Uncovering the trail of positive affect in the job attitudes literature: A systematic review

Eugene Y. J. Tee
Department of Psychology, HELP University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

A review of the organisational psychology literature suggests that researchers have examined at least four job attitude constructs: job satisfaction, work/task satisfaction, job involvement, and organisational commitment. Less, however, is known about why the four different job attitudes vary in magnitude as predictors of vital organisational outcomes. In this systematic review, I propose that positive affect is central in explaining the differential effects of these job attitudes on organisational outcomes. The review then explicates patterns of results underlying prior studies on these job attitudes and presents an overarching proposition: Accurate conceptualisation and measurement of the affective component underlying each job attitude will help illustrate how, and to what extent, each job attitude leads to desirable organisational outcomes. Finally, four key suggestions for further job attitudes research are presented: (a) enhancing conceptualisation and measurement of positive affect in job attitudes, (b) developing an overarching theory of positive affect, (c) focusing on discrete positive emotions, and (d) looking beyond existing current job attitude constructs. This work complements the current affective epoch of job attitudes research, uncovering the trail of positive affect as it has informed the job attitudes literature historically and suggesting its theoretical and practical developments for the future.

Keywords: job attitudes, job involvement, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, positive affect, work/task satisfaction.

Job Attitudes Research: A Brief Historical Overview

The organisational psychology literature is replete with research on job attitudes. Attitude is defined as "a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor" (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993, p. 1). Job attitudes are thus "evaluations of one's job that express one's feelings toward, beliefs about, and attachment to one's job" (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012, p. 344). Job attitudes feature as a mainstay in scholarly research, often conceptualised as antecedents to effective organisational functioning (Argyris, 1957; Likert, 1961; McGregor, 1960). Contemporary conceptualisations of job attitudes acknowledge the importance of both affective and cognitive components of attitude as proximate reasons for how individuals approach tasks, and why they persist on them (Schleicher, Watt, & Greguras, 2004). Extant literature has also incorporated affective elements into the

conceptualisation and measurement of job attitudes (e.g., Brief & Weiss, 2002; H. M. Weiss, 2002; H. M. Weiss & Beal, 2005; H. M. Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

Historically, research on job attitudes has evolved from one form to another, though little theoretical work has detailed the linkages between these distinct constructs. In their historical review of the literature, Judge et al. (2017) showed how the foci of job attitudes research have evolved over time, detailing the central themes that defined each epoch of job attitudes research. For instance, job attitudes research in the cognitive epoch (1960–1980) included researchers such as Argyris (1957), Likert (1961), and McGregor (1960) proposing that organizational effectiveness mirrors the quality of workers' attitudes. Tests of this central hypothesis have resulted in a body of research showing the attitude–performance link primarily at the individual level of analysis (Schneider, Hanges, Smith, & Salvaggio, 2003). In contrast, the current epoch, as highlighted by Judge et al. (2017), is the affective era (1995–present). Partly due to theoretical advancements such as affective events theory (AET; H. M. Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), scholars have since emphasised the role of affect (and affective processes) as a core component of job attitudes. The greater attention paid to affective processes has also shaped the way in which scholars have conceptualised research and theory on job attitudes. The affective era of job attitudes research has also motivated the use of

Correspondence: Eugene Y. J. Tee, Department of Psychology, HELP University, Subang 2, Persiaran Cakerawala, Seksyen U4, 40150 Shah Alam, Selangor D. E., Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. E-mail: teeyj@help.edu.my

measurement tools better suited for capturing fluctuating, within-persons experiences that individuals have of their jobs.

The four main job attitudes that have been the predominant focus of scholars for the past century are (a) job satisfaction, (b) work/task satisfaction, (c) job involvement, and (d) organisational commitment (Judge, Weiss, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Hulin, 2017). Job satisfaction is defined as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job, or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p. 1304) whereas work/task satisfaction is the satisfaction on the individual facets and characteristics of the job itself (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989). Job involvement is defined as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with [their] work, or the importance of work in [their] total self-image" (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965, p. 24). Finally, organisational commitment is identification toward the organisation, characterised by having a strong belief in and acceptance of and willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organisation (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Committed employees also display a strong desire to remain a member of the organisation (Mowday et al., 1982).

The rationale for focusing on these four job attitudes aligns with Judge et al.'s (2017) historical review, but the focus of the present work is more specific. I first review the extent to which positive affect has been conceptualised and operationalised as part of job attitudes. It is then argued that the "trail" of positive affect is evident across the entire history of job attitudes research. Subsequently, it is contended that differences in definition and measurement of positive affect have led to disagreement and inconsistencies in how job attitudes have been researched as part of the broader organisational behaviour literature. In the discussion and suggestions for future research, I then refer to contemporary job attitudes concepts and research that highlight the importance of defining and measuring positive affect as part of any job attitude. In particular, the review emphasises how more recent job attitudes such as work engagement and passion illustrate the value of conceptualising and measuring job attitudes in terms of their affective components. Given the primarily affective nature of work engagement, a review of the evidence for this job attitude allows us to draw contrasts between preceding job attitudes that are primarily conceptualised and operationalised as cognitive-focused job attitudes with the work engagement literature. It is also acknowledged that there are newer job-related constructs that claim to supersede the effects of work engagement; that is, work passion (see Perrewé, Hochwarter, Ferris, McAllister, & Harris, 2014; Zigarmi, Nimon, Houson, Witt, & Diehl, 2009). Work passion, however, is conceptualised as an

affect rather than an attitude and thus is excluded from our review. Work passion is, nonetheless, mentioned in the discussion section of this work. This is in light of scholars' recent arguments that this construct is a better predictor of desirable work outcomes relative to previous constructs. Indeed, Zigarmi et al. (2009) considered work passion as a "mega-construct" that encompasses facets of attitude—but is predominantly affective in nature.

Scholars have examined the interrelationships between the major job attitude constructs. Despite this, little is known about the underlying psychological mechanisms of processes that underlie why certain job attitudes are more strongly associated with organisational outcomes than with others. An overview of the job attitudes literature has suggested two important and related themes—which will be detailed in the present work. First, the different job attitudes vary in the degree in which they influence desirable work outcomes. There is mixed evidence for the effects of job satisfaction on performance; some studies have reported relatively low correlation, $\rho = .17$ (Iaffaldano & Muchinksy, 1985) whereas others have reported a considerable link between the two variables, $\rho = .31$ (Petty, McGee, & Cavender, 1984). In contrast, meta-analyses of the work engagement literature have suggested that this job attitude is consistently predictive of performance at a weighted correlation of .30 or higher (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011; Halbesleben, 2010). Second, it is proposed that the differences in conceptualisation and operationalisation of the job attitudes—as evident from the measurement items—are a plausible reason for the inconsistent effects of differing job attitudes on performance outcomes.

Consistent with AET, and with points made in Judge et al.'s (2017) review, the flow of affect within an individual does shape job attitude outcomes. I extend on this claim, and detail how regularity and intensity of within-person affective states can help explain the differential effects of job attitudes on individual and organisational outcomes. The emphasis of the current work, therefore, is to complement the Judge et al. (2017) work by highlighting how daily affective experiences—in the form of uplifts and hassles (i.e., positive and negative affect)—are essential in shaping job attitudes.

Focus of the Present Article

The current review offers a framework to better understand why these four job attitudes influence work and organisational outcomes to varying degrees. It is proposed that the four job attitudes can be differentiated as gradations in the intensity and frequency by which positive affect is experienced at work, and the target(s) that positive affect is directed toward. As Diener, Larsen, Levine, and Emmons (1985) argued, both intensity and

frequency of affect are central components of affective structure. Studies have further shown that the frequency of positive affect contributes to subjective well-being (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). I propose, however, that the intensity of positive affect is particularly important for our current theorising. The patterns of results underlying prior studies are then explicated, detailing how and why these job attitudes influence organisational outcomes to varying degrees. The current work also presents an important overarching proposition: Accurate conceptualisation and measurement of the affective component underlying job attitudes will help illustrate how, and to what extent, each job attitude will lead to desirable organisational outcomes.

The present work is structured in the following manner. I first present a brief overview of the role of positive affect in job attitudes research, then review in depth the themes and patterns in each of the four job attitudes: job satisfaction, work/task satisfaction, job involvement, and organisational commitment. Throughout each of these job attitudes, I review both the conceptualisation and measurement of constructs, detailing how and why their effects on favourable work outcomes are varied most of the time. Central to this argument is the conceptualisation and measurement of positive affect in each of the four job attitudes. Next, four key themes and suggestions for future job attitudes research are proposed. In this portion of the review, I argue for the relevance of properly conceptualising and measuring job attitudes and their affective elements in advancing research in this area.

Literature Search Strategy

A broad search of research was first conducted on each of the four job attitudes on major databases such as EBSCOhost and PsycINFO as well as Google Scholar. The review also relied on references to publications featured on researchers' ResearchGate profiles. No date/year of publication-range restrictions was imposed for this search. Both empirical and theoretical pieces examining and/or directly related to the four job attitudes were included in the initial sample of articles for this review. In terms of empirical papers, meta-analyses and metareviews of the job attitudes literature were emphasised. This helped with attaining the weighted correlation values that allowed for the assessment of the overall impact of each job attitude on work outcomes. Relevant theoretical pieces that help provide historical context for the development of the four job attitudes were also reviewed. This helped detail the conceptual evolution of the job attitudes in question and strengthen claims regarding the importance of clearly defining and measuring the affective elements of job attitudes.

Finally, books and book chapters were also reviewed. I followed Lyubomirsky et al.'s (2005) review process, adopting the ancestry method where reference lists for all source material were also reviewed. This approach was also applied for new articles uncovered throughout the review.

Positive Affect in Job Attitudes Research

The central proposition for this review is that the differences and overlap between the four major job attitude constructs (job satisfaction, work/task satisfaction, job involvement, and organisational commitment) can be explained by the frequency and intensity by which positive affect is experienced toward different targets as part of one's job attitude. Job attitudes and emotions at work are, of course, distinct constructs (H. M. Weiss & Beal, 2005). Job attitudes are evaluations or evaluative judgements made with regard to one's work, and are thus distinct from affect (H. M. Weiss, 2002). What is argued, however, consistent with the need to better emphasise and understand the role of affect in job attitudes, is that emotions strongly underlie the judgements and evaluations that one forms as part of one's job attitude. Thus, what it emphasised is the importance of accounting for the role of positive emotions in their conceptualisation and measurement, in better understanding the patterns of results observed from job attitudes research. The selection of job attitudes here is limited to recent reviews (e.g., Judge et al., 2017). These job attitudes also continue to be the subjects of recent meta-analyses (e.g., Miao, Humphrey, & Qian, 2017; Ng & Sorensen, 2008).

It is first proposed that job satisfaction is a job attitude characterised by low-arousal positive affect and is formed primarily toward a favourable global assessment of one's job. It is also proposed that this satisfaction can be directed toward facets of one's job, in the form of work/task satisfaction (Ironson et al., 1989). Job satisfaction is contrasted with job involvement, which reflects a more cognitively focussed attitude and is conceptualised as the extent to which individuals identify with their job. The core of job involvement is the extent of identification with the work as a referent target whereas in organisational commitment, the reference target is the organisation rather than the job (Morrow, 1983). While satisfaction, as a low-arousal positive affect and other discrete positive emotions feature as part of job involvement and organisational commitment, past research has tended to overlook the relative importance of affective elements of this job attitude. More recent evidence, however, has painted a more balanced view of the organisational commitment literature, and has highlighted the central importance of affective commitment in predicting a range of organisational outcomes. Mercurio (2015), for

one, highlighted how affective commitment is more predictive of major organisational consequences than continuance or normative forms of commitment. The shift in focus from mainly cognitive aspects of job attitudes to mainly affective elements is also aligned with the central argument: Focussing on the affective components of a job attitude construct enhances its predictive validity on desired organisational outcomes.

Job Satisfaction

Fredrickson (2013, p. 4) defined contentment as a discrete positive emotion that arises when individuals interpret their current circumstances as cherished, right, or satisfying, and when individuals feel safe and comfortable within their immediate environment. In reviewing the job satisfaction construct, Sypniewska (2014) noted that the terms *job satisfaction* and *job contentment* are often used interchangeably. The author aligned these conceptualisations with the humanistic school of thought, proposing that individuals must feel contentment and satisfaction before attaining higher level needs. Contentment, in this regard, is equated with low-arousal joy and, as per Fredrickson's (2013) definition, is comparable to the job satisfaction construct. Indeed, early measures of job satisfaction such the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) have focused on capturing respondents' cognitive evaluations of pay, promotions, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself. Likewise, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; D. J. Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) measures respondents' cognitive assessments of job factors such as security, compensation, advancement, and coworkers.

In the present review, it is suggested that subsequent, more directed and focused job attitude constructs (toward specific tasks in the form of job involvement or toward the organisation in the form of organisational commitment) are characterised by more target-specific and high-arousal emotions. Reconceptualisations of job satisfaction, however, have led to contemporary measures of this construct tapping into more specific (and high arousal) discrete positive emotions. It is only with this revised conceptualisation and operationalisation that researchers find consistent links between job satisfaction and desirable work outcomes.

Research on job satisfaction has proliferated the organisational behaviour literature for many decades and has been examined in relation to job performance. The "happy worker–productive worker hypothesis" has often been touted as the "holy grail" of organisational behaviour research (Petty et al., 1984). Job satisfaction is often framed under Locke's (1976) definition as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job, or job experiences" (p. 1304). Early meta-analyses on job satisfaction and job performance were not supportive of the happy worker–productive worker hypothesis, prompting researchers to conclude that both constructs share a modest linkage at best (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985) or a spurious relationship at worst (Bowling, 2007). Studies have also examined why the link between satisfaction and performance persists despite contrasting empirical evidence (Fisher, 2003).

Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001) in their meta-analysis, however, found a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Drawing their results from a sample of 254 studies ($N = 54,417$ from 312 independent samples), the authors found a true mean correlation of .30 between job satisfaction and job performance. Hence, these authors propose a re-examination of the job satisfaction–job performance link, arguing that previous studies and meta-analyses (e.g., Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985) have assessed job satisfaction as a single facet, resulting in a lack of specificity on how this job attitude relates to job performance. Indeed, the first reason why the job satisfaction–job performance link has consistently failed to impart substantial correlations may be due to its measures lacking fidelity and specificity. Ilies and Judge (2002) critiqued most past studies of job satisfaction as being reliant on "single-shot" measures that are inadequate for assessing the fleeting, momentary, and fluctuating nature of positive affect at work. Additionally, Fisher (2010) noted that widely used instruments of job satisfaction assess *cognitive* evaluations of job features and role characteristics, as opposed to emotions felt toward the job. Second, and at a more conceptual level, job satisfaction has been less predictive of performance given the generality of the term *satisfaction*. Extending on calls to revise the job satisfaction–job performance link, Brief (1998) and Fisher (2010) proposed that further research consider specific forms of happiness at work, and where appropriate, devise new constructs of job satisfaction that better capture discrete positive emotions at work. Fisher (2010), for instance, proposed discrete positive emotions such as pride and interest as examples that may be predictive of job performance outcomes.

As a consequence of the measurement limitations and narrow conceptualisation of this job attitude, satisfaction —as observed in the literature—is considered a global, low-intensity temporal affective state that is unlikely to spur long-term persistence toward tasks and goals. This is more akin to a state of being "not dissatisfied" and further illustrates why low-arousal positive emotions do not consistently or persistently motivate job performance. Employee persistence and sustenance of their

efforts and personal resources toward tasks and organisational goals must then rely on more potent drivers—precisely, job attitudes that are characterised by specific discrete emotions directed toward specific aspects of one's job.

Thus, it is proposed that simply being contented provides the "baseline" for which to attain desired organisational outcomes, but is typically insufficient to drive sustained positive work behaviours, growth, or development potential. Low-arousal joy, in the form of satisfaction, is nonetheless crucial for the cultivation of psychological safety, creating a safe environment for work and expression of self (Kahn, 1990). Work environments that fail to provide this sense of psychological safety may increase job insecurity and consequently, lower satisfaction and involvement toward the job as well as commitment toward the organisation (Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2002). As such, it can be proposed that the necessity of providing psychological safety through cultivating feelings of satisfaction forms the basis for which subsequent, incremental gains from more high-arousal discrete positive emotions can be attained.

A review of the job satisfaction literature in light of these considerations has suggested that the happy worker–productive worker hypothesis can and should be re-examined. The use of experience sampling methods can aid in capturing fleeting, momentary experiences of positive affect at work, allowing for an assessment of how job satisfaction fluctuates depending on work contexts and experiences. While this is a concern primarily of design than of measurement, these methods yield small, albeit statistically significant, influences on job productivity (Ilies & Judge, 2002, 2004; Scott & Judge, 2006). Both emotion and mood, therefore, are the key "missing pieces" in understanding the link between job satisfaction and performance (Fisher, 2000). Satisfaction removes negative affect and, as a low-arousal positive emotion, creates a psychologically safe work environment that prompts organisational members' exploration and opportunities for growth.

Work/Task Satisfaction

In their review of the job attitudes literature, Judge et al. (2017) mentioned the "brief heyday" of work/task satisfaction from 1930 to 1940. The authors stated that much of the research then focused on job satisfaction; about 80% of job attitudes-related research from 1950 onward focussed on job satisfaction versus work satisfaction. The two attitude constructs, however, can be distinguished by how they are measured. Job satisfaction is often assessed as a global or composite score whereas work/task satisfaction is examined by focussing on the individual facets and characteristics of the job itself. The

discussion and debates surrounding the measurement of work and task satisfaction provide another reason for the importance of positive affect in influencing desirable organisational outcomes.

Ironson et al. (1989) showed that the facet scores on the Job in General Scale (JIG), a commonly used measure of satisfaction, were not equivalent to either its composite or global score. Scarpello and Campbell (1983), likewise, using variants of the MSQ, argued that the use of a global or composite measure may also result in an oversight on which elements contribute to job satisfaction. The authors summarized their findings by stating the whole of job satisfaction as being "more complex than the sum of its parts." Global scales of satisfaction require respondents to combine their reactions to various aspects of the job into a single integrated response (which can take the form of a single-item measure) whereas composite scores are derived from a selection of items across the measure. In this approach, the researchers assumed that the coverage of items across the measure is equal to the sum of its principal parts (Ironson et al., 1989). Global and composite approaches, however, appear to lack fidelity or specificity on what elements of the job (e.g., pay, promotions, supervision) directly contribute to satisfaction. These authors also showed that the most important aspect of global job satisfaction appears to be the work itself. Indeed, an assessment of the JIG has shown that the items corresponding to the "nature of the present work" tap into affective reactions, asking respondents to assess their jobs using descriptors such as *satisfying*, *exciting*, *fascinating*, or *boring*.

Whereas Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) showed single-item measures of satisfaction to demonstrate sufficient reliability, the authors argued for the use of such measures only on practical grounds; that is, primarily on cost and time-saving grounds. Recent psychometric work on satisfaction measures, however, has appeared to have satisfied both the need for measurement fidelity and practicality while still maintaining high levels of measurement validity and reliability. Russell et al. (2004), for instance, developed an abridged JIG measure (AJIG), which consists of 8 items, as compared to Ironson et al.'s (1989) original 18. The AJIG consists of a good range of items assessing the extent to which an individual affectively values the job, namely as *good*, *undesirable*, *makes me content*, and *enjoyable*. Recently, Thompson and Phua (2012) also developed the Brief Index of Affective Job Satisfaction, which includes items such as "I like my job better than the average person" and "Most days I am enthusiastic about my job." These authors further argued for the importance of distinguishing between cognitive job satisfaction and affective job satisfaction.

The brief discussion of the development of work satisfaction measures here is necessary, if only to further illustrate the role of measurement specificity in explaining how and why the link between job satisfaction and employee performance is not as robust as it intuitively appears. Considering these points, Ilies and Judge's (2002) initial observations can be extended. In addition to the limitations of one-off, "single-shot measures" of satisfaction that fail to adequately capture affective experiences, researchers have also tended to confound work and task satisfaction by not adequately distinguishing whether it is the overall (i.e., global) or specific (i.e., facet) evaluation of the job that is hypothesised to influence job performance. Further, the mismatch of conceptualisation of job satisfaction as an affective component, but measurement of its cognitive elements, appears to have also contributed to the debate revolving around the happy worker–productive worker hypothesis. The subsequent job attitude, in the form of job involvement, centers on identification with the job. The pattern of results observed here also aligns with the current review's central claim: The degree to which positive affect is conceptualised or measured as part of the job attitude is important in understanding how, and to what extent, that attitude contributes to favourable work outcomes.

Job Involvement

Job involvement was first defined by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with [their] work, or the importance of work in [their] total self-image" (p. 24). Subsequent definitions and conceptualisations of job involvement, however, revolve around a single factor: identification with the job (Blau, 1985). Brooke, Russell, and Price (1988) noted that while job satisfaction relates mainly to one's liking of the job, job involvement reflects one's psychological identification with his or her job. While Lodahl and Kejner (1965) were the first to define job involvement and develop a measure for this attitude, subsequent work has employed Kanungo's (1982) definition and measure as being more accurately representative of the job involvement construct (Blau, 1985). In Kanungo's (1982) terms, job involvement is "a cognitive or belief of psychological identification with one's present job" (p. 341).

Two streams of scholarly research have emerged in attempting to link job involvement with desirable work outcomes; the first focusses on how job involvement impacts employee turnover and absenteeism (Blau & Boal, 1989; Wegge, Schmidt, Parker, & van Dick, 2007) whereas the second links job involvement with job performance (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002). Saal (1978) examined how job involvement influences both absenteeism and performance, and found that job involvement was negatively associated with unexcused absences, but not with job performance. Brown's (1996) meta-analysis has shown that the link between job involvement and both these categories of desirable work outcomes is weak overall, $r = .09$, and may be intervened by both motivation and effort. A successive study by Brown and Leigh (1996) has shown that the effect of job involvement on performance was mediated by effort. This is a crucial finding that was first highlighted by Lawler and Hall (1970), who found that job involvement, but not job satisfaction, is significantly associated with self-rated effort. Subsequent studies, however, have appeared to downplay or overlook the role of effort in explaining the job involvement–performance link prior to Brown and Leigh's (1996) study.

Consequently, Brown (1996) highlighted the need to focus on the "emotive force" that aids in driving motivation and goal-directed behaviour. In justifying his argument, Brown cited that cognitive appraisals of one's work environment arouse emotions that in turn drive subsequent behaviours. This may be why studies of job involvement published after Brown's meta-analysis (e.g., Diefendorff et al., 2002; Wegge et al., 2007) have found significant relationships between job involvement and performance. Wegge et al. (2007), for example, found that the interactive effect between job satisfaction and job involvement significantly lowers absenteeism. Diefendorff et al. (2002) found significant relationships of job performance with job performance and organizational citizenship behaviours. Of note from Diefendorff et al's (2002) study is the use of a different measure of job involvement—one by Paullay, Alliger, and Stone-Romero (1994). This alternative measure of job involvement comprises two factors: role involvement and role setting. The former is defined as the extent to which "one is *engaged* [emphasis added] in the specific tasks that make up one's job" whereas the latter relates to the "degree to which one finds carrying out the task of one's job in the present job environment to be *engaging* [emphasis added]" (Paullay et al., 1994, p. 225). The significant effects found in Diefendorff et al.'s study may be partly due to the use of this alternative measure—tapping into a construct that is characterised by more intense positive emotional experiences, and more akin to work engagement. This subtle point raises the importance of constructing items for job attitude measures by phrasing them precisely and accurately. The central element of job involvement is that of identification, which has often been conceptualised and then measured as a cognitive rather than an affective element. This is in contrast with the conceptualisation and measurement of engagement (or immersion), which focusses more on the affective drivers of performance. The confounding

conceptualisations and definitions blur the distinction between these job attitudes and may lead to spurious correlations if measures using inaccurate terms are employed.

It can also be reasoned that the significant effects of job involvement on desirable work outcomes are attained when multiple job attitudes driven by low-arousal positive emotions are studied as interactions rather than as separate constructs. This provides one explanation why studies examining job attitudes as interactive terms such as between job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Sagie, 1998), job involvement and organisational commitment (Blau & Boal, 1989; Martin & Hafer, 1995), and job involvement and job satisfaction (Wegge et al., 2007) have all found significant relationships with desirable work outcomes while direct effects are weak or absent. In other words, combining multiple job attitudes increases the chances that researchers will find incremental or additive variance: Multiple low-arousal positive emotions as part of compound job attitude variables will significantly predict desirable work outcomes. The results, however, may be misleading given that they are based on a statistical artefact, ultimately leading to a spurious conclusion regarding the *individual* contributions of individual job attitudes. The pattern of findings here echoes Brown's (1996) prescience, where the author stated that "whereas interaction effects are inconclusive, the main effect relationships between job involvement, absenteeism, and turnover are small" (p. 244).

Given that job involvement has often been conceptualised as a "cognitive" construct focussing on identification, most measures of the construct do not account for the emotional core that may be driving motivation and effort. Certainly, considering job involvement without a positive emotional core can instead be detrimental to psychological well-being and performance. Indeed, high scores on several items in Lodahl and Kejner's (1965, p. 29) original measure of job involvement could be mistaken for overidentification and workaholism in light of contemporary research. These items include "The most important things that happen to me involve my work," "Sometimes I lie awake at night thinking ahead to the next day's work," and "I live, eat, and breathe my job." In its place, researchers might consider more contemporary conceptualisations and measures that distinguish between cognitive and affective identification. Work by Johnson, Morgeson, and Hekman (2012), for instance, has distinguished between these two forms of identification and has found that affective, rather than cognitive identification, was predictive of employee commitment and citizenship behaviours.

Research has further implicated high levels of job involvement as contributing to work–family conflict (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). The detrimental effects of job involvement have also been observed on employee performance. Janssen (2003), for example, found that workers high on job involvement "pay the price" of performing highly innovative behaviours by experiencing more conflict with their coworkers. That is, innovative behaviours of workers were found to be more strongly linked with poor quality relations with coworkers if they were high, rather than low, on job involvement. Kühnel, Sonnentag, and Westman (2009) concluded that job involvement could be a "double-edged sword." In their study of nurses, the authors showed that while job involvement is positively associated with work engagement, workers high on job involvement found it difficult to psychologically detach from work, leading to a diminished ability to regain psychological resources. These findings complement an earlier study of teachers, which has shown that job involvement is negatively associated with one's ability to detach from work (Sonnentag & Kruel, 2006).

The detrimental effects of high levels of job involvement can also be understood in light of research on workaholism. Spence and Robbins (1992) defined workaholics as "individuals who are high on work involvement, but low on enjoyment of work" (p. 160). In other words, extant research that has focussed on the cognitive elements of job involvement (i.e., identification with the work) without tapping into (or considering) its affective components might have been inadvertently capturing a variant construct of *workaholism* instead. Considering the effects of high work involvement without the presence of positive emotions explains why workaholism has been associated with burnout and lowered well-being (Schaufeli, Bakker, van der Heijden, & Prins, 2009), lowered life satisfaction (Aziz & Zickar, 2006), work–family conflict (Bakker, Demerouti, & Burke, 2009), and poorer long-term health outcomes (Ng, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2007). In contrast, positive emotions aid in resolving debates between "good" and "bad" forms of workaholism (Harpaz & Snir, 2003; Scott, Moore, & Miceli, 1997). Specifically, positive emotions—which predominantly encourage appetitive, approach-oriented behaviours—are the integral component that distinguishes workaholism (or high job involvement with little positive affect) from engagement (Gorgievski & Bakker, 2010). Finally, Hallberg and Schaufeli (2006) highlighted that constructs such as job involvement and organisational commitment have focused mainly around the cognitive, identification-focussed processes of an individual in relation to his or her job or organisation. This partly explains why recent research on engagement has tended to more frequently show associations between this construct with health outcomes, relative to research on job satisfaction, job involvement, or organisational commitment (e.g., Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012).

The review of the job involvement literature has revealed trends similar to that of job satisfaction. The mixed findings between job satisfaction and job involvement with performance are due to conceptual and measurement concerns—both of which, incidentally, stem from a limited focus on positive affect. It can therefore be suggested that job involvement is a mainly cognitive job attitude construct and, where limited evidence is available (e.g., Brown & Leigh, 1996; Lawler & Hall, 1970), operates to drive performance through effort. While the weak association between job satisfaction and performance is more likely due to measurement limitations (i.e., the inability to capture repeated low-arousal, momentary, and transient experiences of positive emotions at work), the weak relationship between job involvement and performance is due to the construct that focusses primarily on the cognitive component of identification, overlooking its emotional aspects. This explains why the interactive effects of job involvement and satisfaction/commitment, but not their direct effects, predict job performance. By itself, excessive job involvement may even be detrimental to employee performance, given that the construct is examined without the restorative effects of positive emotions. In summary, the evidence has suggested that job involvement is assessed primarily as identification with the job and should thus serve predominantly to enhance an organisational member's association with their job and job roles. This may not, however, generate the impetus for sustained discretionary effort.

Organisational Commitment

Like job involvement, organisational commitment centers on the element of identification. Unlike job involvement, however, the referent point for one's identification is not the job but the organisation itself (Blau & Boal, 1987; Morrow, 1983). Mowday et al. (1982) conceptualised commitment as having (a) a strong belief in, and acceptance of the organisation's goals and values; (b) willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organisation; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organisation. Much of the subsequent work on this construct is based on Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organisational commitment, which consists of affective (extent of identification and involvement with the organisation), continuance (recognition of costs and benefits of leaving the organisation), and normative (willingness to remain on the basis of moral obligation) commitment. This tripartite model of organisational commitment is considered by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) as a psychological state, comprising elements of attitudinal and behavioural perspectives of commitment. Commitment extends beyond

positive global assessments of the job, and unlike job satisfaction or job involvement, includes facts that motivate affiliation and association with the organisation.

Various meta-analyses have been conducted to assess the effects of organisational commitment on job performance (see Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Riketta, 2002). One meta-analysis of note, conducted by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovich, and Topolnytsky (2002), consisting of 144 studies ($N = 50,146$ employees from 155 independent samples) has highlighted two findings critical for the current theoretical work and our reasoning for the centrality of positive emotions in differentiating and understanding the effects of each job attitude. First, Meyer et al. (2002) found that affective commitment was the most significant influence on both organisation-relevant (e.g., performance), and employee-relevant (e.g., stress) outcomes. Second, this meta-analysis has shown that continuance commitment was either unrelated or negatively associated with both organisational and individual outcomes. These results are consistent with Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran's (2005) meta-analysis that has demonstrated a correlation between affective commitment with both job satisfaction and job involvement. An implication of such a finding is that beyond satisfaction, a sense of affiliation and commitment to the work or organisation, based primarily on affective grounds, is more likely to translate to continuance, persistence, and sustenance toward one's work and organisation. In terms of implications for leadership, Kark and van Dijk (2007) related affective commitment with follower promotion-focused behaviours (e.g., creativity) whereas continuance and normative commitment were associated with more prevention-focused behaviours (e.g., noncreative repetitiveness and risk aversion). Fisher (2010) claimed that affective commitment extends beyond satisfaction and may manifest itself as a psychological resource for sustained employee discretionary effort.

A corollary argument to these findings is that the sustenance of individual and organisational psychological resources cannot stem from continuance and normative commitment alone. A cost–benefit assessment of leaving the organisation, characteristic of continuance commitment, is unlikely to motivate persistence and deep affiliation with the organizsation. Fostering continuance commitment through monetary incentives has been shown to only have a modest influence on job satisfaction and motivation (Judge, Piccolo, Podsakoff, Shaw, & Rich, 2010). Normative commitment, likewise, is strongly reliant on motivation by compliance—a possible reason why this form of commitment is also less strongly associated with organisational and individual outcomes than affective commitment (Meyer et al., 2002). The affective component of commitment has greater impact on developing and sustaining influences

toward desirable organisational outcomes than its continuance or normative component. Indeed, in a recent review of the literature, Mercurio (2015) argued for affective commitment as the "core essence" of organisational commitment construct. Finally, a recent and extensive investigation of the differences in individual-level organisational commitment employing a large sample of 16,052 respondents has shown that individuals with dominant affective commitment scores are also most likely to experience positive organisational experiences (Kabins, Xu, Bergman, Berry, & Willson, 2016).

Experiencing positive affect toward one's organisation, characterised by affective form of commitment, should thereby work by increasing one's affiliation toward the organisation and building the motivational resources for directing efforts toward organisational goals. Like job involvement, positive emotions experienced as part of affective commitment should operate by enhancing an organisational member's self-concept and affiliation with the organisation (cf. their job).

Discussion and Recommendations for Future Studies

In this systematic review, I examined the role of positive affect in the job attitudes literature by detailing how positive affect, as part of job satisfaction, work/task satisfaction, job involvement, and organisational commitment, has typically been conceptualised and measured. In essence, the review re-evaluates the job attitudes literature, detailing how the accuracy and precision in which positive attitudes are captured in each of the four job attitudes help explain the patterns of results observed in the organisational behaviour literature. This systematic review reveals the "fingerprints" of positive affect across the four major job attitudes literature, extending on Judge et al.'s (2017) recent historical review of this domain of organisational research. The review also contributes to theoretical development in the affective epoch of job attitudes research in the hopes that clarifying of the role of positive affect helps spur additional research. In the following paragraphs, I offer four key suggestions for advancing the state of job attitudes research.

Conceptualisation and Measurement of Job Attitudes

The first suggestion for further theoretical development and empirical research rests on the need for more accurate conceptualisation and measurement of job attitudes. As highlighted in the review, it appears that historically, job attitudes research has tended to be conceptualised as affective constructs, but measured as cognitive ones. This is the case for job satisfaction, but is also noted in the review of the job involvement literature. The suggestion is not to disregard or eliminate measures tapping into the cognitive elements of any job attitude. Rather, it is proposed that researchers measure both, but align the definition and conceptualisation of each job attitude construct with the operationalisation and measurement of it. I further propose that for affective elements specifically, measures should be taken to capture the dynamic, fleeting, and transient nature of one's job attitudes using appropriate experience sampling approaches. This is crucial given that affect can fluctuate depending on contextual or circumstantial events in one's workplace.

In particular, the job involvement literature has provided a cautionary example of the implications of mismatching conceptualisation and definition of the job attitudes with its measurement. Job involvement and work engagement are conceptually different constructs. In the revision of job involvement measures, however, it appears that researchers have generated items that overlap with elements more akin to work engagement. The positive associations between such items and work outcomes may lead researchers to spuriously conclude that job involvement has substantial influence on desirable organisational outcomes—comparable to that of, say, work engagement. As such, it is not enough to simply construct more affective measures of any job attitude measure but to clearly distinguish between the cognitive and affective drivers of performance of the job attitude in question. To this effect, it is promising to note how more recently developed measures of job satisfaction (e.g., the AJIG; see Russell et al., 2004; Thompson & Phua, 2012) have helped capture the specific facets contributing to satisfaction at work.

Development of measures within the work/task satisfaction literature has suggested that it is crucial to note how specific aspects of the work contribute to (or detract from) overall satisfaction. Such measures, more generally, also highlight the importance, if not necessity, of distinguishing between cognitive and affective elements from the overall general assessment (Thompson & Phua, 2012; H. M. Weiss, 2002). The use of experience sampling approaches should be further encouraged in assessing job satisfaction, as these approaches allow researchers to better capture fleeting positive experiences at work over an extended period of time. Longitudinal studies can thus be particularly useful in tracking the incremental and minute effects of positive affect that would not otherwise be apparent in cross-sectional research designs. Measurement decisions, of course, need to be made considering practical considerations as well. It can also be suggested that researchers should opt for longer, facet-based measures of job satisfaction if the research goal is to develop and test theory.

Overarching Theories for Affective Job Attitude Constructs

To advance theory and guide empirical research on job attitudes in the future, it may be necessary to develop a theory that helps explain the role of affect —positive affect in particular— across job attitudes. The AET by H. M. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) has provided a useful theoretical framework in linking affective experiences with job experiences and should be acknowledged in future job attitudes research. According to the AET, daily experiences at work are characterised as having a pleasant (i.e., uplifting) or unpleasant (i.e., hassling) influence on subjective emotion states. Studies employing this as a theoretical framework can help capture the dynamics and fluctuations of the emotional aspects of one's job attitudes, providing a more fluid representation of how job attitudes change across one's workday and plethora of work experiences.

Another theory that may help guide future development is Fredrickson's (2001) broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. The theory proposes that discrete positive emotions facilitate the broadening of one's thought–action repertoire and build psychological resources for effective functioning. While direct applications of this theory in organisational research appear limited to conceptual work at the moment (Fredrickson, 2000; Vacharkulksemsuk & Fredrickson, 2013), I argue that the theory holds promise in helping detail how discrete positive emotions operate in contributing to desired organisational outcomes. Adopting the broaden-and-build theory also allows for the examination of how discrete positive emotions serve to enrich job attitudes. More generally, this helps the state of science move beyond broad categorisations of emotions as being simply "positive" or "negative," and helps shed light on how specific positive emotions—pride, joy, and inspiration, for instance—help enhance job attitudes and work outcomes. Shirom (2003), for example, proposed the construct of vigor, defined as a positive affect state characterized by "feelings of physical strength, cognitive liveliness and emotional energy" (p. 135). The author linked this construct with the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions, suggesting that frequent experience of vigor can lead to broaden cognition and generation of psychological resources that elevate job performance and organisational effectiveness. Such theoretically grounded and cross-disciplinary links are promising, helping anchor the job attitude constructs within a broader, robust framework.

The broaden-and-build theory may also help shed light on the psychological mechanisms and processes that cause positive affect to enhance individual and organisational-level outcomes. For instance, the "broaden" component is based on work by Isen (2001), who showed that individuals experiencing positive mood exhibit cognitive capabilities such as creativity, more efficient decision-making, greater attention, and increased focus. Conversely, the "build" component suggests that positive emotions facilitate recovery and replenishment of psychological resources by countering the depletory effects of negative emotions (Fredrickson, Mancuso, Branigan, & Tugade, 2000). The outcomes are often consequences of favourable job attitudes, consistent with claims that positive affect leads to, and not simply precedes, success in major life domains, including work (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005).

Discrete Positive Emotions as Part of Job Attitudes

While the focus of the current review is on general positive affect, it is also noteworthy that scholars have highlighted the importance of examining discrete positive emotions as part of job attitudes research. Fisher (2010), for example, alluded to different discrete positive emotions as having differential effects on job attitudes and work outcomes. Interest, for instance, as an emotion that is experienced upon appraisal of a target as being complex, but comprehensible, may be associated with sustained discretionary effort toward challenging tasks, and motivation to persist despite difficulties or challenges (Silvia, 2008; Thoman, Smith, & Silvia, 2011). Examining favourable job attitudes from a facet perspective would also allow for discrete positive emotions to be linked with specific aspects of a job. The emotion of gratitude, conversely, may be associated with assessments of favourable work relationships, which also ultimately contributes to high levels of satisfaction or commitment.

Hu and Kaplan (2015) listed three emotions (i.e., pride, interest, gratitude) in their article as central to organisational experiences, and for advancing organisational research. Similar, complementary research examining how varying discrete emotions shape job attitudes should be encouraged. One immediate suggestion is to more specifically measure discrete positive emotions as part of a job attitudes questionnaire. To this effect, new measures of work-related affect such as work passion (Zigarmi et al., 2009) should be encouraged. Future research may also consider adapting established measures of positive emotions and, at the very least, adapt them for use within organisational contexts. Measures exist for discrete positive emotions such as pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007) and gratitude (Watkins, Woodward, Stone, & Kolts, 2003), but their applicability and utility for organisational research remain uncertain.

A brief discussion on the possible "dark side" of positive affect is also necessary to advance research in this area. While the current review focusses exclusively on the desirable effects of positive affect, it should be acknowledged that the label *positive* is used here to define the subjective, pleasant experiences arising from such affective experiences rather than the intrinsic value of the affect itself (Campos, 2003). High-intensity emotional experiences such as passion are distinguished between both their harmonious and obsessive forms (Vallerand et al., 2003). Li and Tang (2010), likewise, examined the effects of excessive pride, in the form of hubris, and how this affects CEO risk-taking behaviour. Pride, in this instance, forms an important affective component of identification, but the authors also highlighted in their study that it may also drive destructive and reckless managerial actions. Likewise, low-arousal positive states such as contentment may result in complacency and may even distract from task engagement (Pacheco-Unguetti & Parmentier, 2016). Practically, this also suggests the need for a balanced approach toward the management of positive emotions in organisations.

Beyond Job Attitudes—Motivational and Affective Constructs as Antecedents of Organisational Outcomes

Two additional constructs that have been featured as part of the organisational literature are work engagement and work passion. While not conceptualised as job attitudes, these constructs have received considerable research attention. The introduction of these constructs, however, has been met with some debate. Newman, Joseph, and Hulin (2010), for instance, argued that work engagement is highly correlated with the preceding job attitudes, adding that the construct adds little to understanding employee behaviours than what has been established in the literature. Likewise, advocates for the work passion construct (e.g., Zigarmi et al., 2009) have claimed it to be a "mega-construct" that includes elements of attitudes, but it is characterised primarily by an intense and directed affective experience toward one's work. A discussion on justifying the inclusion (or exclusion) of these two constructs as job attitudes is beyond the scope of this article. Regardless, there is arguably theoretical and practical value in examining both work engagement and work passion as possible antecedents or consequences of favourable work experiences, and whether these, too, should be the subject of future systematic reviews of the job attitudes literature akin to Judge et al.'s (2017) work. This would be advised if these two constructs can be conceptualised and measured as job attitudes, albeit with a stronger emphasis on affect. This is consistent with our central proposition, in that these two constructs appear to conceptualise and measure more intense experiences of positive affect at work.

Engagement, as defined by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) is "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (p. 295). Macey and Schneider (2008) posited that engagement also connotes feelings of persistence, enthusiasm, alertness, and pride, alluding to the importance of measuring discrete positive emotions as part of one's work attitude. It is argued that the greater emphasis on specific positive emotions driving engagement explains why engagement research has typically found positive associations between this construct with desirable individual and organisational outcomes compared with the preceding job attitudes. Halbesleben's (2010) meta-analysis has shown that engagement was predictive of individual resources at work, buffered against the effects of burnout, and motivated employee dedication and organisational identification. Engagement is also positively related to performance and personal resources (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Dalal, Baysinger, Brummel, & LeBreton, 2012) as well as proactive work behaviour (Sonnentag, 2003). As opposed to low-arousal feelings of satisfaction, or generalised positive assessments of one's job, the engagement literature has suggestsed that the three components of vigor, dedication, and absorption are the specific affect-driven elements that drive discretionary effort and performance.

Passion, as defined by Vallerand et al. (2003) is "a strong inclination toward an activity that people like, that they find important, and in which they invest time and energy" (p. 757). Zigarmi et al. (2009) extended this construct to relate specifically to work. These authors have defined work passion as "an individual's persistent, emotionally positive, meaning-based state of well-being stemming from reoccurring cognitive and affective appraisals of various job and organizational situations that results in consistent, constructive work intentions and behaviors" (p. 310). While not considered a job attitude, Perrewé et al. (2014) suggested that work passion is more than just an affective state; it consists of feelings specifically directed toward job activities, and encompasses a strong sense of affiliation to the task in which one is engaged. In this regard, work passion appears to contain elements of work/task satisfaction as well as job involvement. Initial research on this construct has shown that passion—but only harmonious passion—helps motivate engagement through the generation of personal resources necessary for work (Trépanier, Fernet, Austin, Forest, & Vallerand, 2014). Birkeland and Buch (2015) and Carbonneau, Vallerand, Fernet, and Guay (2008) found harmonious passion to increase job satisfaction and reduce burnout. Research in this area has also shown that the effects of harmonious work passion extend

beyond that of job satisfaction and even engagement, suggesting that these may be worthwhile constructs to examine in advancing the state of job attitudes research.

Conclusion

In this systematic review, I provide an argument for the importance of positive affect—both in terms of accurate conceptualisation and measurement—to better understand how job attitudes contribute to desirable organisational outcomes. The review highlights the "trail" of positive affect across four major job attitudes (job satisfaction, work/task satisfaction, job involvement, and organisational commitment), showing how these job attitudes, until recently, have tapped into cognitive aspects toward one's job and its aspects rather than the affective elements toward one's job and its aspects. More recent advances in measurement and clarity in conceptualisation, however, have resulted in more consistent findings regarding these job attitudes and their impact on organisational outcomes. This is in line with Judge et al.'s (2017) historical review of the job attitudes literature in its transition and continuous development within the affective domain. I then provided suggestions for further theoretical development and empirical research in view of the main themes from this review. In addition to more accurately conceptualising and measuring affective elements in job attitude constructs, the development of overarching frameworks that capture how positive affect leads to desirable work outcomes is also encouraged. Finally, the review's themes also advocate future research and development of measures to focus on discrete positive emotions. Ultimately, the goal here is to encourage the advancement of job attitudes research that is theoretically sound, yet has clear practical implications for the enhancement of organisational processes.

References

Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Aziz, S., & Zickar, M. J. (2006). A cluster analysis investigation of workaholism as a syndrome. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *11*(1), 52–62. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.11.1.52

Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *83*(1), 189–206. doi:10.1348/096317909X402596

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Burke, R. (2009). Workaholism and relationship quality: A spillover-crossover perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *14*(1), 23–33. doi:10.1037/a0013290

Birkeland, I. K., & Buch, R. (2015). The dualistic model of passion for work: Discriminate and predictive validity with work engagement and workaholism. *Motivation and Emotion*, *39*(3), 392–408. doi:10.1007/s11031-014-9462-x

Blau, G. J. (1985). A multiple study investigation of the dimensionality of job involvement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *27*(1), 19–36. doi:10.1016/0001-8791(85)90050-8

Blau, G. J., & Boal, K. B. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(2), 288–300. doi:10.2307/258536

Blau, G., & Boal, K. (1989). Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. *Journal of Management*, *15*(1), 115–127. doi:10.1177/014920638901500110

Bowling, N. A. (2007). Is the job satisfaction–job performance relationship spurious? A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *71*(2), 167–185. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.007

Brief, A. P. (1998). *Attitudes in and around organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*(1), 279–307. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156

Brooke, P. P., Jr, Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*(2), 139–145. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.73.2.139

Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, *120*(2), 235–255. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.120.2.235

Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(4), 358–368. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.358

Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *30*(1), 63–67. doi:10.2307/3172514

Campos, J. J. (2003). When the negative becomes positive and the reverse: Comments on Lazarus's critique of positive psychology. *Psychological Inquiry*, *14*(2), 110–113. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1402_03

Carbonneau, N., Vallerand, R. J., Fernet, C., & Guay, F. (2008). The role of passion for teaching in intrapersonal and interpersonal outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *100*, 977–987. doi:10.1037/a0012545

Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*(1), 89–136. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x

Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*(2), 241–259. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.131.2.241

Dalal, R. S., Baysinger, M., Brummel, B. J., & LeBreton, J. M. (2012). The relative importance of employee engagement, other job attitudes, and trait affect as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(S1), E295–E325. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.01017.x

Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance.

Journal of Organizational Behavior, *23*(1), 93–108. doi:10.1002/job.123

Diener, E., Larsen, R. J., Levine, S., & Emmons, R. A. (1985). Intensity and frequency: Dimensions underlying positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*, 1253–1265. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.48.5.1253

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Fisher, C. D. (2000). Mood and emotions while working: Missing pieces of job satisfaction? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(2), 185–202. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200003)21:2<185:AID-JOB34>3.0.CO;2-M

Fisher, C. D. (2003). Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *24*(6), 753–777. doi:10.1002/job.219

Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *12*(4), 384–412. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00270.x

Fredrickson, B. L. (2000). Why positive emotions matter in organizations: Lessons from the broaden-and-build model. *Psychologist-Manager Journal*, *4*(2), 131–142. doi:10.1037/h0095887

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, *56*(3), 218–226. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). Positive emotions broaden and build. In P. Devine & A. Plant (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. *47*, pp. 1–53). Burlington, United Kingdom: Academic Press.

Fredrickson, B. L., Mancuso, R. A., Branigan, C., & Tugade, M. M. (2000). The undoing effect of positive emotions. *Motivation and Emotion*, *24*, 237–258. doi:10.1023/A:1010796329158

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*(1), 65–78. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.77.1.65

Gorgievski, M. J., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Passion for work: Work engagement versus workaholism. In S. L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice* (pp. 264–271). Gloucester, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Hakanen, J. J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Do burnout and work engagement predict depressive symptoms and life satisfaction? A three-wave seven-year prospective study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *141*(2–3), 415–424. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2012.02.043

Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2010). A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 102–117). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). "Same same" but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment? *European Psychologist*, *11*(2), 119–127. doi:10.1027/1016-9040.11.2.119

Harpaz, I., & Snir, R. (2003). Workaholism: Its definition and nature. *Human Relations*, *56*(3), 291–319. doi:10.1177/0018726703056003613

Hu, X., & Kaplan, S. (2015). Is "feeling good" good enough? Differentiating discrete positive emotions at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*(1), 39–58. doi:10.1002/job.1941

Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*(2), 251–273. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.251

Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2002). Understanding the dynamic relationships among personality, mood, and job satisfaction: A field experience sampling study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *89*(2), 1119–1139. doi:10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00018-3

Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2004). An experience-sampling measure of job satisfaction and its relationships with affectivity, mood at work, job beliefs, and general job satisfaction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *13*(3), 367–389. doi:10.1080/13594320444000137

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*(2), 193–200. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.2.193

Isen, A. M. (2001). An influence of positive affect on decision making in complex situations: Theoretical issues with practical implications. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *11*(2), 75–85. doi:10.1207/153276601750408311

Janssen, O. (2003). Innovative behaviour and job involvement at the price of conflict and less satisfactory relations with co-workers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *76*(3), 347–364. doi:10.1348/096317903769647210

Johnson, M. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Cognitive and affective identification: Exploring the links between different forms of social identification and personality with work attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(8), 1142–1167. doi:10.1002/job.1787

Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *63*(1), 341–367. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100511

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P., Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *77*(2), 157–167. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.002

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*(3), 376–407. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.127.3.376

Judge, T. A., Weiss, H. M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Hulin, C. L. (2017). Job attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and of change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(3), 356–374. doi:10.1037/apl0000181

Kabins, A. H., Xu, X., Bergman, M. E., Berry, C. M., & Willson, V. L. (2016). A profile of profiles: A meta-analysis of the nomological net of commitment profiles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*, 881–904. doi:10.1037/apl0000091

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*, 692–724. doi:10.2307/256287

Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*(3), 341–349. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.67.3.341

Kark, R., & van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 500–528. doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.24351846

Kühnel, J., Sonnentag, S., & Westman, M. (2009). Does work engagement increase after a short respite? The role of job involvement as a double-edged sword. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *82*, 575–594. doi:10.1348/096317908X349362

Lawler, E. E., & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *54*(4), 305–312. doi:10.1037/h0029692

Li, J., & Tang, Y. I. (2010). CEO hubris and firm risk taking in China: The moderating role of managerial discretion. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(1), 45–68. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.48036912

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *49*(1), 24–33. doi:10.1037/h0021692

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*, 803–855. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *1*(1), 3–30. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x

Martin, T. N., & Hafer, J. C. (1995). The multiplicative interaction effects of job involvement and organizational commitment on the turnover intentions of full- and part-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *46*(3), 310–331. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1995.1023

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*(2), 171–194. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.108.2.171

McGregor, D. M. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Mercurio, Z. A. (2015). Affective commitment as a core essence of organizational commitment: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, *14*(4), 389–414. doi:10.1177/1534484315603612

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *1*(1), 61–89. doi:10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(4), 538–551. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*(1), 20–52. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842

Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2017). A meta-analysis of emotional intelligence and work attitudes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *90*(2), 177–202. doi:10.1111/joop.12167

Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, *8*(3), 486–500. doi:10.5465/AMR.1983.4284606

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Newman, D. A., Joseph, D. L., & Hulin, C. L. (2010). Job attitudes and employee engagement: Considering the attitude "A-factor." In S. L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice* (pp. 43–61). Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Ng, T. W. H., & Sorensen, K. L. (2008). Toward a further understanding of the relationships between perceptions of support and work attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Group and Organization Management*, *33*(3), 243–268. doi:10.1177/1059601107313307

Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2007). Dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of workaholism: A conceptual integration and extension. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*(1), 111–136. doi:10.1002/job.424

Pacheco-Unguetti, A. P., & Parmentier, F. B. (2016). Happiness increases distraction by auditory deviant stimuli. *British Journal of Psychology*, *107*(3), 419–433. doi:10.1111/bjop.12148

Paullay, I. M., Alliger, G. M., & Stone-Romero, E. F. (1994). Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(2), 224–228. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.2.224

Perrewé, P. L., Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., McAllister, C. P., & Harris, J. N. (2014). Developing a passion for work passion: Future directions on an emerging construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(1), 145–150. doi:10.1002/job.1902

Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W., & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*, 712–721. doi:10.5465/AMR.1984.4277608

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(3), 257–266. doi:10.1002/job.141

Russell, S. S., Spitzmüller, C., Lin, L. F., Stanton, J. M., Smith, P. C., & Ironson, G. H. (2004). Shorter can also be better: The abridged Job in General scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *64*, 878–893. doi:10.1177/0013164404264841

Saal, F. E. (1978). Job involvement: A multivariate approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *63*(1), 53–61. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.63.1.53

Sagie, A. (1998). Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: Another look. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *52*(2), 156–171. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1997.1581

Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J. P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology*, *36*(3), 577–600. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1983.tb02236.x

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(3), 293–315. doi:10.1002/job.248

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., van der Heijden, F. M. M. A., & Prins, J. T. (2009). Workaholism, burnout and well-being among junior doctors: The mediating role of role conflict. *Work & Stress*, *23*(2), 155–172. doi:10.1080/02678370902834021

Schleicher, D. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2004). Reexamining the job satisfaction-performance relationship: The complexity of attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(1), 165–177. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.165

Schneider, B., Hanges, P. J., Smith, D. B., & Salvaggio, A. N. (2003). Which comes first: Employee attitudes or organizational financial and market performance? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 836–851. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.836

Scott, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2006). Insomnia, emotions, and job satisfaction: A multilevel study. *Journal of Management*, *32*(5), 622–645. doi:10.1177/0149206306289762

Scott, K. S., Moore, K. S., & Miceli, M. P. (1997). An exploration of the meaning and consequences of workaholism. *Human Relations*, *50*(3), 287–314. doi:10.1177/001872679705000304

Shirom, A. (2003). Feeling vigorous at work? The construct of vigor and the study of positive affect in organizations. In P. L. Perrewé & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in organizational stress and well-being* (Vol. *3*, pp. 135–164). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Silvia, P. J. (2008). Interest—The curious emotion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *17*(1), 57–60. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00548.x

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and behavior*. Chicago, IL: Raud McNally.

Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 518–528. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.518

Sonnentag, S., & Kruel, U. (2006). Psychological detachment from work during off-job time: The role of job stressors, job involvement, and recovery-related self-efficacy. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *15*(2), 197–217. doi:10.1080/13594320500513939

Spence, J. T., & Robbins, A. S. (1992). Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *58*(1), 160–178. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5801_15

Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Näswall, K. (2002). No security: A meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *7*(3), 242–264. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.7.3.242

Sypniewska, B. (2014). Evaluation of factors influencing job satisfaction. *Contemporary Economics*, *8*(1), 57–72. doi:10.5709/ce.1897-9254.131

Thoman, D. B., Smith, J. L., & Silvia, P. J. (2011). The resource replenishment function of interest. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *2*(6), 592–599. doi:10.1177/1948550611402521

Thompson, E. R., & Phua, F. T. (2012). A brief index of affective job satisfaction. *Group and Organization Management*, *37*(3), 275–307. doi:10.1037/t15834-000

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 506–525. doi:1037/0022-3514.92.3.506

Trépanier, S. G., Fernet, C., Austin, S., Forest, J., & Vallerand, R. J. (2014). Linking job demands and resources to burnout and work engagement: Does passion underlie these differential relationships? *Motivation and Emotion*, *38*(3), 353–366. doi:10.1007/s11031-013-9384-z

Vacharkulksemsuk, T., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2013).Looking back and glimpsing forward: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions as applied to organizations. In A. B. Bakker (Ed.), *Advances in positive organizational psychology* (Vol. *1*, pp. 45–60). Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group.

Vallerand, R. J., Blanchard, C., Mageau, G. A., Koestner, R., Ratelle, C., Léonard, M., . . . Marsolais, J. (2003). Les passions de l'ame: On obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 756–767. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.756

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(2), 247–252. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.247

Watkins, P. C., Woodward, K., Stone, T., & Kolts, R. L. (2003). Gratitude and happiness: Development of a measure of gratitude, and relationships with subjective well-being. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *31*(5), 431–451. doi:10.2224/sbp.2003.31.5.431

Wegge, J., Schmidt, K., Parkes, C., & van Dick, R. (2007). 'Taking a sickie': Job satisfaction and job involvement as interactive predictors of absenteeism in a public organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *80*(1), 77–89. doi:10.1348/096317906X99371

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. S., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: Vol. XVI)*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center.

Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluation, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*(2), 173–194. doi:10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00045-1

Weiss, H. M., & Beal, D. J. (2005). Reflections on affective events theory. In N. M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe, & C. E. J. Hartel (Eds.), *The effect of affect in organizational settings: Research in emotion in organizations* (Vol. *1*, pp. 1–21). London, United Kingdom: Elsevier.

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (Vol. *18*, pp. 1–74). Stamford, CT: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Diehl, J. (2009). Beyond engagement: Toward a framework and operational definition for employee work passion. *Human Resource Development Review*, *8*(3), 300–326. doi:10.1177/1534484309338171