Bond University
ePublications@bond

Faculty of Business Publications | Faculty of Business

12-1-2010

Happiness at work

Cynthia D. Fisher
Bond University, cynthia_fisher@bond.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: http://epublications.bond.edu.au/business_pubs

Part of the Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons

Recommended Citation
Cynthia D. Fisher. (2010) "Happiness at work" *International journal of management reviews,* 12 (4), 384-412.

http://epublications.bond.edu.au/business_pubs/304

This Journal Article is brought to you by the Faculty of Business at ePublications@bond. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty of Business Publications by an authorized administrator of ePublications@bond. For more information, please contact Bond University's Repository Coordinator.

Happiness at Work

Cynthia D. Fisher

Professor of Management

School of Business

Bond University

Gold Coast, Queensland 4229

Australia

+61 755 952215

Cynthia_Fisher@Bond.edu.au

Happiness at Work

Abstract

Happiness in the form of pleasant moods and emotions, well-being, and positive attitudes has been attracting increasing attention throughout psychology. The interest in happiness has also extended to workplace experiences. This manuscript reviews what is known about the definition, causes, and consequences of happiness at work, drawing also on insights from the expanding positive psychology literature on happiness in general. Many discrete organizational behavior constructs arguably belong to a larger family of happiness-related constructs, and share some common causes and consequences. Happiness at work includes but is far more than job satisfaction. A comprehensive measure of individual level happiness might include work engagement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Aspects of happiness have been (and should be) conceptualized and measured at multiple levels, including transient experiences, stable person level attitudes, and collective attitudes, and with respect to multiple foci, such as discrete events, the job, and the organization. At all levels, there is evidence that happiness has important consequences for both individuals and organizations. Past research has tended to underestimate the importance of happiness at work.

Introduction

Being happy is of great importance to most people, and happiness has been found to be a highly valued goal in most societies (Diener, 2000). Happiness, in the form of joy, appears in every typology of "basic" human emotions. Feeling happy is fundamental to human experience, and most people are at least mildly happy much of the time (Diener & Diener, 1996). Happiness has attracted the attention of philosophers since the dawn of written history (McMahon, 2006) but has only recently come to the fore in psychological research. The rise of *positive psychology* in the past decade (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) has legitimized attention to happiness and other positive states as opposed to the previously dominant disease model that disproportionately directed attention to illness, depression, stress, and similar negative experiences and outcomes.

This review is aimed at happiness at work. Organizational researchers have been inspired by the move toward positive psychology in general, and have begun to pursue *positive organizational scholarship* (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003) and *positive organizational behavior* (Luthans, 2002; Wright, 2003), though there is still debate on exactly what these terms encompass and how helpful they might be (Fineman, 2006; Hackman, 2009; Luthans & Avolio 2009; Roberts, 2006). As will be explained below, a number of constructs in organizational behavior appear to have some overlap with the broad concept of happiness in the workplace.

In the pages that follow, I will address three sets of questions about happiness:

1. How has happiness been defined and measured?
2. What are the antecedents of happiness?
3. What are the consequences of happiness?

For each question, I begin with a brief overview of what is known from the psychology literature on happiness in general, and then move to a discussion of what is known about

happiness specifically in the workplace. I conclude with a discussion of gaps in our current understanding of happiness in the workplace and the importance of happiness at work.

Defining Happiness

Philosophers and social researchers have defined happiness in a variety of ways (Kesebir & Diener, 2008). The largest divide is between *hedonic* views of happiness as pleasant feelings and favourable judgments versus *eudaimonic* views of happiness involving doing what is virtuous, morally right, true to one's self, meaningful, and/or growth producing (Ryan and Deci, 2001; Ryff & Singer, 2008). The hedonic approach is exemplified by research on subjective well-being. Subjective well-being is usually seen as having two correlated components: judgments of life satisfaction (assessed globally as well as in specific domains such as relationships, health, work, and leisure), and affect balance, or having a preponderance of positive feelings and relatively few or rare negative feelings (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999; Schimmack, 2008). Research on the structure of affect, mood, and emotions consistently finds that the most important dimension in describing individuals' affective experiences is hedonic tone, or pleasantness – unpleasantness (Watson, Wiese, Vaidya, & Tellegen, 1999). In the classic affect circumplex, "happy" anchors the extreme positive end of the pleasantness-unpleasantness dimension (c.f. Russell, 1980; 2003; Remington, Fabrigar, &Visser, 2000).

In contrast to the hedonic view of happiness as involving pleasant feelings and judgments of satisfaction, eudamoinic well-being, self-validation, self-actualization, and related concepts suggest that a happy or "good" life involves doing what is right and virtuous, growing, pursing important or self-concordant goals, and using and developing one's skills and talents, regardless of how one may actually feel at any point in time (c.f. Warr, 2007; Seligman, 2002; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Conventional wisdom suggests that hedonic happiness, conceptualized as mere pursuit of pleasurable experiences, is

unsustainable over the long term in the absence of eudaimonic well-being. When hedonic and eudemonic aspects of well-being are both measured, they are found to be reasonably strongly correlated, and some scholars have questioned the utility of the distinction in empirical work (Kashdan, Biswas-Diener, & King, 2008; Waterman, Schwartz, & Conti, 2008). A number of measures of happiness can be found at Seligman's site www.authentichappiness.com.

Defining Happiness at Work

With rare exceptions, happiness is not a term that has been extensively used in academic research on employee experiences in organizations. This does not mean that organizational researchers are uninterested in employee happiness at work. On the contrary, for many years we have studied a number of constructs that appear to have considerable overlap with the broad concept of happiness (see Table 1). Undoubtedly the most central and frequently used of these is job satisfaction, which has a long history as both an independent and dependent variable in organizational research (c.f. Brief, 1998; Cranny, Smith & Stone 1992). In the past two decades, a number of new constructs have emerged which reflect some form of happiness or positive affective experience in the workplace. What these constructs have in common is that all refer to pleasant judgments (positive attitudes) or pleasant experiences (positive feelings, moods, emotions, flow states) at work. Happiness-related constructs in organizational research vary in several meaningful ways, as discussed below. First is the level at which they are seen to exist, second is their duration or stability over time, and third is their specific content.

(Table 1 Here)

Levels Issues in Organizational Happiness Research

The happiness-related constructs listed in Table 1 vary in level, from transient affective experiences typically measured repeatedly for each respondent, to more stable attributes that

characterize and differentiate persons from each other, to phenomena that occur at the collective level of work team, work unit, or organization as a whole. As in most of psychology, person level constructs and the nomothetic relationships between them have attracted the lion's share of research attention.

Transient level. Weiss and Cropanzano's (1996) influential chapter introduced Affective Events Theory and drew the attention of researchers to real time affective work events and the short-lived moods and emotions that individuals might experience as a result. Happiness-related constructs that are usually defined and measured as transient states that vary at the within person level include state positive mood, the experience of flow, and discrete emotions such as joy, pleasure, happiness, and contentment. Example research questions asked at the transient (within person) level might be "Why is an employee sometimes in a better mood than usual for him/her?," "Why does an individual sometimes experience a state of flow and sometimes not?," and "Do individuals sleep better after days during which they've experience more positive affect than usual at work?"

Person level. Most happiness constructs in organizations are conceptualized at the person level, where all the variance of interest occurs between individuals. The vast majority of research in organizational behavior has focused on this level, and it appears to be our default mode of thinking. For example, Warr's 2007 book *Work, Happiness, and Unhappiness* opens with the person level question, "Why are some people at work happier or unhappier than others?" Happiness-related constructs usually defined and measured at person level include dispositional affectivity, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and typical mood at work.

Unit level. Unit level constructs describe the happiness of collectives such as teams, work units, or organizations. Virtually all measures of these constructs are based on reports of individual members of the collective, with one of two different types of referents. In the

first, the person's own experience is the referent, and group level constructs are created by aggregating the personal experiences or traits of individuals in the collective. For instance, group affective tone has been operationalised as the average of team members' ratings of their own affect during the past week (George, 1990), and unit level engagement is defined as the average of reports of the extent to which each person in the unit is individually engaged with his or her job (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). The second approach elicits and aggregates individuals' perceptions of the collective as the referent (Chan, 1998). Examples are Mason and Griffin's (2005) group task satisfaction scale, which includes items such as, "Our team is happy with the way we work together as a group," and a measure of group mood operationalised as the average of group members' ratings of the group's mood (e.g. Totterdell, 2000; Totterdell, Kellett, Briner & Teuchmann, 1998).

Depending on the theory involved, either individual referent or group referent measures of collective happiness may make sense. Example research questions involving unit level happiness constructs would be, "What are the effects of unit level engagement on unit level customer satisfaction?," "What is the effect of team mood on individual mood and performance?," and "Does group task satisfaction contribute to the prediction of group level citizenship behavior above and beyond the effects of aggregated individual job satisfaction?" (Mason & Griffin, 2005).

It is important to note that relationships between similar constructs need not be parallel across levels (Chen, Bliese, & Mathieu, 2005). Erroneous conclusions can be drawn when data gathered and analyzed at one level are used as a basis of inference for processes at another level (e.g., the ecological fallacy, see Clancy, Berger, & Magliozzi, 2003, or the atomistic fallacy, see Dietz-Roux, 1998). A classic case in point is the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. This relationship has most often been studied at the person level, asking whether employees who are more satisfied than other employees are

likely to perform better. A definitive meta-analysis by Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001) confirms earlier findings that the uncorrected population correlation between job satisfaction and job performance is modest, about .18. This finding has no necessary bearing on the between-units relationship between collective satisfaction and unit performance, though in practice effect sizes may be similar (c.f. Harter et al., 2002). However, the relationship between perceived momentary task performance and momentary task satisfaction within person over time is very much stronger, on average .57 (Fisher, 2003). Individuals feel more satisfied than usual for them at moments when they believe they are performing better than usual compared to their own baseline. In addition to the much different effect size, the processes responsible for satisfaction-performance relationships may be different at different levels.

Stability Issues in Happiness Constructs

Related to the issue of level but not completely isomorphic with it is the presumed stability over time of each happiness-related construct. When people are happy, how long are they happy for? Clearly, constructs measured repeatedly within person are expected to fluctuate over short periods of time, with state mood being a prime example. Emotions are also conceptualized as short-lived reactions to events relevant to personal well-being (Lazarus, 1991). There is evidence of substantial within person variation in happiness states at work. For instance, in an experience sampling study in which respondents rated their momentary task satisfaction five times per day for two weeks, 76% of the total variation was within person over time (Fisher, 2003). Miner, Glomb, and Hulin (2005) found that 56% of the variance in hedonic tone at work assessed four times per day was within person.

Generally, person level and unit level constructs are assumed to be more stable over time. For instance, a person's typical mood at work should vary less over time than his or her momentary mood. Attitudes like job satisfaction are usually measured once and then

assumed to characterize the respondent for some reasonable period of time on either side of the measurement occasion. The common practice of using one-time measures of job satisfaction as predictors in longitudinal research (e.g., on turnover) is clearly consistent with this assumption. When directly investigated, job satisfaction has been found to be modestly stable over two, three, and five year time periods, even for those who change employers and/or occupations (Staw & Ross, 1985). This finding suggests that something constant about the person produces stability in their happiness at work across jobs and over time. One source of stability may be genetic, with Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, and Abraham's (1989) study of monozygotic twins reared apart concluding that that about 30% of the variance in overall job satisfaction is genetically based. Personality traits have also been invoked to explain why some individuals are consistently more satisfied than others. Positive and negative dispositional affectivity as well as several of the big five traits have been found to predict job satisfaction (Connolly & Chockalingam, 2000; Diener, Nickerson, Lucas, & Sandvik, 2002; Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986; Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & de Chermont, 2003; Watson & Slack, 1993). Recent research suggests that stability in job satisfaction may be accounted for distally by genes and more proximally by personality traits and core self-evaluations (Ilies & Judge, 2003; Judge, Heller, & Klinger, 2008).

Group constructs such as average unit level work engagement are also usually assumed to be fairly stable over time. George (1990) defined group affective tone as *consistent* affective reactions within a group and concluded that member personality was the stable source of this consistency. However, group level constructs are occasionally (though rarely) seen as fluctuating and studied in shorter time frames. An example is Totterdell's work on daily and momentary mood in teams (Totterdell et al., 1998).

Note that constructs bearing the same name have been conceptualized as existing at different levels and with different degrees of stability from one study to the next. For example, engagement has been studied as an aggregated unit level phenomenon (Harter et al., 2002), is most often viewed as a relatively stable characteristic at the person level (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008), and has also been conceptualized as a transient state that varies within person from day to day (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Sonnentag, 2003). Similarly, job satisfaction has appeared at all three levels, with morale or collective satisfaction being the unit level construct, typical measures of job satisfaction providing the stable person level variable, and several times per day reports of momentary satisfaction showing meaningful within person variation (Ilies & Judge, 2002; 2004). The next section will discuss the ways in which happiness-related constructs have been measured in organizational research.

Measuring the Content of Happiness at Work

The content of happiness constructs and measures varies considerably, though all feature a common core of pleasantness. As mentioned earlier, many work-related happiness constructs focus largely on the hedonic experiences of pleasure and liking, and/or positive beliefs about an object (e.g., job satisfaction, affective commitment, the experience of positive emotions while working). Other constructs include both hedonic and eudaimonic content, the latter involving learning/development, growth, autonomy, and self-actualization.

Further, happiness constructs and measures vary as to whether they focus mainly on "cold cognitions" such as beliefs and evaluative judgments or on "hot" affective phenomena such as moods and emotions. Constructs also vary as to their target. Moods are relatively free floating affective states that may not have a known cause or target, emotions have specific targets, and attitudes by definition are judgments about attitude objects. When happiness constructs have an object, it can be a very broad object (e.g. the organization or

occupation), slightly less broad (the job as a whole), somewhat more specific (facets of the job such as coworkers, supervisors, or the work itself), or very specific (a particular work event). The paragraphs that follow explore traditional and newer workplace variables that belong to the family of happiness constructs.

Job Satisfaction

The most frequently studied construct by far is job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an attitude so should contain both cognitive and affective components (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). However, there has been a history of mismatch between the definition of this construct and its measurement. In his classic definition, Locke described job satisfaction largely as affect: "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from an appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (1976, p. 1300). Others have pointed out that the most frequently used measures of job satisfaction ignore affect and have a predominant focus on the cognitive component (Brief, 1998; Brief and Weiss, 2002; Organ & Near, 1985; Weiss, 2002).

Widely used instruments such as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ, Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967), the Job Descriptive Index (JDI, Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), and the Job in General Scale (JIG, Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989) ask for descriptions and evaluations of job features rather than feelings about the job or emotional experiences while working. It has been demonstrated that these commonly used verbal measures do not capture affect very well, certainly not as well as a "faces" scale of job satisfaction. Faces scales literally ask respondents to choose one of 11 faces ranging from an extremely unhappy/frowning face to a very happy smilingly face to represent their feelings about the job or some facet of the job (Kunin, 1955). Brief and Roberson (1989) showed that a retrospective rating of positive mood at work over the past week did not account for unique variance beyond job cognitions in the MSQ or JDI, but did contribute to a faces measure of job satisfaction. Fisher (2000) assessed mood and emotions repeatedly over

a two week period, and found that average affect while working was more strongly related to a faces overall job satisfaction measure than to standard verbal measures of overall job satisfaction. Fisher concluded that while affect while working was related to job satisfaction, it was by no means the same thing. Brief (1998) has called for research on a "new job satisfaction" construct which explicitly includes affect as a component, suggesting that the affective component may relate to outcomes differently than the cognitive component that has been the focus of most existing research.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is probably the second most commonly measured in the family of constructs related to happiness at work. Commitment has been conceptualized in a number of ways (Swailes, 2002), not all of which are directly relevant to happiness. For instance, continuance or instrumental commitment involves staying with an organization because of the inducements offered or because of a lack of viable alternatives rather than because membership is valued or pleasant. In contrast, commitment based on personally identifying with the organization's goals and values and being affectively attached to the organization would be considered part of happiness at work. Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was the commitment measure of choice for many years. This scale was designed to tap the extent to which employees identify with and accept the organization's goals, are willing to exert effort toward those goals, and strongly desire to remain part of the organization. The OCQ is regarded as predominantly assessing the affective form of commitment (Mowday, 1998).

Meyer and Allen (1991) explicitly divided the commitment construct into three components: affective, continuance, and normative. Affective commitment is the form most closely aligned with happiness as it represents emotional attachment to the organization. The Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) measure of commitment uses six items to assess affective

commitment. Sample items include, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization,” “I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization (R).” Normative commitment involves feeling that one has an obligation to the organization and its people, and that it would not be “right” to leave an organization deserving of such loyalty. Normative and affective commitment are not always empirically distinct, and both represent internalized forms of psychological attachment, prompting some scholars to suggest that the constructs should be combined and labeled affective commitment (Cohen, 2007; Ko, Price, & Mueller 1997). Affective commitment is fairly strongly related to other positive attitudes in the workplace. A recent meta-analysis found that affective commitment correlated .60 with job satisfaction and .50 with job involvement, corrected for unreliability (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005). These relationships suggest a common core of happiness across these distinct constructs.

Job Involvement

Job involvement is a traditional construct dating from 1965 that belongs in the happiness family (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). Job involvement is state of engagement with one’s job, identifying with one’s work, and viewing the job as central to one’s identity and self-esteem, roughly opposite to the concept of alienation or meaninglessness (Brown, 1996). Measures of job involvement include those developed by Lodahl and Kejner (1965), Kanungo (1982), and Saleh and Hosek (1976). Typical items are, “I eat, live, and breath my job” and “The most important things that happen to me involve my present job.”

Engagement

Personal engagement and *psychological presence at work* are concepts introduced by Kahn (1990, 1992) to refer to the amount of the authentic physical, cognitive, and emotional self that individuals devote to their work and the feelings of attentiveness, connection, integration, and focus that accompany moments of high engagement. Since then, a number

of scholars have taken up the term engagement, and have defined it in a variety of ways (Britt, Dickinson, Green-Shortridge, & McKibben, 2007; Macey & Schneider, 2008). Engagement has been viewed as everything from a trait to a relatively stable state to a momentary state, and from cognition to affect to behavior. After an exhaustive review, Macey and Schneider (2008 p. 24) describe person level engagement as "positive affect associated with the job and the work setting connoting or explicitly indicating feelings of persistence, vigor, energy, dedication, absorption, enthusiasm, alertness, and pride. As such, engagement has components of organizational commitment, job involvement, and the positive affectivity components of job satisfaction."

Bakker and Demerouti (2008, pp. 209-210) have defined engagement as "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working. Dedication refers to being strongly involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, and challenge. Absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work." Engagement is seen as the opposite of burnout and is often measured by the Utrecht Work Enthusiasm Scale (UWES, Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-roma, & Bakker, 2002). Sample items include, "At my work, I feel bursting with energy" (vigor), "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose" (dedication), and "When I am working, I forget everything else around me" (absorption). This conceptualization of engagement is usually considered a relatively stable orientation toward a given job. However, Sonnentag (2003) reworded the UWES to assess daily engagement (e.g., "Today I felt strong and vigorous in my work," "Today, I got carried away by my work") and found that engagement varied meaningfully within person from day to day.

Taking a quite different tack, Harter et al. (2002) present the Gallup Workplace Audit, a 12 item measure of employee engagement. The items do not directly refer to the experience of feeling or acting engaged, but descriptively assess presumed antecedents in the form of workplace situations thought to facilitate engagement. Items address issues such as role clarity, availability of recognition and praise, opportunities for learning and development, and caring relationship with others at work.

Thriving and Vigor

There has been an explosion of new constructs involving employee happiness and well-being in the past decade. One might argue that these are similar to or part of the larger concept of engagement. Spreitzer's concept of *thriving at work* combines feelings of vitality and energy with beliefs that one is learning, developing, and making progress toward self-actualization (Spreitzer, Sutcliffe, Dutton, Sonenshein, & Grant, 2005; Spreitzer & Sutcliffe, 2007). Her thirteen item thriving scale sums hedonic statements such as "I have energy and spirit" with eudaimonic ones such as "I am growing in many positive ways."

Shirom's (2003, 2006) concept of *vigor* at work is defined as a positive affective experience involving energetic resources including feelings of physical strength, emotional energy, and cognitive liveliness. The Shirom - Melamed Vigor Measure includes 14 items in total, tapping physical strength ("I feel full of pep,"), emotional energy ("I feel able to show warmth to others,"), and cognitive liveliness ("I feel mentally alert.") at work. Vigor has been treated as a stable person level variable, and individuals undoubtedly can be characterized by their typical level of vigor at work. However, the components of vigor seem likely to fluctuate within person from moment to moment or day to day, so this concept may benefit from being studied at a more transient level as well.

Flow and Intrinsic Motivation

Both flow states and intrinsic motivation refer to the enjoyment experienced when engrossed in a task. Flow occurs when one is totally absorbed in using one's skills to progress on a challenging task, such that irrelevant external stimuli and the passage of time are excluded from awareness. Flow is a very enjoyable state, having been described as exhilarating, euphoric, providing a deep sense of enjoyment, being an optimal or peak experience, and being characterized by high activation positive affect, but it also requires feelings of learning, development, and mastery (Csikszenthihalyi, 1990; Csikszentmihalyi, Abuhamdeh, & Nakamura, 2005). Flow states may occur when individuals are working on tasks that are above their own average on both challenge and skill requirements. When this occurs, "the person is not only enjoying the moment, but is also stretching his or her capabilities with the likelihood of learning new skills and increasing self-esteem and personal complexity" (Csikszentmihalyi & LeFevre, 1989, p. 816). Additional requirements for the experience of flow include a clear goal and immediate feedback on task success or progress (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Flow is also more likely when self-efficacy is high and supportive organizational resources are present (Salanova, Bakker, & Llorens, 2006). Bakker (2001) has developed a 13 item work-related flow scale containing subscales for absorption, work enjoyment, and intrinsic motivation.

Intrinsic motivation has many similarities to flow, though it may sometimes be a less intense experience. In lab studies, intrinsic motivation has been measured either as self-rated task enjoyment or as the amount of time voluntarily spent on a task after it is clear that there is no extrinsic reason to persist. Deci's cognitive evaluation theory states that intrinsic motivation relies on perceptions of competence and self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985). More recently, self-determination theory has shifted the focus away from enjoyment and competence and toward levels of self-determination. Several gradations between entirely extrinsic and entirely intrinsic motivation have been delineated, recognizing that individuals

may be self-determined in the sense of choosing to perform an activity because they think they should or think it is right to do so, but without being intrinsically motivated purely by interest in and enjoyment of the activity itself (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Affect at Work

In contrast to some of the above constructs that involve attitudes and/or cognitions, measures of affect at work directly assess moods or emotions experienced while working. The traditional affect circumplex features two dimensions, hedonic tone (pleasure to displeasure) and arousal or activation. Alternative conceptualizations of the same space rotate these two axes 45 degrees to the dimensions of high versus low positive affect (enthusiasm/elation to depression/sadness) and high versus low negative affect (anxiety/tension to calmness/comfort) (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) suggest that the former conceptualization (hedonic tone and arousal) is most useful for measuring state mood at work. Some scholars believe that hedonic tone is by far the more important of these two dimensions, particularly in the workplace (Daniels, 2000; Russell, 1978; Warr, 1990). Weiss, Nicholas, and Daus (1999) found that average hedonic tone while working was correlated with job satisfaction while average activation level was not. Wright and Bonett (1996) also found that pleasantness-based measures were more predictive in organizational research than activation-based measures, and Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, and Kelloway (2000) reported that the pleasant/unpleasant dimension dominated descriptions of job-related affect. On the other hand, it seems likely that the arousal dimension may prove to have value when predicting motivation and creativity (c.f. Baas, De Dreu, & Nijstad, 2008).

There are a number of measures of affect at work. Fisher (1997) constructed the Job Emotions Scales by selecting 8 positive and 8 negative emotion terms from the 135 prototypical emotions identified by Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, and O'Connor (1987). Items

were chosen based on how frequently they were experienced at work and breadth of coverage of Shaver et al.'s hierarchical cluster analysis of emotion categories. The Job Emotion Scales focus on hedonic tone without regard for arousal, and contain terms associated with specific emotions rather than more generalized moods.

Most other measures of affect at work follow the mood circumplex by considering both hedonic tone and arousal. More specifically, Watson and Tellegen's (1985) rotation to PA and NA and the associated Positive and Negative Affect Scales (PANAS, Watson, Clark, and Tellegen, 1988) have proven popular. In some cases, the PANAS itself has been used to measure affect at work with frames of reference ranging from current moment to past week to past month to work in general. In other cases, the PANAS has heavily influenced the development of work-related affect scales. The commitment to including PA and NA terms in work-related affect measures has occurred at the cost of hedonic tone, to the point that pure markers of happiness and unhappiness at work have been excluded from some measures. Examples of mood circumplex based measures of affect at work include the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000), the Job Affect Scale (Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988; Burke, Brief, George, Roberson, & Webster, 1989), Warr's (1990) two dimensional measure of anxiety-contentment and depression-enthusiasm, and Daniel's (2000) measures of affective well-being featuring five first order and two second order dimensions.

Scales for the measurement of discrete emotional states are also available. The PANAS-X provides multi-item scales for the positive emotions of joviality, self-assurance, attentiveness, and serenity (Watson & Clark, 1994). Arguing that context-specific measures are often more predictively valid in the same context, Levine and Xu (2005) have developed a workplace measure of ten discrete emotions, including the five positive emotions of joy, pride, attentiveness, contentment, and affection.

Conclusions: Conceptualizing and Measuring Happiness at Work

There are a great many existing constructs that have something to do with happiness at work, be it fleeting and within person, stable and person level, or collective. Certainly these three levels are different from each other, require their own measures, and would typically be used to predict criteria at different levels. The largest proliferation of constructs and measures is at the stable person level. If happiness at this level is viewed as the proverbial elephant being examined by blind men, we can conclude that we have developed a good if isolated understanding of its parts, such as the trunk (e.g. job satisfaction) and the tail (e.g. typical mood at work). It may be that we've decomposed the beast into almost meaninglessly small pieces (e.g., the right ear of vigor, the left ear of thriving). Perhaps what is missing is a more holistic appreciation of the entire animal in the form of happiness at work.

We know that broad constructs perform better in predicting the broad criteria often of most interest to organizational researchers (c.f. Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996). One might wonder which happiness-related measures are broad enough to have predictive utility and to collectively cover the territory of happiness at work at the person level. My suggestion is to distinguish three foci or targets for happy feelings: 1) the work itself, 2) the job including contextual features, and 3) the organization as a whole. The three parallel broadband measures most likely to be useful in this framework would be 1) engagement, as conceptualized by Bakker and Demerouti (2008), representing affective and cognitive involvement and enjoyment of the work itself; 2) job satisfaction, representing largely cognitive judgments about the job including facets such as pay, co-workers, supervisor, and work environment; and 3) affective organizational commitment, as feelings of attachment, belonging, and value match to the larger organization. These three measures together should capture much of the variance in person level happiness in organizations. The next section of

this paper turns to a consideration of what causes individuals to feel happy, first in general, and then specifically in organizations.

Causes of Happiness in General

A very important question concerns what makes people happy, and why some people are happier than others. Generic answers are 1) something in the environment or circumstances of the person makes them happy, 2) something inside the person predisposes them to be more or less happy, 3) an interaction of person and situation creates happiness, and 4) volitional behaviors impact happiness. There is support for all of these having important implications for happiness.

Environmental Contributors to Happiness

Laypeople often assume that relatively stable life circumstances have a great deal to do with producing happiness, and in fact there is evidence that subjective well-being is on average higher among those who are married, embedded in supportive social networks, employed, participate in religious and leisure activities, earn more money, are of higher social and occupational status, believe they are healthy, and live in prosperous, democratic, and individualistic countries as opposed to poorer collectivist countries (c.f. Argyle, 1999; Suh & Koo, 2008). Interestingly, Fowler and Christakis (2008) have recently shown that individuals are likely to become happier if a close friend or neighbor has become happier in the preceding six months. Never-the-less, the role of such environmental contributors to subjective well-being is less than is often assumed. Once basic human needs are met, objective life circumstances account for a modest 8-15% of the variance in subjective well-being (Kesebir & Diener 2008). This may be a result of adaptation level, opponent process, and hedonic treadmill phenomena that act to return happiness to previous levels relatively quickly as individuals adjust to changed circumstances (Frederick & Loewenstein, 1999).

At the transient level of positive moods and pleasant emotions, immediate situational occurrences clearly are important in explaining variance in happiness within person over time. Individuals experience positive emotions when they appraise a current situation or event as beneficial to their interests, or as representing progress toward important goals (Frijda, 1988; Lazarus, 1991). Research on hassles and uplifts (terms coined by Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981) identifies the kind of minor daily events that result in negative and positive emotions, respectively. A pair of innovative studies based on self-determination theory showed that individuals have happier than usual days compared to their own baselines when they experience greater satisfaction of basic needs for competency, autonomy, and relatedness in major activities during the day (Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, & Ryan, 2000; Sheldon, Ryan, & Reis, 1996). In achievement settings, individuals report more intrinsic motivation and positive emotions when they hold mastery or performance-approach goals for an activity than when they have performance-avoid goals (Pekrun, Elliot, & Maier, 2006; Rawsthorne & Elliott, 1999). Another short-lived situational influence on happiness is the happiness of others with whom one interacts, through the mechanism of emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson 1994).

Interestingly, the events that provoke momentary happiness are not necessarily the opposite of, or absence of, events that cause unhappiness. Events perceived as hassles are not merely the opposite of those perceived as uplifts. A number of studies in the well-being literature support the “two-domain” theory, with positive and negative affect having different and largely non-overlapping predictors (c.f. Gannon, Vaux, Rhodes, & Luchetta, 1992; Stallings, Dunham, Gatz, Baker, & Bengtson, 1997). For instance, social activities are usually associated with a concurrent increase in positive affect but no change in negative affect (Clark & Watson, 1988).

Personal Contributors to Happiness

The relative stability of well-being judgments over time, together with the modest effects of environmental circumstances, have led experts to suggest that something stable in individuals accounts for a substantial share of well-being. It seems that genes and personality explain some of the person level variance in happiness, with some individuals being naturally programmed to be happier than others (Diener, et al., 1999; Lucas, 2008). Research on twins suggests that up to 50% of the variance in subjective well-being is genetically determined (Lykken & Tellegen 1996; Tellegen, Lykken, Bouchard, Wilcox, Segal, & Rich, 1988; Weiss, Bates & Luciano 2008). Set point theories suggest that individuals are predisposed to a certain level of happiness, and usually return to that set point relatively quickly following temporary disturbances due to favorable or unfavorable external events (Brickman, Coats, & Janoff-Bulman, 1978).

Genetic set points may act through personality traits as well as other stable cognitive and motivational tendencies. Traits consistently related to subjective well-being include extraversion and emotional stability (neuroticism) and the similar constructs of dispositional positive and negative affectivity, as well as locus of control, optimism, and self-esteem (c.f. Heller, Watson, & Ilies, 2004; Lucas, 2008; Steel, Schmidt, & Shultz, 2008). Individuals high on trait positive affectivity appear to be more sensitive and reactive to potentially rewarding situations and respond with greater increases in pleasant feelings, while those high on negative affectivity respond with stronger negative emotions in potentially punishing situations. A biological basis for these traits is found in the distinct behavioral approach and behavioral avoidance systems in the brain (Corr, 2008; Carver, Sutton, & Scheier, 2000). Elliot and Thrash (2002) propose a higher-order construct called “approach temperament” that combines extraversion, behavioral activation system sensitivity, and dispositional positive affectivity. They state that these constructs “share the same basic core—a general neurobiological sensitivity to positive/desirable (i.e. reward) stimuli (present or imagined)

that is accompanied by perceptual vigilance for, affective reactivity to, and a behavioral predisposition toward such stimuli." (p. 805).

Dispositionally happy people seem to habitually construe events differently than unhappy people. They refrain from making social comparisons that would disadvantage them, they dwell on their successes rather than ruminating on their failures, they are persistently optimistic, and they use more effective coping strategies than their less happy peers (Lyubomirsky, 2001; Lyubomirsky & Ross, 1997). Dispositionally happy people may also selectively expose themselves to environments or relationships that facilitate subsequent happiness.

Genetic, set point, and personality perspectives have been referred to as "top down" models of well-being, as they posit a stable disposition to be more or less happy that directly influences well-being and/or colors perceptions and evaluations of the events and circumstances that contribute to well-being. In contrast, "bottom up" views of well-being suggest that overall happiness or well-being is compiled from a number of discrete moments of happiness, or from the sum of satisfactory experiences across several domains of life. Diener, Sandvik, and Pavot (1991) provided evidence to support the bottom up view, finding that the percent of time individuals experienced net positive affect was a strong predictor of overall happiness. Fredrickson and Losada (2005) showed that individuals who were "flourishing" experienced a ratio of 2.9 or more instances of positive affect for every instance of negative affect. Evidence for the contribution of domain satisfactions to overall life satisfaction has also been found (c.f. Heller et al. 2004). In sum, both top down and bottom up influences on happiness occur.

Person by Situation Interactions

As in most areas of psychology, neither the person nor the situation absolutely determines outcomes, but an interaction between the two is important. "Fit" or "need

satisfaction" theories suggest that happiness occurs when what the situation offers corresponds to what a particular individual needs, wants, or expects. Rabbi Schachel (1954, p. 37) famously proposed that "happiness is not having what you want, but wanting what you have." Larsen and McKibban (2008) have shown that unique variance in happiness is predicted by both having what you want and wanting what you have. There is also evidence that positive affect comes from perceptions of progress toward the idiosyncratic goals one has set (Carver & Scheier, 1990; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999) and from employing one's unique constellation of personal strengths (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005). Thus, the specific activities or accomplishments that would make one person happy may be different from those that would make another happy.

Becoming Happier

The booming market for self-help books indicates that many individuals believe they can improve their happiness with effort. Recent popular books by credible social psychologists include *Authentic Happiness* (Seligman, 2002) and *The How of Happiness: A Scientific Approach to Getting the Life You Want* (Lyubomirsky, 2008). Lyubomirsky and her colleagues (2001; Boehm & Lyubomirsky, 2008; Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005) have suggested that happiness is 50% genetically determined (top down), 10% environmentally caused, and 40% potentially modifiable by intentional happiness-enhancing activities and practices (bottom up). The latter include practicing gratitude, kindness, forgiveness, and spirituality, choosing and pursuing authentic goals, nurturing social relationships, seeking opportunities to experience flow, and engaging in meditation and physical exercise. Selgiman (2002) suggests that authentic happiness is facilitated by developing and practicing character virtues such as kindness, gratitude, optimism, curiosity, playfulness, humor, open-mindedness and hope. Eudaimonic happiness is thought to be increased by, "(1) pursuing intrinsic goals and values for their own sake, including personal

growth, relationships, community, and health, rather than extrinsic goals and values, such as wealth, fame, image, and power; (2) behaving in autonomous, volitional, or consensual ways, rather than heteronomous or controlled ways; (3) being mindful and acting with a sense of awareness; and (4) behaving in ways that satisfy basic psychological needs for competence**,** relatedness, and autonomy" (Ryan, Huta, & Deci, 2008, p. 139).

Researchers have recently turned their attention to designing and assessing interventions aimed at improving long term happiness (c.f. Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, et al., 2005; Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2007). One such study (Seligman et al. 2005) tested five simple self-administered interventions and found that two of them effectively improved happiness six months later. One of the successful interventions involved an on-line assessment of one's "signature strengths" together with instructions to use a character strength in a new way each day for a week. The other effective intervention involved writing down three good things that happened each day and attributing causes to each, for a week. Research by Lyubomirsky, Sheldon et al. (2005) suggests that improving happiness is less straight forward. For instance, practicing gratitude three times per week was less effective than doing it once per week, perhaps because habituation began to set in, while performing several acts of kindness on a single day of the week was more effective than performing one act per day over the same week.

In sum, it appears that happiness is a function of environmental events and circumstances, stable tendencies in the person, and the fit between the two, with the possibility of limited modification by carefully chosen and intentionally varied volitional acts. These same categories can be used to describe likely antecedents of happiness in organizations, as detailed below.

Causes of Happiness in Organizations

This section will first review environmental contributors to happiness located at the organization, job, and event levels. Dispositional and person by situation contributors to happiness will be discussed next, followed by consideration of intentional means of improving happiness at work.

Environmental Contributors to Happiness in Organizations

"In order to achieve the good life people must work in good organizations" (Gavin & Mason, 2004, p. 387). For much of the history of organizational behavior, we have assumed that the dominant causes of happiness or unhappiness and stress in organizations were to be found in attributes of the organization, the job, the supervisor, or other aspects of the work environment. A very great deal of literature has accumulated showing which aspects of organizations and jobs are most often predictive of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and other forms of happiness at work.

Organizational level. At the organizational level, one might consider attributes of the organization's culture and HR practices as likely causes of happiness among organization members. The Great Place to Work Institute suggests that employees are happy when they "trust the people they work for, have pride in what they do, and enjoy the people they work with." Trust in the employer, built on credibility, respect, and fairness, is seen as the cornerstone (http://www.greatplacetowork.com). Sirota, Mischkind, and Meltzer (2005) agree that three factors are critical in producing a happy and enthusiastic workforce: equity (respectful and dignified treatment, fairness, security), achievement (pride in the company, empowerment, feedback, job challenge), and camaraderie with team mates.

High performance work practices, also known as high involvement and high commitment approaches, involve redesigning work to be performed by autonomous teams, being highly selective in employment, offering job security, investing in training, sharing information and power with employees, adopting flat organization structures, and rewarding

based on organizational performance (c.f. Huselid, 1995; Lawler 1992; Pfeffer, 1998). These practices often improve motivation and quality, reduce employee turnover, and contribute to short and long term financial performance. High performance work practices also seem likely to enhance affective commitment, engagement, and satisfaction, and in fact some of the impact of these practices on organizational performance may be mediated by their effects on employee happiness. High performance work practices may act on happiness at least partly by increasing the opportunity for employees to attain frequent satisfaction of the three basic human needs posited by self-determination theory: competence, autonomy, and relatedness.

Research on perceived psychological climate provides evidence that individual level perceptions of affective, cognitive, and instrumental aspects of organizational climate are consistently and strongly related to happiness in the form of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Carr, Schmidt, Ford, & DeShon, 2003). Another meta-analysis showed that five climate dimensions of role, job, leader, work group, and organization were consistently related to job satisfaction and other job attitudes (Parker, Baltes, Young, Huff, Altmann, Lacost, & Roberts, 2003). Perceptions of organizational justice are also related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). In sum, it appears that some aspects of organizational practices and qualities, and how they are perceived by organization members, are consistently predictive of happiness-related attitudes. The next section considers job level influences on happiness at work.

Job level. Much of the research on what makes people happy in organizations has focused on stable properties of the job, with complex, challenging, and interesting work assumed to produce positive work attitudes. The best known typology of job characteristics is that of Hackman and Oldham (1975, see Table 2), with evidence confirming that jobs

possessing more of these characteristics are more satisfying to incumbents (Fried & Ferris, 1987). Morgeson and Humphrey (2006) have expanded the conceptualization of job characteristics to include not just the five motivational factors from Hackman and Oldham, but several additional motivational factors, social factors, and work context factors, as shown in Table 2. A meta-analysis showed that most of these are positively related to happiness at work, and collectively explain more than half of the variance in job satisfaction and 87% of the variance in organizational commitment.

(Table 2 here)

Warr provides another typology of job characteristics that goes beyond the work itself to include supervision, pay, and career issues as additional predictors of happiness (Table 2). Generally, greater quantities of desirable job characteristics are considered better. However, Warr's "vitamin model" (1987, 2007) suggests that like some vitamins, increasing amounts of some job characteristics improve well-being only until deficiencies are overcome and one reaches the "recommended daily allowance." Beyond that point, additional amounts are thought to have limited beneficial effects on happiness. Further, there may be some job characteristics that in high quantities actually reduce happiness, just as it is possible to overdose on some vitamins. For instance, Warr suggests that it is possible to have too much personal control, too much variety, and too much clarity.

Moving away from the work itself to consider other job-level attributes, there is evidence that leader behavior is related to employee happiness. Charismatic leadership is strongly related to subordinate job satisfaction (corrected population correlation = .77, DeGroot, Kiker, & Cross, 2000), and leader-member exchange is also fairly strongly related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Likewise, trust in the leader is a strong predictor of satisfaction and commitment (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Autonomy support displayed by leaders also appears to be important for follower

satisfaction, well-being, and engagement (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). A stream of research on abusive supervision by Tepper (2007) documents the deleterious effects of inappropriate leader behavior on follower happiness.

A final source of happiness at work may be pleasant relationships with other people. Aside from research on leadership, social connections at work have been largely ignored by researchers. This is surprising given the absolutely central role that interpersonal relationships are known to play in human happiness and well-being (Baumeister & Leary 1995). Recently, interpersonal relationships in the workplace have begun to attract some attention, and it appears that "high quality connections" with others may be important sources of happiness and energy for employees (Dutton, 2003; Dutton & Ragins, 2007). Tom Rath's popular book *Vital Friends* (2006) reports that individuals who said they had a best friend at work were seven times more likely to report being engaged in their job.

Event level. The above paragraphs have focused on the effects of relatively stable aspects of the work setting such as organizational practices and job design on similarly stable measures of happiness such as overall job satisfaction. This section will consider more transient causes of states of happiness such as pleasant moods and positive emotions in real time. Affective events theory (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) suggests that stable features of the work setting such as those described above act at least partly by predisposing the more frequent occurrence of particular kinds of affective events – momentary happenings that provoke concurrent moods or emotions. For instance, one might expect that enriched jobs would more often provide events involving positive feedback or challenges successfully met, either of which should create concurrent positive affect. As predicted by affective events theory, the cumulation of momentary pleasant experiences has been shown to predict overall job satisfaction (Fisher, 2000). The paragraphs that follow further explore events and other short-lived predictors of momentary happiness at work.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) famously asked employees to describe a time they felt especially good or bad about their job. They found that incidents reported as causing good feelings tended to differ from those associated with bad feelings. Good feelings were most often experienced in connection with events involving achievement, recognition, interesting and challenging work, responsibility, and advancement/growth. Herzberg et al. went on to conclude in their motivator-hygiene theory that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were independent unipolar constructs that had different determinants. This conclusion has been roundly criticized when referring to stable overall job attitudes (House & Wigdor, 1967), but does seem to have merit when describing the connection between momentary events and concurrent positive and negative emotions at work, consistent with current two-domain theories of the sources of affect. More recent studies of events that cause positive emotions at work confirm that events involving goal achievement, recognition, challenging and interesting tasks, and pleasant interactions with others are associated with concurrent pleasant emotions, and that events perceived as hassles which cause negative feelings do tend to be different than the mere absence of events perceived as uplifts (Basch & Fisher, 2000, 2004; Hart, Wearing, & Headley, 1993; Maybery, Jones-Ellis, Neale, & Arentz, 2005).

Perceived performance is likely to be another determinant of momentary positive mood and emotions at work. Employees spend most of their work time performing or attempting to perform, so beliefs about how well they are doing it should be both salient and continuously available. We know that goal achievement and positive feedback predict satisfaction (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996; Kluger, Lewinsohn, & Aiello, 1994; Locke, Cartledge, & Knerr, 1970). Control theory suggests that the rate of progress toward a goal is a determinant of positive affect (Carver & Scheier, 1990). Fisher has argued that perceived performance is a strong determinant of concurrent mood and emotion at work, especially for individuals who care

about their job and who have adopted approach goals (Fisher, 2008). In an experience sampling study, she found an average within person correlation between self-rated performance at a moment in time and concurrent task satisfaction of .57 (Fisher & Noble 2004).

Finally, an individual's momentary affect at work may be influenced by other people with whom he or she interacts through emotional contagion. There is evidence that contagion may occur from leader to follower (Bono & Ilies, 2006; Johnson, 2008; Sy, Côté, & Saavedra, 2005) among teammates (c.f. Bakker, van Emmerik, & Euwema, 2006; Barsade, 2002; Ilies, Wagner, & Morgeson, 2007; Kelly & Basade, 2001; Totterdell, 2000; Walter & Bruch, 2008), and from customer to service-provider (Dallimore, Sparks, & Butcher, 2007).

It is important to remember that happiness and positive attitudes are not directly *created* by environments or events such as those described above, but rather by individuals' perceptions, interpretations, and appraisals of those environments and events. The large body of research on appraisal theories of emotion (c.f. Lazarus, 1991; Scherer, Schorr, & Johnstone, 2001) clearly supports a critical role for the appraisal process in determining experienced emotion. Appraisals can be influenced not just by the objective nature of the events, but also by dispositional characteristics, expectations, attributions, and social influence. For instance, a number of studies have shown that respondents' job satisfaction and perceptions of job characteristics can be influenced by the judgments expressed by their coworkers and supervisors (c.f. Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978; Thomas & Griffin, 1983).

Dispositional Contributors to Happiness in Organizations

As in the general happiness literature, there is evidence that happiness at work displays some stability and may be due to personal as well as environmental factors. The stability of job satisfaction over time has already been discussed. Findings that both genes and

personality predict job satisfaction verify that there is a dispositional component to happiness at work that operates independently of the characteristics of the work situation. In general, individuals high on dispositional positive affectivity and core self-evaluations (comprised of internal locus of control, self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, and emotional stability) tend to be happier at work as well as in other areas of life (Judge & Bono, 2001; Judge et al., 2008; Judge & Hurst, 2008).

The mechanisms by which dispositions contribute to happiness at work have been explored by several scholars. Bowling, Beehr, Wagner, & Libkuman (2005, p. 1044) suggest three such mechanisms: "that dispositions (a) influence employees' equilibrium or adaptation level of job satisfaction, (b) influence employees' sensitivity to workplace events, and (c) influence the speed at which job satisfaction returns to equilibrium after one is exposed to a workplace event." Other researchers have shown that the effects of trait affectivity on job satisfaction are mediated by state affect (Ilies & Judge, 2004; Weiss 2002). Finally, individuals high in core self evaluations are more likely to adopt self-concordant, intrinsic goals, the pursuit of which brings happiness (Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005).

Person by Situation Contributors to Happiness in Organizations

Another category of antecedents of happiness at work involves the fit between person and situation. The Theory of Work Adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984) states that satisfaction occurs when the work environment meets the employee's requirements. The concept of fit has been defined in a number of ways, assessed at the level of person-organization fit as well as person-job fit. *Supplementary fit* involves the person having similar qualities to the organization and is often conceptualized as value fit or personality fit with the organization's culture or with others in the organization. *Needs-supplies fit* occurs when the job and organization supply what the individual needs, wants, or prefers. *Demands-abilities fit* is when the employee's skills and abilities fulfill what the job requires.

There is considerable evidence that supplementary fit and needs-supplies fit are related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Edwards, 1991; Kristof-Brown, 1996; Westerman & Cyr, 2004; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). Individuals are happier when embedded in a work environment that matches their values and goals, and that meets their needs and preferences. The finding that a personal quality, growth need strength, moderates employee reactions to job scope is additional evidence for the importance of fit between the employee and the job (Fried & Ferris, 1987).

Increasing Happiness at Work

The preceding discussion of causes of happiness may suggest scope for individuals and organizations to increase individual happiness in the workplace.

Individual actions to increase happiness at work. There is relatively little research on how individuals may volitionally contribute to their own happiness at work, though much of the advice on how to improve happiness in general (e.g., practice gratitude, pursue intrinsic goals, nurture relationships, find flow) could also be applied in the work setting. Momentary happiness is associated with perceptions of effective performance or progress toward goals, so setting and pursuing challenging but achievable short term goals may enhance real-time feelings of happiness. At the more stable person level, individuals could seek both person-job and person-organization fit when choosing employment, and adjust expectations to match reality. If dissatisfied, they might decide to leave one job and find another that suits them better, though very few studies have investigated this phenomenon by following individuals across organizations. An exception is Boswell, Boudreau, and Tichy (2005), who found that executives who were less satisfied in a given year were more likely to change jobs and be more satisfied the following year in the new job. They dubbed this the “honeymoon effect.” Unfortunately, the increase in happiness was short-lived, and by the second year in the new job, satisfaction had returned to baseline levels.

It has been suggested that individuals will be more authentically happy if they feel a "calling," or a connection between what they do at work and a higher purpose or important value (Seligman 2002; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz 1997). Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) describe "job crafting" by employees, which is defined as modifying the tasks to be performed, building or changing relationships with coworkers or clients, and psychologically reframing the meaning of work. Individuals are thought to craft their jobs to assert control, create a positive self-image at work, and fulfill basic needs for connection to others. For instance, nurses may redefine their work as helping patients heal as opposed to performing menial tasks as directed by physicians. Such changes should be quite effective in creating both supplementary and needs-supplies fit, and would be expected to improve happiness at work.

Another approach for individuals to improve demands-abilities fit is provided by the *strengths-based view*. This approach suggests that each individual has a unique configuration of personal or character strengths, talents, and preferences. Individuals should discover what their personal strengths are, and then design their job or career to allow them to cultivate these strengths and spend much of each day applying them while minimizing demands to complete activities that do not use strengths. Following this advice should improve both eudaimonic and hedonic happiness, as individuals enjoy greater competence and self-actualization.

Strengths and the means to identify them have been approached differently by the various scholars associated with this view. Roberts and her colleagues (Roberts, Dutton, Spreitzer, Heaphy, & Quinn, 2005; Roberts, Spreitzer, Dutton, Quinn, Heaphy, & Barker, 2005) advocate a process of soliciting feedback from others about times that the focal individual was at their personal best, then seeking patterns across the qualitative replies received to form a picture of the "reflected best self." Donald Clifton and colleagues

(Buckingham & Clifton, 2001) at the Gallup Organization have developed a typology of 34 human strengths and a proprietary on-line survey to assess these strengths (the Clifton StrengthsFinder, www.strengthsfinder.com). A technical report on the instrument is available (Asplund, Lopez, Hodges, & Harter, 2007). Peterson and Seligman (2004) have developed the Values in Action Inventory of Strengths, a measure of 24 character strengths that is available at www.authentichappiness.com. Both of these instruments are used in an ipsative fashion, identifying for each individual their own relative strengths as potential targets for development in work or elsewhere in life.

Organizational actions to increase happiness at work. A specific organizational intervention to improve employee well-being was recently reported by Proudfoot, Corr, Guest, and Dunn (2009). They developed a cognitive-behavioral training program lasting seven weeks with six further weeks of follow-up, to teach stressed financial services sales agents to change dysfunctional thinking and adopt an optimistic attributional style. The intervention increased job satisfaction and well-being assessed three months later and reduced employee turnover and enhanced performance up to two years later.

Perceptions of a number of attributes of organizations and jobs are reliably correlated with job satisfaction and affective commitment, suggesting that these attributes might be levers for organizations wishing to improve happiness in the workplace. Specific, if idealistic, suggestions include the following:

- Create a healthy, respectful, and supportive organizational culture
- Supply competent leadership at all levels
- Provide fair treatment, security, and recognition
- Design jobs to be interesting, challenging, autonomous, and rich in feedback
- Facilitate skill development to improve competence and allow growth
- Select for person-organization and person-job fit

- Enhance fit through the use of realistic job previews and socialization practices
- Reduce minor hassles and increase daily uplifts
- Persuade employees to reframe a current less-than-ideal work environment as acceptable (mentioned but decidedly not endorsed by Hackman, 2009)
- Adopt high performance work practices

Unfortunately, disposition also affects happiness in general and at work, such that happiness may be somewhat "sticky" and less than perfectly responsive to improvements in objective organization and job features (Staw & Ross, 1985). In addition, individuals may readily habituate to improved circumstances (Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2007). Further, the fact that individuals bring different needs, preferences, and expectations to work suggests that no single solution will make everyone equally happy. A reasonable question to ask is whether organizations (and individuals) *should* in fact try to improve employee happiness at work. What individual and organizational benefits might be expected to accrue from increased employee happiness? The next sections consider the consequences of happiness in general and in organizational settings.

Consequences of Happiness in General

Chronic happiness or subjective well-being has important consequences in addition to reflecting a better quality of life. In a massive review of the literature, Lyubomirsky, King, and Diener (2005 p. 803) conclude, "Numerous studies show that happy individuals are successful across multiple life domains, including marriage, friendship, income, work performance, and health." They argue that these relationships are found not just because success brings happiness, but because happiness, in the form of trait and/or state positive affect, has a causal effect on success. Those who are happy engage in behaviors that cascade to create improved outcomes in psychological, tangible, and even physiological domains. A meta-analytic review concluded that trait positive affect is a strong predictor of reduced

morbidity and of increased longevity among older adults, and that both state and trait positive affect are associated with reduced symptoms of ill health and pain (Pressman & Cohen, 2005).

At the state level, emotions are associated with characteristic action tendencies. For instance, anger is associated with the action tendency of attack, and fear is associated with escape. Action tendencies for happiness are less specific but generally involve approach, outgoingness, and expansiveness (Lazarus, 1991). The safety signaled by happiness allows for play and experimentation. Fredrickson's Broaden and Build theory (2001) further explains mechanisms by which momentary positive affect may promote success. Specifically, positive emotions "broaden people's momentary thought-action repertoires and build their enduring personal resources, ranging from physical and intellectual resources to social and psychological resources." Positive emotions also enhance broad-minded coping, speed recovery from negative states, and may "trigger upward spirals toward enhanced emotional well-being" (Fredrickson & Joiner 2002, p. 172). Positive activated moods have been found to enhance creativity and may facilitate goal attainment (Aspinwall, 1998; Baas et al., 2008). There is also a substantial literature investigating the complex manner in which positive mood may affect information processing and memory, though the effect is not universally helpful to task performance (c.f. Forgas, 1995; Forgas & George, 2001; Martin & Clore, 2001).

Consequences of Happiness in Organizations

There is evidence that the experience of happiness at the transient, person, and unit level has important consequences in organizations.

Consequences of Transient Happiness

The effects of momentary states of happiness are largely positive. At the day level, state positive mood is associated with creativity and proactivity on the same day and predicts

creativity and proactivity the next day (Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, & Staw, 2005; Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009). Positive mood also seems to reduce interpersonal conflict and enhance collaborative negotiation outcomes (Baron, Fortin, Frei, Hauver, & Shack, 1990). Day level fluctuations in positive mood and job satisfaction predict daily variance in organizational citizenship and workplace deviance at the within person level (Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006; Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006). Momentary positive mood can also influence how other aspects of the work environment are evaluated, with induced pleasant moods spreading to concurrent ratings of job satisfaction and task characteristics (Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995; Kraiger, Billings, & Isen, 1989).

Momentary moods are also implicated in motivational processes. Erez and Isen (2002) manipulated state mood and found that positive affect increased persistence and task performance, and acted on motivation by increasing expectancies, instrumentalities, and valences. Ilies and Judge (2005) demonstrated that affect was an important intervening variable in explaining the effect of feedback on subsequent self-set goals. Further discussion of how positive mood may affect work motivation can be found in George and Brief (1996) and Seo, Barrett, and Bartunek (2004).

While the most common effect of momentary happiness on work behavior appears to be positive, it has been argued that moods and emotions can harm concurrent work performance. Beal, Weiss, Barros, & MacDermid (2005) suggest that all emotions, positive or negative, have the potential to reduce task performance by redirecting scarce attentional resources away from the task and toward the source of the affect.

Consequences of Person Level Happiness

The huge amount of person level research involving happiness-related constructs and work outcomes suggests that positive attitudes and experiences are associated with beneficial consequences for both employees and organizations. For instance, job satisfaction and

organizational commitment are negatively related to intention to quit and actual turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002), absence (Hackett, 1989; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), and counter-productive work behavior (Dalal, 2005), and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior/contextual performance (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Job satisfaction is negatively related to depression, anxiety, and burnout, and positively related to physical health (Faragher, Cass, & Cooper, 2005).

The relationship of overall job satisfaction to individual job performance has long been of interest to organizational scholars (c.f. Brief, 1998; Fisher 1980; 2003; Vroom, 1964), and has even been described as "the Holy Grail" of organizational behavior research (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Laypeople strongly believe that happy employees are more likely to be productive employees (Fisher, 2003), despite reviews that have consistently revealed only a weak raw score correlation of .18 or less (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Judge et al., 2001; Vroom, 1964). However, adjusting for sampling error and substantial unreliability in the measurement of performance increases the estimated population correlation to .30 (Judge et al., 2001). Judge et al. found that job complexity was a significant moderator of the satisfaction-performance relationship, with a much stronger relationship of .52 in highly complex jobs. Note that the existence of this relationship does not guarantee that satisfaction is the cause and performance is the effect. A number of different causal explanations for the relationship have been offered (see Judge et al. 2001 for a review), including that performance causes satisfaction, especially when contingent reward systems are in place (Lawler & Porter, 1967). However, two meta-analyses involving panel data support the predominant direction of causality (for person level relationships) being from job attitudes to job performance (Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006; Riketta, 2008).

Harrison et al. (2006) have recently presented their Attitude-Engagement Model. Using meta-analytic structural equation modeling, they have shown that a higher order construct, overall job attitude, composed of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, is a strong predictor of a composite criterion of individual effectiveness including measures of core job performance, contextual performance, lateness, absenteeism, and turnover. The estimated correlation between the latent attitude and performance constructs was a very impressive .59. Lagged data were analyzed in this framework as well, enabling Harrison et al. to conclude that positive attitude is in fact a powerful cause of individual effectiveness at work.

These findings are consistent with Ajzen and Fishbein's correspondence principle (1977, see also Fisher, 1980), which states that broad attitudes best predict broad aggregate criteria, while more narrow and specific attitudes may better predict specific behaviors toward the same attitude object. A review of the literature on attitudes predicting behavior by Kraus (1995) verified the importance of correspondence between attitudes and behavior. Kraus also found that attitudes predicted behavior more strongly when the attitudes were stable, certain, accessible, and formed on the basis of direct personal experience. Job satisfaction, affective commitment, and work engagement would seem to fulfill these requirements and thus could be expected to predict appropriately matched behavioral criteria.

When happiness is conceptualized as dispositional positive affect, there is evidence that it predicts career success. "Compared with their less happy peers, happy people earn more money, display superior performance, and perform more helpful acts" (Boehm & Lyubomirsky, 2008, p. 101). Happy people are less likely to experience periods of unemployment (Diener et al. 2002) and more likely to succeed in job search. As well as charming interviewers (Burger & Caldwell, 2000), their cheerfulness may attract social support from work colleagues, thus enabling them to perform better, as well as upwardly biasing supervisor's perceptions of their performance. Dispositional PA has been linked to

better performance in managerial decision making and interpersonal tasks (Staw & Barsade, 1993). In a predictive study, the extent to which employees felt and expressed positive emotions at work predicted performance ratings, increases in pay, and social support 18 months later (Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994). Further, managers high on positive affect have been found to cope with organizational change more effectively (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999). In sum, person level happiness at work is correlated with, and is often predictive of, positive consequences for both employees and organizations.

Consequences of Unit Level Happiness

At the collective level, there is evidence that average employee satisfaction within a work unit is often related to hard and soft unit level outcomes. In what has been called "linkage research," the case for average employee attitudes driving business performance has been made in the popular business press, with employee satisfaction touted as a possible lead indicator of later customer satisfaction and financial performance in balanced score-card approaches (Heskett, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1997; Rucci, Kirn, & Quinn, 1998). A recent meta-analysis confirmed that unit level employee satisfaction predicts customer satisfaction and perceptions of service quality (Brown & Lam, 2008). A meta-analysis of 42 correlations between the Gallup measure of business unit engagement and business unit outcomes showed that average employee engagement at unit level was significantly related to customer satisfaction, profit, productivity, employee turnover, and safety, with corrected population correlations ranging from |.15 to .29| (Harter et al., 2002). If causality runs from attitudes to organizational performance, these effect sizes can translate into substantial annual dollar returns for more engaged business units. Koys (2001) measured job satisfaction, profit, and customer satisfaction for two years across 28 restaurants in a chain. Average employee satisfaction at time 1 predicted profit in year 2 (r=.27), profit as a percent of sales in year 2 (r=.35), and customer satisfaction in year 2 (r=.61). These relationships were stronger than

those in the reverse causal direction. Patterson, Warr, and West (2004) found similar results in a study of 42 small organizations (93% with fewer the 500 employees). Average employee satisfaction predicted following year productivity r=.44. The results held up when prior productivity was controlled. A study of 35 large companies over five years found that average organizational level job satisfaction significantly predicted subsequent return on assets and earnings per share (Schneider, Hanges, Smith, & Salvaggio, 2003). However, this study also found that correlations were stronger for the reverse causal order, with company performance predicting subsequent job satisfaction.

Conclusions about the Consequences of Happiness in Organizations

Many management scholars (including the author) have spent decades attempting to disabuse students of the commonsense belief that "a happy worker is a productive worker." Our stance was based on discouraging reviews of the job satisfaction - job performance relationship going back as far as Brayfield and Crockett (1955). Subsequent reviews (Vroom, 1964; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Judge et al., 2001) confirmed that the uncorrected relationship between satisfaction and performance is modest.

However, the weight of evidence suggests that it is time to revise this pessimistic conclusion in some ways. When corrections for unreliability and sampling error are applied, meta-analytic studies show moderate relationships between job satisfaction and both core and contextual performance (Judge, et al. 2001; LePine et al, 2002). There is evidence that positive individual and collective attitudes (engagement, satisfaction, commitment, involvement) are not only related to, but also predictive of, organizationally desired outcomes including individual and unit performance, employee retention, safety, customer satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior (Harrison et al., 2006; Riketta, 2008). Relationships among narrow measures of specific attitudes and uni-dimensional performance constructs are not always large, but they are consistently non-zero. When multiple attitude

and performance measures are combined into composite criteria, the relationships between them are much stronger. The estimated population correlation between overall attitudes and broadly defined performance estimated by Harrison et al. (2006) was a convincing .59, with evidence that causality flows from attitude to performance.

Another reason to be concerned about employee happiness is the important mediating role that attitudes and affect appear to play. The effects of objective work environments, job design, personality, and psychological climate on more distal outcomes such as performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover are often mediated through happiness-related constructs such as job satisfaction, affective commitment, and mood at work (c.f. Carr, et al., 2003; Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006; Patterson, et al., 2004; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007; Parker, et al. 2003). In sum, the evidence suggests that happiness at work does matter, not just to employees but also to organizations. This being the case, the next section will suggest a sampling of specific avenues for future research on aspects of happiness in organizations.

Suggestions for Research on Happiness in Organizations

There is scope for further research on happiness at work as it plays out at the transient, person, and unit levels.

Transient Level

Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) has stimulated research at the within person level for the past decade, but there is still much to be learned about the real-time causes and consequences of mood and emotions while working. For instance, the causal mechanisms by which affect and task performance are related at the transient level are in need of more research. For instance, Fisher (2008) has proposed a number of as-yet untested hypotheses about the means by which performance perceptions influence affect at work, and the attributes of individuals and situations that might be expected to influence the extent to

which performers are affectively reactive to their own perceived performance. Goal orientation may be an important moderator in this regard (Pekrun, et al., 2006).

It has become popular in the emotions in organizations literature to call for more research on discrete emotions rather than undifferentiated positive or negative affect. This is particularly good advice in the case of negative emotions (e.g., anger vs fear), which have quite different appraisal patterns and action tendencies. In contrast, many specific positive emotions seem to share similar antecedents and action tendencies, and in practice the emotions of happiness, enthusiasm, contentment, and liking often co-occur when assessed in real time. Never-the-less, there may be some payoff in examining selected positive emotions that are particularly relevant in the workplace.

Two pleasant emotions that are substantially understudied but potentially very important in understanding work motivation and performance are *interest* and *pride*. In organizational behavior, interest in a task has been considered in research on intrinsic motivation, flow, and job design, but there is more to be learned about how immediate task characteristics, person characteristics, and their match interact to create and sustain interest during task performance (Fisher & Noble, 2004; Silvia, 2006). Sansone and Harackiewicz (1996, p. 220) note that "the experience of interest is important … because it may function as a proximal motivator for moment-to-moment performance."

Pride is an emotion that is often looked on with somewhat of a jaundiced eye, whereas in fact pride in achievement and satisfaction with demonstrating competence or helping others can be very powerful and uplifting feelings. Further, employees are most likely to experience this pleasant emotion while doing something the organization values, performing well on core or contextual tasks, so it seems to offer the opportunity for both parties to win. There has been relatively little research on pride among adults, though research interest has increased of late (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Additional research on "authentic pride"

(appraisal of accomplishments or contributions as due to internal, controllable, and unstable causes) is likely to be quite useful in organizational settings. Pride is a self-administered reward that is also likely to motivate task choice, effort, and persistence.

Person Level

The vast majority of existing research on happiness-related constructs at work has taken place at the person level, and we know a very great deal of about job satisfaction and organizational commitment and their correlates. We probably do not need more such research, unless these constructs are used as dependent variables for new happiness-enhancing interventions or as mediating variables carrying the effect of such interventions to performance outcomes.

What seems more intriguing and useful is further research on a higher-order construct, for the sake of argument called *happiness at work*, containing a number of positive attitudes and feelings. Harrison et al. (2006) combined job satisfaction and organizational commitment into a powerful latent predictor. I suggested earlier that three constructs may be needed to cover the construct space of happiness at work at the person level. Adding engagement with the work itself to job satisfaction and affective commitment assures that the three major foci (organization, job, work itself) are covered. Engagement is closer to a motivational construct than the other two attitudes, so that a composite measure containing all three should result in even better prediction of aggregate and broad measures of employee behavior toward and contributions to organizations.

Further research on the mechanisms and processes by which happiness is turned into increased contribution in organizations will also be useful. Explanations offered to date include changes in information processing toward enhanced cognitive flexibility brought on by positive mood; increased psychological, physical, and social resources built by positive emotions that are subsequently deployed toward performance; and increased motivation due

to higher expectancy theory components and upward goal revision. Drawing on social exchange theory, Organ (1977) proposed that reciprocity norms might explain greater contributions to an organization by happy employees who attribute the cause of their happiness to the organization. Because core task performance may be constrained by ability, these discretionary contributions may take other forms and be more likely to show up in broad performance criteria including citizenship, timely attendance, and retention. Locke and Latham (1990) are among those who have proposed models in which goals, self-efficacy, effort, rewards, and satisfaction interact in performance-enhancing spirals.

Another interesting area for research at the person level involves happiness-enhancing interventions. One such intervention may involve assessing human strengths and evaluating the effects of optimally matching personal strengths to job content. Note that "strengths" as conceptualized by Buckingham and Clifton (2001), Peterson and Seligman (2004), and Roberts, Spretizer, et al. (2005) are different than the cognitive skills that have been the target of employee selection research for a century. Both strengths instruments are proprietary at this time, and there is little empirical work publicly available to verify the intuitively appealing notion that designing jobs to match employees' idiosyncratic strengths will increase both individual happiness and organizational effectiveness.

Other happiness-enhancing interventions by both individuals and organizations could also be developed and trialed in the work setting, builing on the research of scholars such as Lyubomirsky (Lyubomirsky, Sheldon et al., 2005; Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2007) and Seligman (2002; Seligman et al., 2005). The Gallup engagement items were chosen specifically to be satisfying aspects of the work environment over which supervisors could potentially exercise control to improve outcomes, suggesting that improvements in unit satisfaction are possible. Organization-sponsored training interventions like the one reported by Proudfoot et al. (2009) find that lasting improvements in individual happiness can be

achieved. Some interventions aimed at increasing productivity (goal setting, high involvement work practices, etc.) seem to have side-effects of increasing satisfaction.

Unit Level

We know relatively little about sources and implications of collective happiness at the group, unit, or organizational level. Most of the research on unit level happiness and outcomes has involved small to medium sized work units such as bank branches or restaurant locations (c.f. Harter et al., 2002; Koys, 2001). These studies indicate modest but significant effects running from happiness to business unit performance. I found only one study of very large units (entire Fortune 500 firms, Schneider, et al., 2003). In this study of large units, organizational performance was a stronger cause of average satisfaction than the reverse. If these results are consistent, it raises the possibility that unit size may moderate the causal direction of happiness-outcome relationships and processes. In an article about evolutionary biology in organizations, Nicholson (1998) suggested that ideal human communities consist of not more than 150 people. Perhaps collective happiness is a more powerful causal construct in smaller units, where members are acquainted with each other, there is an obvious target for the altruism that may be inspired by unit or individual happiness, reciprocity is more easily monitored, and there is greater likelihood that individual actions will impact unit outcomes. Different causal mechanisms, including performance creating more resources to be shared and thus raising subsequent happiness, may prevail when very large organizations are the unit of analysis.

In general, research on the mechanisms connecting happiness to broadly conceived performance-related outcomes at all levels will be instructive. One might wonder if there are one or more common mechanisms across levels. For instance, happiness may create resources and the desire to approach, with subsequent positive spirals being created such that the performance engendered by that approach feeds back into further resources and

happiness, be it at transient, person, or unit level (Bakker, et al. 2006; Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002; Walter & Bruch, 2008).

Conclusions

Happiness at work is an umbrella concept that includes a large number of constructs ranging from transient moods and emotions to relatively stable attitudes and highly stable individual dispositions at the person level to aggregate attitudes at the unit level (Table 1). In the workplace, happiness is influenced by both short-lived events and chronic conditions in the task, job, and organization. It is also influenced by stable attributes of individuals such as personality, as well as the fit between what the job/organization provides and the individual's expectations, needs, and preferences. Understanding these contributors to happiness, together with recent research on volitional actions to improve happiness, offer some potential levers for improving happiness at work.

And there is reason to think that improving happiness at work is a worthy goal. Evidence suggests that the "happy – productive worker hypothesis" may be more true than we thought. At the transient level, individuals are indeed happier than usual when they believe they are performing better than usual. At the person level, meta-analytic evidence shows that happiness-related constructs such as job satisfaction, engagement, and affective commitment have important consequences for both individuals and organizations. Happiness at the person and group level is related to core and contextual performance, customer satisfaction, safety, attendance, and retention. Relationships are strongest when both happiness and outcomes are conceptualized and measured broadly. The use of narrow measures of happiness-related constructs and an emphasis on predicting core task performance may have resulted in organizational researchers underestimating the total impact of happiness at work. As suggested by Krause (1995), it is time to move beyond Wicker's (1969) dismal conclusion that attitudes seldom predict more than 10% of the variance in

behavior. When attitude measures are consistent in target and scope to behavior measures, and when the attitudes in question are salient, stable, and have been formed based on personal experience, as is true of happiness at work, they can indeed predict behavior.

The importance of helping employees be happy at work may be increasing. There is widespread consensus that employment relationships are changing. Employers and employees are generally more loosely connected. Job security, loyalty, and average tenure are lower than in the past. Employer-employee relationships seem to be more contingent on both parties being satisfied with the exchange and continuing to meet each others' expectations (c.f. Roehling, Cavanaugh, Moynihan, & Boswell, 2000). In this environment, happiness at work is likely to be the glue that retains and motivates the high quality employees of the future.

References

Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, ***84***, 888-918.

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S.G., Mueller, J.S. and Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, ***50***, 367-403.

Argyle, M. (1999). Causes and correlates of happiness. In Kahneman, D., Diener, E., and Schwarz, N. (eds.), *Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology* (pp. 353-373). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

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

Aspinwall, L.G. (1998). Rethinking the role of positive affect in self-regulation. *Motivation and Emotion*, ***22***, 1-32.

Asplund, J., Lopez, S.J., Hodges, T. and Harter, J. (2007). *The Clifton StrengthsFinder® 2.0 Technical Report: Development and Validation.* http://strengths.gallup.com/private/Resources/CSFTechnicalReport031005.pdf.

Baard, P.P., Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, ***34***, 2045–2068.

Baas, M., De Dreu, C.K.W. and Nijstad, B.A. (2008). A meta-analysis of 25 years of mood-creativity research: Hedonic tone, activation, or regulatory focus. *Psychological Bulletin*, ***134***, 779-806.

Bakker, A.B. (2001). *Questionnaire for the assessment of work-related flow: The WOLF*. The Netherlands: Department of Social and Organizational Psychology, Utrecht University.

Bakker, A.B. and Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, ***13***, 209-223.

Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M.P. and Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work and Stress*, ***22***, 187-200.

Bakker, A.B., van Emmerik, H. and Euwema, M.C. (2006). Crossover of burnout and engagement in work teams. *Work and Occupations*, ***33***, 464-489.

Baron, R.A., Fortin, S.P., Frei, R.L., Hauver, L.A. and Shack, M. L. (1990). Reducing organizational conflict: The role of socially-induced positive affect. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, ***1***, 133-152.

Barsade, S.G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, ***47***, 644-675.

Basch, J. and Fisher, C. D. (2000). Affective job events – emotions matrix: A classification of job related events and emotions experienced in the workplace. In Ashkanasy, N., Zerbe, W. and Hartel, C. (eds), *Emotions in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice* (pp. 36-48). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Basch, J. and Fisher, C.D. (2004). *Development and Validation of Measures of Hassles and Uplifts at Work*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management.

Baumeister, R.F. and Leary, M.R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, ***117***, 497-530.

Beal, D. J., Weiss, H. M., Barros, E. and MacDermid, S. M. (2005). An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***90***, 1054-1068.

Boehm, J.K., and Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Does happiness promote career success? *Journal of Career Assessment, **16**,* 101-116.

Bono, J. E. and Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *Leadership Quarterly, **17**,* 317-334.

Boswell, W.R., Boudreau, J.W. and Tichy, J. (2005). The relationship between employee job change and job satisfaction: The honeymoon-hangover effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **90**,* 882-892.

Bowling, N.A., Beehr, T.A., Wagner, S.H. and Libkuman, T.M. (2005). Adaptation-level theory, opponent process theory, and dispositions: An integrated approach to the stability of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **90**,* 1044-1053.

Brayfield, A.H. and Crockett, W.H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin, **52**,* 396–424.

Bretz, R.D. and Judge, T.A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, **44**,* 32-54.

Brickman, P., Coates, D. and Janoff-Bulman, R. (1978). Lottery winners and accident victims: Is happiness relative? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, **36**,* 917-927.

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

Brief, A.P., Burke, M.J., George, G.M., Robinson, B.S. and Webster, J. (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? *Journal of Applied Psychology, **73**,* 193-198.

Brief, A.P., Butcher, A.H. and Roberson, L. (1995). Cookies, disposition, and job attitudes: The effects of positive mood-inducing events and negative affectivity on

job satisfaction in a field experiment. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, ***62***, 55-62.

Brief, A.P. and Roberson, L. (1989). Job attitude organization: An exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, ***19***, 717-727.

Brief, A.P. and Weiss, H.M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, ***53***, 279-308.

Britt, T.W., Dickinson, J.M., Greene-Shortridge, T.M. and McKibben, E.S. (2007). Self-engagement at work. In Nelson, D.L. and Cooper, C.L. (eds.) *Positive Organizational Behavior* (pp. 143-158). London: Sage.

Brown, S.P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, ***120***, 21, 235.

Brown, S.P. and Lam, S.K. (2008). A meta-analysis of relationships linking employee satisfaction to customer responses. *Journal of Retailing*, ***84***, 243-255

Buckingham, M. and Clifton, D. O. (2001). *Now, Discover Your Strengths*. New York: Free Press.

Burger, J.M. and Caldwell, D.F. (2000). Personality, social activities, job-search behavior and interview success: Distinguishing between PANAS trait positive affect and neo extraversion. *Motivation and Emotion*, ***24***, 51-62.

Burke, M.J., Brief, A.P., George, J.M. Roberson, L., and Webster, J. (1989). Measuring affect at work: Confirmatory analyses of competing mood structures with conceptual linkage to cortical regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, ***57***, 1091-1102.

Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E. and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.). (2003). *Positive Organizational Scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett- Kohler.

Carr, J.Z., Schmidt, A.M., Ford, J.K. and 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.

Carver, C. S. and Scheier, M. F. (1990). Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view. *Psychological Review, **97**,* 19-35.

Carver, C. S., Sutton, S. K. and Scheier, M. F. (2000). Action, emotion, and personality: Emerging conceptual integration. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, **26**,* 741-751.

Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **83**,* 234-246.

Chen, G., Bliese, P.D. and Mathieu, J.E. (2005). Conceptual framework and statistical procedures for delineating and testing multilevel theories of homology. *Organizational Research Methods, **8**,* 375-409.

Clancy, K.J., Berger, P.D. and Magliozzi, T.L. (2003). The Ecological Fallacy: Some fundamental research misconceptions corrected. *Journal of Advertising Research, **43**,* 370-380.

Clark, L.A. and Watson, D. (1988). Mood and the mundane: Relations between daily life events and self-reported mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, **54**,* 296-308.

Clark, L.A. and Watson, D. (1994, updated 1999). *The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule – expanded form*. Iowa City: University of Iowa (http://www.psychology.uiowa.edu/faculty/Clark/PANAS-X.pdf).

Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, ***17***, 336-354.

Cohen-Charash, Y. and Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, ***86***, 278-321.

Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C. and Ng, K.Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***86***, 425-445.

Connolly, J.J. and Chockalingam, V. (2000). The role of affectivity in job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, ***26***, 265-281.

Cooper-Hakim, A. and Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, ***131***, 241-305.

Corr P.J. (ed.) (2008) *The Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cranny, C.J., Smith, P.C. and Stone, E.F. (eds.). (1992). *Job Satisfaction: Advances in Research and Applications*. New York: The Free Press.

Csikszenthihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: HarperPerennial.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., Abuhamdeh, S. and Nakamura, J. (2005). Flow. In Elliot, A.J. and Dweck, C.S. (eds.), *Handbook of Competence and Motivation* (pp. 598-608). New York: The Guilford Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. and LeFevre, J. (1989). Optimal experience in work and leisure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, ***56***, 815-822.

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.

Dallimore, K.S., Sparks, B.A. and Butcher, K. (2007). The influence of angry customer outbursts on service providers' facial displays and affective states. *Journal of Service Research*, ***10***, 78-92.

Daniels, K. (2000). Measures of five aspects of affective well-being at work. *Human Relations*, ***53***, 275-294.

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

Deci, E.L., Connell, J.P. and Ryan, R.M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **74**, 580–590.

Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.

DeGroot, T., Kiker, D.S. and Cross, T.C. (2000). A meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, ***17***, 356-371.

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being. *American Psychologist*, ***55***, 34-43.

Diener, E. and Diener, C. (1996). Most people are happy. *Psychological Science*, ***96***, 181-185.

Diener, E., Nickerson, C., Lucas, R.E. and Sandvik, E. (2002). Dispositional affect and job outcomes. *Social Indicators Research*, ***59***, 229-259.

Diener, E., Sandvik, E. and Pavot, W. (1991). Happiness is the frequency, not the intensity, of positive versus negative affect. In Strack, F., Argyle, M. and Schwarz, N. (eds.). *Subjective Well-Being*. Pergamon Press.

Diener, E., Suh, E.M., Lucas, R.E. and Smith, H.L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, **125***, 276-302.

Dietz-Roux, A.V. (1998). Bringing context back into epidemiology: Variables and fallacies in multilevel analyses. *American Journal of Public Health, **88***, 216-971.

Dirks, K.T. and Ferrin, D.L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **87***, 611-628.

Dormann, C. and Zapf, D. (2001). Job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of stabilities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, **22***, 483-504.

Dutton, J.E. (2003). *Energize Your Workplace: How to Create and Sustain High-Quality Connections at Work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dutton, J.E., and Ragins, B.R. (2007). *Exploring Positive Relationships at Work.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eagly, A.H., and Chaiken, S. (1993). *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Edwards, J.R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In Cooper, C. L. and Robertson, I. T. (eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 283-357). Oxford, England: John Wiley and Sons.

Elliot, A.J., and Thrash, T.M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: Approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, **82***, 804-818.

Erez, A. and Isen, A.M. (2002). The influence of positive affect on the components of expectancy motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **87***, 1055-1067.

Faragher, B., Cass, M. and C.L., C. (2005). The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine, **62**,* 105-112.

Fineman, S. (2006). On being positive: Concerns and counterpoints. *Academy of Management Review, **31**,* 270-291.

Fisher, C.D. (1980). On the dubious wisdom of expecting job satisfaction to correlate with performance. *Academy of Management Review, **5**,* 607-612.

Fisher, C.D. (1997). *What do people feel and how should we measure it?* Paper presented at the Second Biennial Australian Industrial and Organisational Psychology Conference, Melbourne.

Fisher, C.D. (2000). Mood and emotions while working: Missing pieces of job satisfaction? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, **21**,* 185-202.

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**,* 1-25.

Fisher, C.D. (2008). The thrill of victory, the agony of defeat. In Ashkanasy, N. M. and Cooper, C. L. (eds.), *Research Companion to Emotion in Organizations* (pp. 120-135). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Fisher, C.D. and Noble, C.S. (2004). A within-person examination of correlates of performance and emotions while working. *Human Performance, **17**,* 145-168.

Forgas, J.P. (1995). Mood and judgment: The Affect Infusion Model (AIM). *Psychological Bulletin, **117**,* 39-66.

Forgas, J.P. and George, J.M. (2001). Affective influences on judgments and behavior in organizations: An information processing perspective. *Organizational Behavior* and Human Decision Processes, 86, 3-34.

Fowler J.H. and Christakis N.A. (2008). Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social network: longitudinal analysis over 20 years in the Framingham Heart Study. *British Medical Journal* ***337***, *a2338*, 23-27.

Frederick, S. and Loewenstein, G. (1999). Hedonic adaption. In Kahneman, D., Diener, E. and Schwarz, N. (eds.), *Well-being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology* (302-329). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Fredrickson, B.L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-built theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist,* ***56***, 218-226.

Fredrickson, B.L. and Joiner, T. (2002). Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being. *Psychological Science,* ***13***, 172-175.

Fredrickson, B.L. and Losada, M.F. (2005). Positive affect and the complex dynamics of human flourishing. *American Psychologist,* ***60***, 678-686.

Fried, Y. and Ferris, G.R. (1987). The validity of the job characteristics model: A review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology,* ***40***, 287-322.

Frijda, N.H. (1988). The laws of emotion. *American Psychologist,* ***43***, 349-358.

Fritz, C. and Sonnentag, S. (2009). Antecedents of day-level proactive behavior: A look at job stressors and positive affect during the workday. *Journal of Management,* ***35***, 94-111.

Gagné, M. and Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* ***26***, 331-362.

Gannon, L., Vaux, A., Rhodes, K. and Luchetta, T. (1992). A two-domain model of well-being: Everyday events, social support, and gender-related personality factors. *Journal of Research in Personality,* ***26***, 288-301.

Gavin, J.H. and Mason, R.O. (2004). The virtuous organization: The value of happiness in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics,* ***33***, 379-392.

George, J.M. (1990). Personality, affect, and behavior in groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **75**,* 107-116.

George, J.M. and Brief, A.P. (1996). Motivational agendas in the workplace: The effects of feelings on focus of attention and work motivation. *Research in Organizational Behavior **18**,* 75-109).

Gerstner, C.R. and Day, D.V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **82**,* 827-844.

Griffeth, R.W., Hom, P.W. and 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.

Hackett, R.D. (1989). Work attitudes and employee absenteeism: A synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, **62**,* 235-248.

Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **60**,* 159-170.

Hackman, J.R. (2009). The perils of positivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, **30**,* 309-319.

Harrison, D.A., Newman, D.A. and 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.

Hart, P.M., Wearing, A.J. and Headley, B. (1993). Assessing police work experiences: Development of the police daily hassles and uplifts scales. *Journal of Criminal Justice, **21**,* 553-572.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L. and 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.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J.T. and Rapson, R.L. (1994). *Emotional Contagion*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Headey, B. (2008). Life goals matter to happiness: A revision of set-point theory. *Social Indicators Research, **86***, 213-231.

Heller, D., Watson, D. and Ilies, R. (2004). The role of person versus situation in life satisfaction: A critical examination. *Psychological Bulletin, **130***, 574-600.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: Wiley.

Heskett, J.L., Sasser, W.E. Jr. and Schlesinger, L.A. (1997). *The Service Profit Chain*. New York: The Free Press.

House, R.J. and Wigdor, L.A. (1967). Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology, **20***, 369-389.

Huselid, M.A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal, **38***, 635-672

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

Ilies, R. and 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***, 1119-1139.

Ilies, R. and Judge, T.A. (2003). On the heritability of job satisfaction: The mediating role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **88***, 750-759.

Ilies, R. and 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***, 367-389.

Ilies, R. and Judge, T.A. (2005). Goal regulation across time: The effects of feedback and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***90***, 453-467.

Ilies, R., Scott, B.A. and Judge, T.A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, ***49***, 561-575.

Ilies, R., Wagner, D.T. and Morgeson, F.P. (2007). Explaining affective linkages in teams: Individual differences in susceptibility to contagion and individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***92***, 1140-1148.

Ironson, G.H., Smith, P.C., Brannick, M.T., Gibson, W.M. and 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.

Johnson, S.K. (2008). I second that emotion: Effects of emotional contagion and affect at work on leader and follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, ***19***, 1-19.

Judge, T.A. and Bono, J.E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***86***, 80-92.

Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Erez, A. and Locke, E.A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: The role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***90***, 257-268.

Judge, T.A., Heller, D., and Klinger, R. (2008). The dispositional sources of job satisfaction: A comparative test. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, ***57***, 361-372.

Judge, T.A., Heller, D. and Mount, M.K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **87**,* 530-541.

Judge, T.A., and Hurst, C. (2008). How the rich (and happy) get richer (and happier): Relationship of core self-evaluations to trajectories in attaining work success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **93**,* 849-863.

Judge, T.A., Scott, B.A. and Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, Job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **91**,* 126-138.

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

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Pucik, V. and Welbourne, T.M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **84**,* 107-122.

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

Kahn, W.A. (1992) To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human Relations, **45**,* 321-349.

Kanner, A.D., Coyne, J.C., Schaefer, C. and Lazarus, R.S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, **4**,* 1-39.

Kanungo, R.N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, **67**,* 341-349.

Kashdan, T.B., Biswas-Diener, R. and King, L.A. (2008). Reconsidering happiness: The costs of distinguishing between hedonics and eudaimonia. *Journal of Positive Psychology, **3**,* 219-233.

Kelly, J.R. and Barsade, S.G. (2001). Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, ***86***, 99-130.

Kesebir, P. and Diener, E. (2008) In pursuit of happiness: Empirical answers to philosophical questions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, ***3***, 117-125.

Kluger, A.N. and DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, ***119***, 254-284.

Kluger, A.N., Lewinsohn, S. and Aiello, J.R. (1994). The influence of feedback on mood: Linear effects on pleasantness and curvilinear effects on arousal. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, ***60***, 276-299.

Ko, J., Price, J.L. and Mueller, C.W. (1997). Assessment of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment in South Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***82***, 961-973.

Koys, D.J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, ***54***, 101-114.

Kraiger, K., Billings, R.S. and Isen, A.M. (1989). The influence of positive affective states on task perceptions and satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, ***44***, 12-25.

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

Kristof-Brown, A.L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, ***49***, 1-49.

Kunin, T. (1955). The construction of a new type of attitude measure. *Personnel Psychology*, ***9***, 65-78.

Larsen, J.T. and McKibban, A.R. (2008). Is happiness having what you want, wanting what you have, or both? *Psychological Science*, 19, 371-377.

Lawler, E.E. (1992). *The Ultimate Advantage: Creating the High-involvement Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawler, E.E. and Porter, L.W. (1967). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations*, ***7***, 20-28.

Lazarus, R.S. (1991). *Emotion and Adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A. and Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***87***, 52-65.

Levine, E.L. and Xu, X. (2005). *Development and validation of the state-trait emotion measure (STEM)*. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles.

Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M. D. (ed), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349).

Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P. (1990) Work motivation and satisfaction: Light at the end of the tunnel. *Psychological Science*, ***1***, 240-246.

Locke, E.A., Cartledge, N. and Knerr, C.S. (1970). Studies of the relationship between satisfaction, goal-setting, and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, ***5***, 135-158.

Lodahl, T.M. and Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***49***, 24-33.

Lucas, R.E. (2008). Personality and subjective well-being. In Eid, M. and Larsen, R. J. (eds.), *The Science of Subjective Well-Being* (pp. 171-194). New York: The Guilford Press.

Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, ***23***, 695-706.

Luthans, F. and Avolio, B.J. (2009). The point of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, ***30***, 291-307.

Lykken, D. and Tellegen, A. (1996). Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon. *Psychological Science*, *7*, 186-189.

Lyubomirsky, S. (2001). Why are some people happier than others? The role of cognitive and motivational processes in well-being. *American Psychologist*, ***56***, 239-249.

Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). *The How of Happiness: A Scientific Approach to Getting the Life You Want*. New York: Penguin Press.

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L. and Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, ***131***, 803-855.

Lyubomirsky, S. and Ross, L. (1997). Hedonic consequences of social comparison: A contrast of happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, ***73***, 1141-1157.

Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K.M. and Schkade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology*, ***9***, 111-131.

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

Martin, L.L. and Clore, G.L. (2001). *Theories of Mood and Cognition: A User's Guidebook*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mason, C.M. and Griffin, M.A. (2005). Group task satisfaction: The group's shared attitude to its task and work environment. *Group and Organization Management,* ***30***, 623-652.

Mathieu, J.E. and Zajac, D.M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin,* ***108***, 171-194.

Maybery, D. J., Jones-Ellis, J., Neale, J. and Arentz, A. (2006). The positive event scale: Measuring uplift frequency and intensity in an adult sample. *Social Indicators Research,* ***78***, 61-83.

McMahon, D.M. (2006). *Happiness: A History*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review,* ***1***, 61, 29.

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

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

Miner, A.G., Glomb, T.M. and Hulin, C. (2005). Experience sampling mood and its correlates at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* ***78***, 171-193.

Morgeson, F.P and Humphrey, S.E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* ***91***, 1321-1339.

Mount, M., Ilies, R. and Johnson, E. (2006) Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, **59**, 591-622.

Mowday, R.T. (1998). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, ***8***, 387-402.

Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, ***14***, 224-247.

Nicholson, N. (1998). How hardwired Is human behavior? *Harvard Business Review*, ***76***, 134-147.

Ones, D.S. and Viswesvaran, C. (1996). Bandwidth-fidelity dilemma in personality measurement for personnel selection. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, ***17***, 609-626.

Organ, D.W. (1977) A Reappraisal and Reinterpretation of the Satisfaction-Causes-Performance Hypothesis. *Academy of Management Review*, ***2***, 46-53.

Organ, D.W. and Near, J.P. (1985). Cognition vs affect in measures of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychology*, ***20***, 241-253.

Parker, C.P., Baltes, B.B., Young, S.A., Huff, J.W., Altmann, R.A., Lacost, H.A. and Roberts, J.E. (2003). Relationships between psychological climate perceptions and work outcomes: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, ***24***, 389-416.

Patterson, M., Warr, P. and West, M. (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, ***77***, 193-216.

Pekrun, R., Elliot, A.J. and Maier, M.A. (2006). Achievement goals and discrete achievement emotions: A theoretical model and prospective test. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, ***98***, 583-597.

Peterson, C. and Seligman, M.E.P. (2004). *Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The Human Equation: Building Profits by Putting People First.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Podsakoff, N.P., LePine, J.A. and LePine, M.A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***92***, 438-454.

Pressman, S.D. and Cohen, S. (2005). Does positive affect influence health? *Psychological Bulletin*, ***131***, 925-971.

Proudfoot, J.G., Corr, P.J., Guest, D.E. and Dunn, G. (2009). Cognitive-behavioural training to change attributional style improves employee well-being, job satisfaction, productivity, and turnover. *Personality & Individual Differences*, ***46***, 147-153.

Rath, T. (2006). *Vital Friends: The People You Can't Afford to Live Without*. New York: Gallup Press.

Rawsthorne, L.J. and Elliot, A.J. (1999). Achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, ***3***, 326-344.

Reis, H.T., Sheldon, K.M., Gable, S.L., Roscoe, J. and Ryan, R.M. (2000). Daily well-being: The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, ***26***, 419-435.

Remington, N.A., Fabrigar, L.R. and Visser, P.S. (2000). Reexamining the circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, ***79***, 286-300.

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

Roberts, L.M. (2006). Response – shifting the lens on organizational life: The added value of positive scholarship. *Academy of Management Review*, ***31***, 74-80.

Roberts, L.M., Dutton, J.E., Spreitzer, G.M., Heaphy, E.D. and Quinn, R.E. (2005). Composing the reflected best-self portrait: Building pathways for becoming extraordinary in work organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, ***30***, 712-736.

Roberts, L.M., Spreitzer, G., Dutton, J., Quinn, R., Heaphy, E. and Barker, B. (2005). How to play to your strengths. *Harvard Business Review*, ***83***, 74-80.

Roehling, M.V., Cavanaugh, M.A., Moynihan, L.M. and Boswell, W.R. (2000). The nature of the new employment relationship: A content analysis of the practitioner and academic literatures. *Human Resource Management*, ***39***, 305-320.

Rucci, A.J., Kirn, S.P. and Quinn, R.T. (1998). The employee-customer-profit chain at Sears. *Harvard Business Review*, ***76***, 82-97.

Russell, J.A. (1978). Evidence of convergent validity on the dimensions of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, ***36***, 1152-1168.

Russell, J.A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, ***39***, 1161–1178.

Russell, J.A. (2003) Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion. *Psychological Review*, ***110***, 145-172.

Ryan, R.M. and 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. and 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.

Ryan, R.M., Huta, V. and Deci, E.L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, ***9***, 139-170.

Ryff, C.D. and Singer, B.H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, ***9***, 13-39.

Salancik, G.R. and Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, ***23***, 224-253.

Salanova, M., Bakker, A.B. and Llorens, S. (2006). Flow at work: Evidence for an upward spiral of personal and organizational resources. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, **7**, 1-22.

Saleh, S.D. and Hosek, J. (1976). Job involvement: Concepts and measurements. *Academy of Management Journal*, ***19***, 213-224.

Sansone, C. and Harackiewicz, J.M. (1996). "I don't feel like it": The function of interest in self-regulation. In Martin, L.L. and Tesser, A. (eds.) *Striving and Feeling: Interactions among Goals, Affect and Self-regulation* (pp. 203-228). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schachtel, H.J. (1954). *The Real Enjoyment of Living*. New York: Dutton.

Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., González-romá, V. and Bakker, A.B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, ***3***, 71-92.

Scherer, K., Schorr, A. and Johnstone, T., (Eds.). (2001). *Appraisal Processes in Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schimmack, U. (2008). The structure of subjective well-being. In Eid, M. and Larsen, R. J. (Eds.), *The Science of Subjective Well-being* (pp. 97-123). New York: The Guilford Press.

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

Seligman, M.E.P. (2002). *Authentic Happiness: Using the New Positive Psychology to Realize Your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment*. New York: Free Press.

Seligman, M.E.P. and Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, **55***, 5-14.

Seligman, M.E.P., Steen, T.A., Park, N. and Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist, **60***, 410-421.

Seo, M., Barrett, L. and Bartunek, J.M. (2004). The role of affective experience in work motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, **29**, p423-439.

Shaver, P., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D. and O'Connor, C. (1987). Emotion knowledge: Further exploration of a prototype approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, **52***, 1061-1086.

Sheldon, K.M. and Elliot, A.J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, **76***, 482-497.

Sheldon, K.M. and Lyubomirsky, S. (2007). It is possible to become happier? (And if so, how?). *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, **1***, 129-145.

Sheldon, K.M., Ryan, R. and Reis, H.T. (1996). What makes for a good day? Competence and autonomy in the day and in the person. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, ***22***, 1270-1279.

Shirom, A. (2003). Feeling vigorous at work? The construct of vigor and the study of positive affect in organizations. In Ganster, D. and Perrewe, P.L. (eds.), *Research in Organizational Stress and Well-Being* (Vol. 3, pp. 135-165). Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.

Shirom, A. (2006). Explaining vigor: On the antecedents and consequences of vigor as a positive affect at work. In Cooper, C. L. and Nelson, D. (eds.), *Organizational Behavior: Accentuating the Positive at Work* (pp. 86-100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Silvia, P.J. (2006). *Exploring the Psychology of Interest*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sirota, D., Mischkind, L.A. and Meltzer, M.I., (2005). *The Enthusiastic Employee*. Upper Saddle River: Wharton School Publishing.

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

Spreitzer, G.M. and Sutcliffe, K.M. (2007). Thriving in organizations. In Nelson, D.L. and Cooper, C.L. (eds.), *Positive Organizational Behavior* (pp. 74-85). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Spreitzer, G., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J., Sonenshein, S. and Grant, A.M. (2005). A socially embedded model of thriving at work. *Organization Science*, ***16***, 537-549.

Stallings, M.C., Dunham, C.C., Gatz, M., Baker, L.A. and Bengtson, V.L. (1997). Relationships among life events and psychological well-being: More evidence for a two factor theory of well-being. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, ***16***, 104-199.

Staw, B.M. and Barsade, S.G. (1993). Affect and managerial performance: A test of the sadder-but-wiser vs. happier-and-smarter hypothesis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, ***38***, 304-331.

Staw, B.M., Bell, N.E. and Clausen, J.A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, ***31***, 56-77.

Staw, B.M. and Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***70***, 469-480.

Staw, B.M., Sutton, R.I. and Pelled, L.H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science*, ***5***, 51-71.

Steel, P., Schmidt, J. and Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, ***134***, 138-161.

Suh, E.M. and Koo, J. (2008). Comparing subjective well-being across cultures and nations: The “what” and “why” questions. In Eid, M. and Larsen, R. J. (eds.), *The Science of Subjective Well-Being* (pp. 414-427). New York: The Guilford Press.

Swailes, S. (2002). Organizational commitment: A critique of the construct and measures. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, ***4***, 155-179.

Sy, T., Côté, S. and Saavedra, R. (2005). The contagious leader: Impact of the leader's mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***90***, 295-305.

Tellegen. A., Lykken. D.T., Bouchard. T.J. Jr., Wilcox, K., Segal, N. and Rich. S. (1988). Personality similarity in twins reared apart and together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, ***54***, 1031-1039.

Tepper, B.J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, ***33***, 261-289.

Thomas, J. and Griffin, R. (1983). The social information processing model of task design: A review of the literature. *Academy of Management Review*, ***8***, 672-682.

Thoresen, C.J., Kaplan, S.A., Barsky, A.P., Warren, C.R. and de Chermont, K. (2003). The affective underpinnings of job perceptions and attitudes: A meta-analytic review and integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, ***129***, 914-945.

Totterdell, P. (2000). Catching moods and hitting runs: Mood linkage and subjective performance in professional sports teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***85***, 848-859.

Totterdell, P., Kellett, S., Briner, R. and Teuchmann, K. (1998). Evidence of mood linkage in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, ***74***, 1504-1515.

Tracy, J.L. and Robins R.W. (2007). The nature of pride. In Tracy, J.L., Robins, R.W. and Tangney, J. P. (eds.), *The Self-conscious Emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 263-282). New York: Guilford Press.

Van Katwyk, P.T., Fox, S., Spector, P.E. and Kelloway, E.K. (2000). Using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, ***5***, 219-230.

Verquer, M.L., Beehr, T.A. and Wagner, S.H. (2003) A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, ***63***, 473-489.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.

Walter, F. and Bruch, H. (2008). The positive group affect spiral: A dynamic model of the emergence of positive affective similarity in work groups. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, ***29***, 239-261.

Warr, P.B. (1987). *Work, Unemployment, and Mental Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, **63**,* 193-210.

Warr, P. (2007). *Work, Happiness, and Unhappiness*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Waterman, A.S., Schwartz, S.J. and Conti, R. (2008). The implications of two conceptions of happiness (hedonic enjoyment and eudaimonia) for the understanding of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Happiness Studies, **9**,* 41-79.

Watson, D., & Clark, L.A. (1994, updated 1999). The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule – expanded form. Iowa City: University of Iowa (http://www.psychology.uiowa.edu/faculty/Clark/PANAS-X.pdf).

Watson, D., Clark, L.A. and Tellegen, A. (1988). Development of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, **54**,* 1063-1070.

Watson, D. and Slack, A.K. (1993). General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, **54**,* 181-202.

Watson, D. and Tellegen, A. (1985). Toward a consensual structure of mood. *Psychological Bulletin, **98**,* 219-202.

Watson, D., Wiese, D., Vaidya, J. and Tellegen, A. (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: Structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychobiological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, **76**,* 820-838.

Weiss, A., Bates, T.C. and Luciano, M. (2008). Happiness is a personal(ity) thing: The genetics of personality and well-being in a representative sample. *Psychological Science*, ***19***, 205-210.

Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W. and Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, No. 22)*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Weiss, H.M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs, and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, ***12***, 173-194.

Weiss, H.M. and 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., Nicholas, J.P. and Daus, C.S. (1999). An examination of the joint effects of affective experiences and job beliefs on job satisfaction and variations in affective experiences over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, ***78***, 1-24.

Westerman, J.W. and Cyr, L.A. (2004). An integrative analysis of person-organization fit theories. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, ***12***, 252-261.

Wicker, A.W. (1969). Attitudes versus actions: The relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. *Journal of Social Issues*, ***25***, 41-78.

Wright, T.A. (2003). Positive organizational behavior: An idea whose time has truly come. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, ***24***, 437-442.

Wright, T.A. and Bonett, D.G. (1996). *The role of activation and pleasantness-based affect in performance prediction*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Cincinnati.

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

Table 1

Happiness-Related Constructs in the Workplace

Unit Level	Person Level	Transient Level
Morale/collective job satisfaction	Job satisfaction	State job satisfaction
Group affective tone	Dispositional affect	Momentary affect
Group mood	Affective organizational commitment	Flow state
Unit level engagement	Job involvement	Momentary mood at work
Group task satisfaction	Typical mood at work	State engagement
	Engagement	Task enjoyment
	Thriving	Emotion at work
	Vigor	State intrinsic motivation
	Flourishing	
	Affective well-being at work	

Table 2

Job/Task Characteristics Related to Happiness

Hackman and Oldham (1975)	Morgeson and Humphrey (2006)	Warr (2007)
Task Significance	Work Scheduling Autonomy	Opportunity for Personal Control
Skill Variety	Decision-Making Autonomy	Opportunity for Skill Use
Task Identity	Work Methods Autonomy	Externally Generated Goals
Feedback from the Job	Task Variety	Variety
Autonomy	Task Significance	Environmental Clarity
	Task Identity	Contact with Others
	Feedback From Job	Availability of Money
	Job Complexity	Physical Security
	Information Processing	Valued Social Position
	Problem Solving	Supportive Supervision
	Skill Variety	Career Outlook
	Specialization	Equity
	Social Support	
	Initiated Interdependence	
	Received Interdependence	
	Interaction Outside Organization	
	Feedback From Others	
	Ergonomics	
	Physical Demands (-)	
	Work Conditions	
	Equipment Use	