial measures such as GDP, quarterly profits, and performance, the latter of which perhaps have been overemphasized in the past at the expense of the former (e.g., Budd, 2011; Diener & Seligman, 2004; Oishi, 2012; Rothkopf, 2011). As a key part of most societies, business organizations will need sound conceptualizations and measures of job-related well-being in order to show how the jobs they provide contribute to well-being. Public policy makers also need to understand how jobs contribute to lives beyond economics.

The purpose of this article was to build a theoretically based conceptualization of job-related well-being, with theories of the self and the life course as a foundation, and leveraging job attitude and general well-being literatures. Building on to job satisfaction conceptualizations (e.g., Cranny et al., 1992; Locke, 1969, 1976; Spector, 1997), I argue that job-related well-being includes an affective response to an evaluation of the job, and a job is an entity made up of facets, but I further argue this is not the end of the story; a job is not an entity taken up by the worker solely to experience its facets, nor solely for pleasure or enjoyment, but for broad purposes such as self-acceptance, mastery, growth, autonomy, intimacy, and purpose. The expanded conceptualization of job-related well-being developed here makes several important contributions to the job satisfaction and management literatures.

First, this conceptualization is strongly anchored in theories of the self, identity, and life, which locates this individual attitude firmly within the individual her- or himself rather than within the walls of the organization or job. The foundation for this conceptualization is the

whole individual in the context of her or his whole life. This is a new locus for development of a job-related attitude. Most job attitudes have been developed with a focus on the job rather than how individuals "see" or understand jobs.

Second, this conceptualization deepens from current conceptualizations by adding a job-related eudaimonic aspect to the current hedonic conceptualization of job satisfaction. This builds on existing knowledge but expands the focal arenas for identification of facets that comprise job-related satisfaction to reflect workers' sense of self and their diverse life roles and situations. It adds satisfaction of fulfillment of deeper purposes in workers' lives to satisfaction as enjoyment of job facets designed and administered by managers. This important addition mirrors theoretical crystallization in general well-being literatures (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

Third, this conceptualization also broadens from current conceptualizations by re-focusing on satisfaction with general-level facets. Satisfaction with self-expression, growth and development, having an important role in society, financial subsistence and thriving, effect on family and other close relationships, and the ability to construct a full life comprise facets of satisfaction with job purpose. Satisfaction with work, work relationships, and organization comprise satisfactions with job facets. This broadened conceptualization is more inclusive of diverse work situations and workers.

Fourth, this conceptualization highlights the importance of facet level of specificity, including general-level facets and highlighting current conceptualizations' and measures' use of first-, and second-level sub-facets (please refer to Table 2). The general-level facets developed here may provide a taxonomy of job satisfaction facets and elements to guide future research toward understanding mixed findings in the extant literature by providing a theoretically based structure on which meta-analyses and reviews could be conducted.

Finally, this conceptualization of job-related well-being is important to the practice of management and to societies. Needs of business organizations and workers suggest that a reexamination of the construct is timely (e.g., Khurana, 2007; Picoult, 2010). Strategists argue that firms that regularly engage in exchanges with primary stakeholder groups—in this case employees—must take these stakeholders' perceptions into account when formulating strategies or else risk withdrawal of support, which in turn can weaken performance and threaten prospects of survival, competitiveness, and profitability (Bosse, Phillips, & Harrison, 2009; Walsh & Nord, 2005). Organizations that care about and understand their primary stakeholders, including employees in the context of their lives, should arguably pay attention to the primary desires, wants, expectations, and needs these stakeholders bring to bear in their primary interaction with the organization, if not because it is important in itself (Gephart, 2004), then because those that actively consider the purposes of jobs to their employees and managers may be able to develop a competitive advantage relative to those that do not, in turn influencing organizational health and performance (Harter et al., 2008; Hitt & Ireland, 1985; Schneider et al., 2003). Job-related well-being provides a more complete way to measure the impact of organizations and jobs on worker well-being, a topic that is increasingly of interest world-wide (Oishi, 2012; Rothkopf, 2011).

Conclusion

Fulfillment of the meaning and purpose of the job for the worker is likely vital to that worker's overall well-being as well as their engagement in and motivation toward their work in a specific organizational setting. Currently, job satisfaction is the most central job-related well-being construct in the literature, where there are multiple calls for its further theoretical development (e.g., Guion, 1992; Kinicki et al., 1992; Meyer & Maltin, 2010). Despite this, job satisfaction research appears to be declining just when greater understanding of job-related well-

being is needed due to organizations and jobs in flux, a potential upcoming decline in productivity or increase in turnover as the economy recovers, interest in non-economic incentives and sustainable motivations, and societal concern about narrow outcome measures.

Budd (2011) makes a compelling case that the twentieth-century emphasis on a limited number of conceptualizations of what work means, with emphasis on economic explanations versus psychological and social ones, has resulted in unnecessarily partial explanations of work-related phenomena in management and other research literatures. A more inclusive conceptualization of work, including the meanings of work to individuals, will result in a more holistic consideration of jobs and work in these literatures.

In this article, I propose and develop one such conceptualization, job-related well-being. In this holistic re-conceptualization, satisfaction and happiness include both pleasure and deep fulfillment based on what jobs comprise and what they mean to workers. This conceptualization is offered in the spirit of advancing our understanding of, and stimulating further research on, job-related well-being, which is so important to the health of individuals, their families, the organizations that employ them, and society as a whole. To more fully understand employment, jobs, work, and productivity, it is important to recognize that, like E.B. White, many workers want to both change the world in some way and to have one hell of a good time—to enjoy a job that matters to their selves, lives, families, and communities.

References

Andrews, F.M. & Robinson, J.P. (1991). Measures of subjective well-being. In J.P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver, & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes* (pp. 61-114). San Diego: Academic Press.

Arvey, R.D., Bouchard, T.J., Jr., Segal, N.L., & Abraham, L.M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*. 187-192.

Arnold, J. (2002). Careers and career management. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Volume II* (pp. 115-132). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Arthur, M.B., Hall, D.T., & Lawrence, B.S. (Eds.) (1989). *Handbook of Career Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ashforth, B.E. & Kreiner, G.E. (1999). How can you do it? Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*. 413-434.

Barley, S.R. & Kunda, G. (2001). Bringing work back in. *Organization Science, 12*, 76-95.

Barnett, R.C. & Hyde, J.S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist, 56*, 781-796.

Bosse, D. A., Phillips, R. A., & Harrison, J. S. (2009). Stakeholders, reciprocity, and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *30*, 447-456.

Brief, A.P. (1998). *Attitudes In and Around Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brief, A.P. & Nord. W.R. (Eds.) (1990). *Meanings of Occupational Work: A Collection of Essays.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Brooks, A., Hagan, S.E., Sathyanarayanan, S., Schultz, A., & Edington, D.W. (2010). Presenteeism: Critical issues. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 52,* 1055-1067

Budd, J.W. (2011). *The Thought of Work.* Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

Carr, J.Z., Schmidt, A.M., Ford, J.K, & DeShon, R.P. (2003). Climate perceptions matter: A meta-analytic path analysis relating molar climate, cognitive and affective states, and individual level work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 605-619.

Cascio, W.F. (2003). Changes in workers, work, and organizations. In.W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology, Volume 12: Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 401-422). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Chatman, J.A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: a model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 333-349.

Cranny, C.J., Smith, P.C., & Stone, E.F. (1992). *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance.* New York: Lexington Books.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1241-1255.

Dawis, R.V. & Lofquist, L.H. (1984). *A Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Dawis, R.V., Pinto, P.P., Weitzel, W., & Nezzer, M. (1974). Describing organizations as reinforcer systems: A new use for job satisfaction and employee attitude surveys. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 4*, 55-66.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological

    well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology, 49*, 14-23.

Diener,E., Scollan, C.N., & Lucas, R.E. (2009). The evolving concept of subjective well-being:

    The multifaceted nature of happiness. In Diener, E. (Ed.) *Assessing Well-being: The*

    Collected Works of Ed Diener. New York: Springer.

Diener, E. & Seligman, M. (2004). Beyond money: Toward an economy of well-being.

    Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 5.

Dik, B.J., Duffy, R.D., & Eldridge, B.M. (2009). Calling and vocation in career counseling:

    Recommendations for promoting meaningful work. *Professional Psychology Research*

    and Practice, 40, 625-632.

Dormann, C. & Zapf, D. (2001). Job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of stabilities. *Journal of*

    Organizational Behavior, 22, 483-504.

Eagly, A.H. & Chin, J.L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American*

    Psychologist, 65, 216-234.

Edwards, B.D., Bell, S.T., Arthur, Jr., W., & Decuir, A.D. (2008). Relationships between facets

    of job satisfaction and task and contextual performance. *Applied Psychology: An*

    International Review, 57, 441-465.

England, G.W. & Whitely, W.T. (1990). Cross-national meanings of work. In A.P. Brief &

    W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Meanings of Occupational Work: A Collection of Essays* (pp. 65-

    106). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Enriquez, V.G. (1989). *Indigenous Psychology and National Consciousness*. Tokyo: Institute

    for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Erdogan, B., Bauer, T.N., Truxillo, D.M., & Mansfield, L.R. (2012). Whistle while you work: A review of the life satisfaction literature. *Journal of Management, 38*, 1038-1083.

Farmer, S.M. & van Dyne, L. (2010). The idealized self and the situated self as predictors of employee work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 503-516.

Fave, A.D., Brdar, I., Freire, T., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Wissing, M.P. (2011). The eudaimonic and hedonic components of happiness: Qualitative and quantitative findings. *Social Indicators Research, 100*, 185-207.

Fisher A. (2003). Believe it or not, a labor shortage is coming. *Fortune,* October 7.

Ford, M.T., Heinen, B.A., & Langkamer, K.L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: a meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 57-80.

Frese, M. (2008). The word is out: We need an active performance concept for modern workplaces. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 67-69.

Friedman, S.D. & Greenhaus, J.H. (2000). *Work and Family—Allies or Enemies?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Friedlander, F. (1963). Underlying sources of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 47*, 246-250.

Ganster, D.C. & Perrewé, P.L. (2011). Theories of occupational stress. In J.C. Quick & L.E. Tetrick (Eds.) *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology, 2nd edition* (pp. 37-53). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Gelfand, M. J., Bhawuk, D. P. S., Nishii, L. H., & Bechtold, D. J. (2004). Individualism and collectivism. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.)

Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies (pp. 437-513). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gephart, R.P. Jr. (2004). From the editors: Qualitative research and the *Academy of Management Journal*. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*, 454-462.

George, J.M. & Jones, G.R. (1996). The experience of work and turnover intentions: Interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction, and positive mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 318-.325

Grandey, A.A., Cordeiro, B.L., & Michael, J.H. (2007). Work-family supportiveness organizational perceptions: important for the well-being of male blue-collar hourly workers? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 71*, 460-478.

Grant, A. M. (2008). Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 48-58

Griffeth, R.W., Hom, P.W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*, 463-488.

Griffin, M.A..& Clark, S. (2011). Stress and well-being at work. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Volume 3*, (pp. 359-398). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Griffin, M.A., Parker, S.K., & Neal, A. (2008). Is behavioral engagement a distinct and useful construct? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 48-51.

Grzywacz, J.G., Carlson, D.S., Kacmar, K.M., & Wayne, J.H. (2007). A multi-level perspective on the synergies between work and family. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 559-574.

Guion, R.M. (1992). Agenda for Research and Action. In C.J. Cranny, P.C.Smith, & E.F. Stone (Eds), *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance* (pp. 257-281). New York: Lexington Books.

Guest, D. & Conway, N. (2011). Health and well-being: The role of the psychological contract. In J.C. Quick & L.E. Tetrick (Eds.) *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology, 2nd edition* (pp. 9-23). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Gunz, H. & Piperal, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of Career Studies*. Los Angeles, Sage.

Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250-279.

Hansen, L.S. (1997). *Integrative Life Planning: Critical Tasks for Career Development and Changing Life Patterns*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harrison, D.A., Newman, D.A., & Roth, P.L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*, 305-325.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 268-279.

Hershcovis, M.S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K.A., Dupré, K.E., Inness, M., et al. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 228-238.

Hitt, M. A. & Ireland, R. D. (1985). Corporate distinctive competence, strategy, industry and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *6*, 273-293.

Hobfoll, S.E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*, 513-528.

Hofstede, G. H. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw Hill.

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. Harper & Brothers Publishers: New York.

Hulin, C.L. (2011). Work and being: Meanings of work in contemporary society. Working paper, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Hunter, J.K. & Schmidt, F.L. (2008). Conceptual versus empirical distinctions among constructs: Implications for discriminant validity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* 1: 36-39.

Iaffaldano, M.T. & Muchinsky, P.M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*, 251-273.

Ironson, G.H., Smith, P.C., Brannick, M.T., Gibson, W.M., & Paul, K.B. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 74, 193-200.

James, L.R. & James, L.A. (1992). Psychological climate and affect: Test of a hierarchical dynamic model. In C.J. Cranny, P.C.Smith, & E.F. Stone (Eds), *Job Satisfaction: How*

People Feel About Their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance (pp. 89-117). New York: Lexington Books.

Johns, G. (2010). Presenteeism in the workplace: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 519-542.

Johns, G. (2011). Attendance dynamics at work: The antecedents and correlates of presenteeism, absenteeism, and productivity loss. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*, 483-500.

Judge, T. A., Parker, S., Colbert, A. E., Heller, D., & Ilies, R. (2002). Job satisfaction: A cross-cultural review. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Volume II* (pp. 25-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*, 376-407.

Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 692-724.

Karraker, M.W. & Grochowski, J.R. (2006). *Families with Futures: A Survey of Family Studies for the Twenty-first Century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kerr, B.A. (1985). Review of the Job Descriptive Index. In J.V. Mitchell, Jr. (Ed.) *The Ninth Mental Measurement Yearbook* (pp. 753-754). Lincoln NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Keyes, C.L.M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 1007-1022.

Khurana, R. (2007). *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kinicki, A.J., McKee-Ryan, F.M., Schriesheim, C.A., & Carson, K.P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 14-32.

Koenig, A.M., Eagly, A.H., Mitchell, A.A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*, 616-642.

Kossek, E.E. & Lambert, S. J. (Eds). (2005). *Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural, and Individual Perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kossek, E.E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 139-149.

Krause, S.J. (1995). Attitudes and the prediction of behavior: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 58-75.

LaGuardia, J.G. (2009). Developing who I am: A self-determination theory approach to the establishment of healthy identities. *Educational Psychologist, 44*, 90-104.

Law, K.S., Wong, C., & Mobley, W.H. (1998). Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 741-755.

Levinson, D.J. (1978). *Seasons in a Man's Life*. NY: Alford Knopf.

Locke, E.A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4*, 309-336.

Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational and Industrial Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Loscocco, K.A. & Roschelle, A.R. (1991). Influences on the quality of work and non-work life: Two decades in review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39*, 182-225.

MacDermid, S.M. (2005). (Re)considering conflict between work and family. In E.E. Kossek & S.J. Lambert (Eds.), *Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural, and Individual Perspectives* (pp. 19-40). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Macey, W.H. & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 3-30.

Meilaender, G.C. (Ed.) (2000). *Working: Its Meaning and Limits*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Meyer, J.P. & Maltin, E.R. (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: A critical review, theoretical framework, and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*, 323-337.

Moore, C., Gunz, H., & Hall, D.T. (2005). Tracing the historical roots of career theory in management and organization studies. In H. Gunz & M. Peiperal (Eds.), *Handbook of Career Studies* (pp. 13-38). Los Angeles, Sage.

Muirhead, R. (2004). *Just Work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Newman, D.A. & Harrison, D.A. (2008). Been there, bottled that: Are state and behavioral work engagement new and useful construct "wines"? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *1*, 31-35.

Nord, W.R., Brief, A.P., Atieh, J.M., & Doherty, E.M. (1990). Studying meanings of work: the case of work values. In A.P. Brief & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Meanings of Occupational Work: A Collection of Essays* (pp. 21-64). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Oishi, S. (2012). *The Psychological Wealth of Nations: Do Happy People Make a Happy Society?* Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*, 963-974.

Parsons, F. (1909). *Choosing a vocation*. Boston: Houghton.

Phillips, N. & Lawrence, T.B. (Forthcoming). The turn to work in organization and management theory: Some implications for strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*.

Picoult, J. (2010). Here comes a turnover storm. *New York Times*, October 17: Bu9.

Poelmans, S.A.Y. (Ed.) (2005). *Work and Family: An International Research Perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Power, S.J. & Rothausen, T.J. (2003). The work-oriented midcareer development model: An extension of Super's maintenance stage. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*, 157-197.

Pratt, M.G., Rockmann, K.W., & Kaufmann, J.B. (2006). Constructing professional identity: The role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical residents. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*, 235-262.

Prochaska, J.O., Evers, K.E., Johnson, J.L., Castle, P.H., Prochaska, J.M., Sears, L.E., … Pope, J.E. (2011). The well-being assessment for productivity: A well-being approach to presenteeism. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 53*, 735-742.

Rath, T. & Harter, J. (2010). *Well-being: The Five Essential Elements*. New York: Gallup Press.

Rice, R.W., Gentile, D.A., & McFarlin, D.B. (1991). Facet importance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 31-39.

Rich, B.L., LePine, J.A., & Crawford, E.R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*, 617-635.

Riketta, M. (2008). The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: a meta-analysis of panel studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 472-481.

Rothausen, T.J. (1994). Job satisfaction and the parent worker: The role of flexibility and rewards. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*, 317-366.

Rothausen, T.J. (1999). "Family" in organizational research: A review and comparison of definitions and measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *19*, 817-836.

Rothausen, T.J., Gonzalez, J.A., Clarke, N.E., & O'Dell, L.L. (1998). Family-friendly backlash - fact or fiction?: The case of organizations' on-site child care centers. *Personnel Psychology, 51*, 685-706.

Rothausen, T.J., Gonzalez, J.A., and Griffin, A.E.C. (2009). Are all the parts there everywhere? Facet job satisfaction in the United States and the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 26*, 681-700.

Rothausen, T.J., Malshe, A., & Arnold, J.K. (2012). Emotional and physical strain and identity cycles in voluntary turnover. Featured top poster presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Division 14 of the American Psychological Association, San Diego, April.

Rothkopf, D.J. (2011). Redefining the meaning of number one. *New York Times, Sunday Review Section, October 9*, 1 & 7.

Roy, K.M. (2006). Father stories: A life course examination of paternal identity among low-income African American men. *Journal of Family Issues, 27*, 31-54.

Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1069-1081.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68-78.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*: 141-166.

Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J.P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology*, *36*, 577-600.

Schalk, R. & Rousseau, D.M. (2002). Psychological contracts in employment. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Volume II* (pp. 133-142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schleicher, D.J., Hansen, S.D., & Fox, K.E. (2011). Job attitudes and work values. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Volume 3*, (pp. 137-189). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Schneider B., Hanges P.J., Smith S.B., & Salvaggio, A.N. (2003). Which comes first:
Employee attitudes or organizational financial and market performance? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 836–851.

Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The Measurement of Job Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Snipes, R.L., Oswald, S.L., LaTour, M., & Armenakis, A.A. (2005). The effects of job satisfaction facets on customer perceptions of service quality: an employee-level analysis. *Journal of Business Research, 58*, 1330-1339.

Sollinger, O.N., van Olffen, W., & Roe, R.A. (2008). Beyond the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 70-83.

Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stride, C., Wall, T.D., & Catley, N. (2007). Measures of Job Satisfaction, Organisational Commitment, Mental Health, and Job-related Well-being: A Benchmarking Manual, *2nd edition*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley and Sons.

Super, D. E. (1990). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career choice and development, 2nd edition* (pp. 197-261). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tait, M., Padgett, M.Y., & Baldwin, T.T. (1989). Job and life satisfaction: A reevaluation of the strength of the relationship and gender effects as a function of the date of study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 502-507.

Tay, L. & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and subjective well-being around the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 354-365.

Tett, R.P. & Meyer, J.P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 259-293.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Valcour, P.M. & Hunter, L.W. (2005). Technology, organizations, and work-life integration. In E.E. Kossek & S.J. Lambert (Eds.), *Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural, and Individual Perspectives* (pp. 61-84). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Walsh, J. P. & Nord, W. R. (2005). Taking stock of stakeholder management. *Academy of Management Review, 30*, 426-438.

Waterman, A.S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 678-691.

Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary. (1996). New York: Random House.

Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.

Weiss, H.M. & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 18*, 1-74.

Weiss, H.M. & Rupp, D.E. (2011). Experiencing work: An essay on a person-centric work psychology. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 4*, 83-97.

Weitzel, W., Pinto, P.R., Dawis, R.V., & Jury, P.A. (1973). The impact of organization on the structure of job satisfaction: Some factor analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology, 26*, 545-557.

Williams, M.L., McDaniel, M.A., & Nguyen, N.T. (2006). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 392-413.

Wrzesniewski, A. & Dutton, J.E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, *26*, 179-201.

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P, & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 21-33.

Yu, K.Y.T. (2009). Affective influences in person-environment fit theory: Exploring the role of affect as both cause and outcome of P-E fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1210-1226.

TABLE 1

Facets of Job Purposes across Literatures

	Element of Job Purpose Satisfaction	Selected Variations
Individual identity and self concept ↑	Satisfaction that the job allows for *expression* of the self; allows the individual to express important elements of the self, especially in terms of core values and beliefs about work	Job as calling I was "meant to do," fulfills my purpose Job expresses who I am, my identity Job fits my abilities / interests / personality / skills / values Job fits my spiritual, religious, or secular beliefs Job fits my life stage Job is part of my class identity
	Satisfaction that the job contributes to *development*; the ability to grow, change, and learn now and in the future	Job facilitates upgrades to my knowledge and skills Job is part of a desired career over time Job coalesces to a meaningful trajectory over my life span Job fosters my ongoing relevance in the labor market Job keeps me interested and fulfilled over time
	Satisfaction that the job gives something to do with time and a *role* to play in larger communal and societal endeavors, to contribute to that collective with others in a social setting	What I make or do in the job is valuable to society Job allows me to do my duty, fulfills need to serve Job allows me to help others Job allows me to be part of a larger community Job makes me a useful, respectable part of society Job fill my time with usefulness / achievement Job allows me to make a contribution Job and organization are honorable in my community Job provides organizational or professional status
↓ Life and relationship interdependencies	Satisfaction that the job facilitates procurement of physical needs and wants through *financial* rewards for self and family now and into the future (necessities of life, subsistence, desired life, comfort, status)	Job allows for subsistence; "working to live" Job allows for provision of necessities of life for myself and others important to me, such as family Financial success in this job signals approval and success Financial success in this job is a sign the value of my work Job allows for preferred standard of living Job facilitates financial thriving
	Satisfaction that the job has a positive impact in *primary relationships* in family and with significant others; the job contributes good to family, as defined	Job benefits significant others in my life Job allows for enough time with my family Job contributes to my family's lifestyle and survival Job contributes positively to my relationships Job gives pride and status to my family Job allows me to care for dependents
	Satisfaction with how the job affords the *life* construction needed and wanted, including involvement in arenas such as: leisure, friendships, health, religion, citizenship, ethnicity	Job contributes positively to my overall life Job fits my life Job allows for involvement in: religion, education, community, citizenship, leisure, personal relationships, ethnic identity, and others important to me Job facilitates well-being at work and in life

TABLE 2

Sample Items for General-level Measurement of Whole Job Satisfaction Facets, with Possible Sub-facets

General-level facet	Possible sub-facets from the MSQ, JDI, and reviewed literatures (selected, not comprehensive)		Sample item(s) at the general-level— Indicate level of satisfaction with:
	1st order sub-facets	2nd order sub-facets	
Eudaimonic (purpose) facets			
Expression	Identity related to job Moral values Ability utilization	Fit with specific elements of interests, values, abilities	The way the job feels like what I was meant to do The way the job fits who I am
Development	Growth Advancement Learning	Skill development Personal growth	How doing the job contributes to my development and growth How I can learn in this job
Role	Being part of a community Having a role in a larger effort Worthy process / product	Social status Social service Contribution to customers Contribution to society Making a profit	The feeling the job gives me that I have a role in a larger purpose How my job contributes to society
Financial	Provision of necessities Provision of luxuries	Life-style afforded Housing afforded Pay for level of effort Benefits	The way the job allows me to provide for myself and important others The impact of the job on my financial condition
Primary Relationships	Impact on partner Impact on dependents Impact on others	Impact on time Impact on relationships Spillover	The way the job fits with my primary family and life relationships The good my job contributes to family
Life Construction	Impact on community Impact on leisure Impact on hobbies Impact on health	Housing Amenities Sport Art	How the job fits with aspects of life such as leisure, community, hobbies, and health The way my job allows me to live life
Hedonic (enjoyment) facets			
Tasks	Work process Work product Technology used	Level of involvement with people, things, ideas	The work tasks I perform regularly The process of my work tasks The product of my work
Work Relationships	Supervisor Co-workers Customers Suppliers Other professional	Supervision-technical Supervision-human Peers-friendships Subordinates-quality Mentors	My relationships with the people I work with regularly The people I regularly come into contact with
Organization	Leadership and management Reputation Time policies Working conditions	Flexibility Communication Strategy and position Stability Buildings, technology Inclusiveness	The quality of the organization/s in which I work The way the organization is managed and led

TABLE 3

Job-related Attitudes: Definitions and Targets

Attitude (source)	Definition An attitude of an employee…	Target	Selected behaviors likely more strongly related
Hedonic job-related well-being (here)	… toward a job, centered on an assessment of pleasure or enjoyment from the job.	Whole job (object)	Broad range of behaviors related to work, people, and the organization
Eudaimonic job-related well-being (here)	… toward a job, centered on an assessment of fulfillment of the purposes in the employees' life from the job.	Whole job (object)	Broad range of personal expression and growth, role in the organization, and aspects that fit with the whole life including family
Facets of hedonic job-related well-being (here)	… toward a specific element of a job, centered on an assessment of pleasure or enjoyment taken from that element of the job.	Facets of jobs, see table 2 for list (objects)	Work—task performance behaviors Relationships—citizenship behaviors directed at other people Organization—OCBs
Facets of eudaimonic job-related well-being (here)	…toward an element of a job purpose, centered on an assessment of the sense of fulfillment of that element of purpose.	Facets of job purpose, see Table 2 for list (objects)	(not comprehensive) Expression—task performance behaviors Life construction—retention
Work involvement (Kanungo, 1982)	…centered on an assessment of one's identification with work and the centrality of work in one's life	Work tasks (object)	Effort toward task-related goals, staying in a particular career or line of work
Organizational commitment (Solinger, van Olffen, & Roe, 2008)	… toward the organization including assessments of one's identification with it, internationalization of its goals, norms, and values, and readiness to serve and enhance its interests	Organization (object)	Effort toward organization-determined goals, staying with a specific organization (retention), organization-centered citizenship behaviors
Work engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010)	… of feeling energized by, dedicated to, and absorbed in work (may include both work involvement and commitment); a motivational state	Putting energy and effort into the job (behavior)	Task-related performance behaviors Motivation Expending energy and effort on the job, being emotionally involved in the job
Presenteeism (Johns, 2011; Prochaska et al., 2011)	Attending work when ill (a behavior; Johns, 2011) or inability to concentrate at work due to issues in work or non-work life domains (a state; Prochaska et al., 2011)	Paying attention in the job (behavior)	Task-related performance behaviors Concentrating on work while at the job

FIGURE 1

Origin of Job-Related Well-Being

Basic facets of jobs in organizations

Specific job

Facets of Job

Basic human needs and desires from jobs

Needs from specific self and life situation

Facets of job purpose

Objective and perceived fit

Job-related Well-Being

Enjoyment of facets of the job (hedonic)

Current job-related attitudes

Fulfillment of job purposes (eudaimonic)