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Guided by the Dualistic Model of Passion (DMP; Vallerand, et al., 2003), border (Clark, 2000) and enrichment (Rothbard, 2001; Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977) theories, this dissertation tested a mediated model that examined the role of work-life balance in the relationship between harmonious and obsessive passion (HP and OP, respectively), with performance indicators such as in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours, and well-being indicators such as job and life satisfaction. HP for work was hypothesised to positively relate with employee performance and well-being, while OP for work will be negatively related. This relationship is mediated by work-life balance. Employees with HP will have higher levels of work-life balance, enabling them to have favourable performance and well-being outcomes. In contrast, employees with OP will experience less work-life balance, preventing them from attaining optimum work outcomes. This dissertation utilised a field survey methodology across three studies—validation of the passion for work scale (Study 1), main effects of passion for work (Study 2), and mediating effects work-life balance to employee outcomes (Study 3).

Study 1 tested the two-factor structure of the passion for work scale using confirmatory factor analysis (Study 1a) and established convergent and divergent
validity through correlations of conceptually similar and dissimilar constructs (Study 1b). Results concurred with previous validation of the original passion scale (Vallerand, et al., 2003), where harmonious and obsessive passion for work serve as two separate factors. Results also showed that HP and OP for work are distinct constructs in comparison with work involvement, goal orientation, workaholism, work engagement, and calling. Study 2 tested the role of passion for work on in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours, and job and life satisfaction. Hypotheses were partially supported. Findings showed that HP for work was positively related to indicators of employee performance and well-being, while OP for work was not significantly related to all outcomes. Study 3 tested the indirect effect of work-life balance in the relationship between passion for work and performance and well-being outcomes. Findings lend partial support to the hypotheses. The indirect effects of work-life balance in the relationship between HP and OP for work and performance outcomes were not significant. However, significant indirect effects of work-life balance were found between both types of workplace passion and indicators of employee well-being.

This research program contributes to the workplace passion literature in several ways. First, further validation of the passion for work scale among samples from a non-Western developing context further broadens the applicability of the Dualistic Model of Passion. Second, examining the role of passion for work substantiates the claims of popular press and also determines the extent to which passion can be an enabler or deterrent of optimum work performance and well-being. Finally, integrating the DMP, and border and enrichment perspectives further extends our understanding of how passionate employees manage work and non-work life domains to attain balance, and its consequences to employee work outcomes. Implications for research and practice are discussed.
# Table of Contents

Signed Statement of Originality............................................................. i  
Acknowledgements................................................................................ ii  
Dedication............................................................................................... v  
Publication arising from the Thesis...................................................... vi  
Abstract................................................................................................ vii  
Table of Contents.................................................................................. ix  
List of Tables......................................................................................... xiv  
List of Figures........................................................................................ xv  

## Chapter 1

Driven towards a middle-ground: Passion and work-life Balance among Filipino professionals

1. Introduction........................................................................................... 1  
   Research Aim 1.................................................................................... 4  
   Research Aim 2.................................................................................... 6  
   Research Aim 3.................................................................................... 9  
   Summary................................................................................................ 12  

## Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

1. Introduction........................................................................................... 15  
   Concept of Passion............................................................................... 16  
   Consequences of Passion.................................................................... 21  
      Affective consequences..................................................................... 21  
      Behavioural consequences............................................................... 22  
      Outcomes related to individual performance.................................... 22  
      Outcomes related to mental health................................................... 23  
   Passion and work-related outcomes.................................................... 24  
      Attitudinal and behavioural outcomes............................................. 24  
      Performance and well-being in the workplace................................. 25  
   Literature review synthesis................................................................. 28  

Construct validation of the Workplace Passion Scale.......................... 32  

1. The role of context.............................................................................. 32  
   Convergent and divergent validation.................................................. 34  
      Work involvement............................................................................. 35  
      Goal orientation............................................................................... 36
Chapter 5

Study 3: The Mediating Role of Work-Life Balance on Performance and Well-being Outcomes among Passionate Employees

Introduction and Hypothesis

Method

Participants

Procedure

Measures

Passion for work

Work-life balance

Co-Worker ratings of in-role behaviour

Co-Worker ratings of organisational citizenship behaviours

Self and co-worker ratings of job satisfaction

Self and co-worker ratings of life satisfaction

Controls

Results

Main effects analyses

Mediation analyses

Harmonious passion and outcome variables

Obsessive passion and outcome variables

Supplementary analyses

Discussion

Summary

Chapter 6

General Discussion of Key Findings and Conclusions

Construct Validation of the Passion for Work Scale

Main Effects of Passion for Work on In-Role Behaviours (IRB), Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB), Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction

Mediating Effect of Work-Life Balance in the relationship between In-Role Behaviours (IRB), Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB), Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction
List of Tables

Table 1  Summative descriptions between passion for work and conceptually-relevant constructs 44
Table 2  Means, standard deviations, coefficient alpha, and intercorrelations of passion, work involvement and goal orientations 84
Table 3  Means, standard deviations, coefficient alpha, and intercorrelations of passion, workaholism, work engagement, and calling 84
Table 4  Means, standard deviations, coefficient alpha, and intercorrelations of Study 2 variables 95
Table 5  Results of hierarchical regression analyses of Study 2 variables 96
Table 6  Means, standard deviations, reliability, and intercorrelations of Study 3 variables 110
Table 7  Results of hierarchical regression analyses of Study 3 variables 111
Table 8  Indirect effects of harmonious passion via work-life balance on employee performance and well-being outcomes 114
Table 9  Indirect effects of obsessive passion via work-life balance on employee performance and well-being outcomes 115
Table 10 Reported correlations between harmonious and obsessive passion in the leisure context 127
Table 11 Reported correlations between harmonious and obsessive passion in the work context 129
Table 12 Overview of hypotheses and findings across studies 137
List of Figures

Figure 1A  Proposed theoretical model of the mediating role of work life balance in the relationship between passion for work and performance outcomes.  13

Figure 1B  Proposed theoretical model of the mediating role of work life balance in the relationship between passion for work and well-being outcomes.  14

Figure 2  Conceptual map of the consequences of passion with mediators and moderators  31
Chapter 1

Driven towards a middle-ground: Passion and work-life balance among Filipino professionals

Introduction

Working in organisations is regarded as a hub of opportunities that may benefit an individual’s skill and character development. Research on the factors and processes that determine the motivation of individuals in pursuing their work have steadily risen (Kanfer, Chen, & Prichard, 2008). Consequently, the notion of someone who is passionately driven towards one’s work has generated considerable interest in organisational behaviour. For instance, Boyatzis, Mckee, and Goleman (2002) reported that scholars consider passion as a vital ingredient that enables employees to sustain the energy essential to organisational excellence. Passion is also what managers can utilise to motivate or inspire others. Similarly, passionate people create their own success, become productive, self-fulfilled, and exceed expectations (Chang, 2002).

The aforementioned claims in popular press such as that of Chang, and Boyatzis and colleagues have also been substantiated in various empirical sources. For instance, Baum and Locke (2004) cited passion as one of the driving forces behind venture growth, with qualities of passionate people that reflect enthusiasm and zeal, enabling them to confront opportunities as well as work through barriers and challenges. Passion provides the drive and courage needed to overcome personal, social, and organisational barriers. Passionate individuals also facilitate continuous organisational learning by harnessing good ideas and strategic wisdom (Bierly, Kessler, & Christensen, 2000). However, despite the popular press’ accolades for the role of passion at work, there are few who digress and favour other qualities such as effort or hard work as more relevant to work success (Cuban, 2012; Sweet, 2013). These diverse perspectives about passion
for work raise the question whether being passionate at work is actually favourable, or something that may potentially cause workers more harm than good.

Empirical work on passion has revolved around the conceptualisation of the Dualistic Model of Passion (DMP; Vallerand, Blanchard, Mageau, Koestner, Ratelle, Le´onard et al., 2003) which defined passion as a strong inclination towards a self-defining activity, fuelled by a person’s liking (or even loving) of such activity. Passionate individuals find the activity important and highly valuable, where time and energy are invested in its engagement, usually during periods of leisure.

The DMP categorises passionate individuals into two types—the harmonious and obsessive—and is differentiated on the basis of how the passionate activity is internalised. Internalisation process involves an active and personal endorsement of the importance of externally motivated behaviors such as work, and is facilitated by satisfying the basic needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness (Niemec, Ryan, & Deci, 2006). Harmonious or obsessive passion emerges as a result of an autonomous or controlled internalisation of the passionate activity into one’s identity. Harmoniously passionate individuals have autonomously internalised the passionate activity which enables them to participate in the activity while having control of the extent they participate in it. The passionate activity occupies an important but not overpowering part of one’s identity and thus, is in harmony with other aspects of an individual’s life. In contrast, a controlled internalisation enables an obsessively passionate individual to participate in an activity without the capacity to control the extent of his or her participation. In this case, the activity has control over the individual and the person cannot help but continue participating in the passionate activity (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010).

Contingencies, such as feelings of excitement, social acceptance or elevated self-esteem, play a crucial role in differentiating harmonious and obsessive passion.
(Vallerand et al., 2003). As a result of the controlled internalisation, these contingencies are attached to the passionate activity which allows the obsessively passionate to experience feelings of self-acceptance or enhanced self-esteem through continuous participation in the activity. Thus, these ego-invested contingencies contribute to the rigidity and inflexibility in task engagement among the obsessively passionate.

Harmonious passion is a reflection of an autonomous internalisation of the activity, where participation is volitional and based on enjoyment and/or mastery of skills, instead of extrinsic sources. The harmoniously passionate does not rely on contingencies, which allows them to demonstrate a flexible approach to various tasks—whether it be the passionate activity or otherwise. They participate in their passionate activity and at the same time, are able to divert their participation to other important tasks (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010). In contrast, the controlled internalisation among the obsessively passionate individuals causes them to exemplify such rigidity in two ways. First, it may be in situations where they choose to continue participating in the passionate activity over other tasks. Second, they may participate in a non-passionate task but remain preoccupied with thoughts about the passionate activity.

The DMP originally contextualised passion in activities within the leisure context. Alongside this conceptualisation, Vallerand and colleagues (2003) pioneered the passion research by developing the Passion Scale. It consisted of two subscales with seven items each. They initially tested a two-factor model of the original 14-item scale and found support for the existing duality of passion. Minor revisions to the passion scale have been made, which reduced the harmonious and obsessive passion subscales to six items (Vallerand, 2010). The Passion Scale has been used in various contexts such as sports (Donahue, Rip, & Vallerand, 2009; Amiot, Vallerand, & Blanchard, 2006; Philippe, Vallerand, Houlfort, Lavigne, & Donahue, 2010), education
While prior work has been devoted to understanding the correlates of passion, several gaps still exist that warrant further empirical investigation, particularly in the areas of (1) scale validation of the passion for work scale, (2) examining the relationship between passion for work and employee performance and well-being, and (3) mechanisms linking passion for work and employee performance and well-being.

**Research Aim 1: Establishing the construct validation of the passion for work scale**

Despite the extensive use of the Passion Scale, few have reported validation studies regarding the structure of passion in their respective contexts. The current literature about workplace passion has been predominantly contextualised in France (e.g., Vallerand, Paquet, Philippe, & Charest, 2010), Canada (e.g., Lavigne et al., 2012), the United States (e.g., Ho & Pollack, 2014), Sweden (e.g., Thorgen & Wincent, 2013), Russia (e.g., Astakhova & Porter, 2015) and Norway (e.g., Donahue et al., 2012), with samples such as health care practitioners, teachers, entrepreneurs and other working professionals. With the exception of Liu, Chen, and Yao (2011) whose research was conducted in a non-Western setting, but otherwise developed nation (i.e., China), the common denominator among most of these contexts include a Western setting among relatively developed countries.

However, despite the relative abundance of workplace passion research, only Ho, Wong, and Lee’s (2011) examination of the measurement model of harmonious and obsessive passion, and Astakhova and Porter’s (2015) validation of the passion against pertinent variables in their study account for the validity of the passion construct as applied in the work setting. The only other validation studies involve the adaptation of the passion scale to suit the gambling context (Rousseau, Vallerand, Rattelle, Mageau,
While there is a general acceptance of the two-factor structure of the passion construct across work and non-work contexts, it is important to account for the potential influences of contextual and environmental characteristics that may promote or hinder one’s passion towards work (Johns, 2006). Further validation of this scale is beneficial by its ability to capture the passion characteristic across contexts and sample characteristics, enabling the generalisability of this construct.

Thus, the first objective of this research program is to conduct a construct validation of the passion for work scale. This is undertaken in two ways. First, a confirmatory factor analysis is employed to test the two-factor measurement model of harmonious and obsessive passion. Second, harmonious and obsessive passion for work constructs are correlated with other conceptually similar and dissimilar constructs to establish convergent and divergent validity. The original conceptualisation of the passion scale was based on an activity that excludes school or work. Likewise, previous validation of the passion scale employed Western samples that include non-English and English speakers, predominantly situated in developed nations.

In this study, passionate working individuals are investigated, providing support for the construct’s suitability in the work context. Furthermore, the samples for the validation study are employees from different professions from the Philippines, a non-Western context and with work-related motives that reflect environmental and cultural considerations. Establishing the construct validity of the passion scale brings important contributions. First, testing its factor structure against a sample that is different from those of the original and subsequent samples (i.e., developed, Western context) establishes the generalisability of the scale in measuring and typifying passion for work. Second, testing for the convergent and divergent validity also establishes the
uniqueness of passion as a construct, as well as the suitability of the Dualistic Model of Passion in explaining passion as a motivational force at work.

**Research Aim 2: Relationship between passion for work and employee outcomes**

The current DMP literature is also limited in terms of identifying the role of harmonious and obsessive passion on performance outcomes at work. Passion has always been considered as a driving force that enables individuals to display a high degree of dedication towards an activity (Vallerand, et al., 2007). In the context of work, an empirical examination of the role of passion can be of value in understanding the extent of its influence in enabling an employee’s capacity to perform what is required in the job. Passion for one’s work has been regarded as an important attribute among employees, suggesting that those who are more enthusiastic and focused on their jobs are qualities that organisations look for in prospective employees (Perrewé, Hochwarter, Ferris, McAllister, & Harris, 2013; Ho et al., 2011).

The Dualistic Model of Passion has been used to investigate different work-related outcomes, such as job creativity (Liu et al., 2011), entrepreneurial behaviours (Murnieks, Mosakowski, & Cardon, 2014), goal challenge (Thorgren & Wincent, 2013), and perceptions of job demands and resources (Lavigne, Forest, Fernet, & Crevier-Braud, 2014). Few studies have also examined firm-level work performance in the project management and entrepreneurship contexts. For instance, Patel, Thorgren, and Wincent (2015) investigated how passionate leaders contribute to job-creation outcomes for organisations. Ho and Pollack (2014) also found that passionate entrepreneurs impact referrals and total business incomes as measures of financial performance. However, with the exception of Ho and colleagues (2011) and Astakhova and Porter’s (2015) studies, there is still limited research on how passion for work impacts individual job performance.
Previous research on passion for work and individual work performance has yet to capture performance outcomes in terms of in-role behaviours (IRBs) and organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs). Investigating such relationship is worthwhile as IRBs and OCBs serve important functions in performance appraisal, optimal organisational functioning and financial stability (Hackman, 1990; Katz, 1964; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Furthermore, using the DMP as a theoretical anchor that explains the positive and negative consequences of passion on employee performance strengthen its utility in management and organisational behaviour research.

A person’s well-being has been generally investigated within the DMP literature, both in non-work (e.g., Carpentier, Mageau, & Vallerand, 2012; Philippe, Vallerand & Lavigne, 2009; Rousseau & Vallerand, 2008) and work settings (e.g., Forest, Mageau, Sarrazin, & Morin, 2011; Donahue et al., 2012). In particular, satisfaction towards one’s life and work has been used to describe well-being among passionate individuals. For instance, life satisfaction was used as an indicator of psychological adjustment and well-being among recreational gamers, athletes and student-apprentices (Vallerand et al., 2007; Przybylski, Weinstein, Ryan, & Rigby, 2009; Amiot et al., 2006). Other studies also suggest that job satisfaction is a relevant indicator of employee well-being and sound physical and mental health (DeJonge & Schaufelli, 1998; Faragher, Cass, & Cooper, 2005). Thus, job satisfaction, affective strains, family and life satisfaction and stress, were indicators used to capture employee well-being (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Thompson & Prottas, 2006).

Despite the utility of satisfaction as an operationalisation of well-being in the workplace, there is limited investigation on work satisfaction together with life satisfaction as indicators of employee well-being, particularly among passionate
employees. Examining the role of passion for work on one’s satisfaction at work and life in general is important for several reasons. First, it can provide a comprehensive illustration of individual well-being that encompasses more than one context. Indeed, prior studies also reported a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989; Judge & Watanabe, 1993).

Second, employee well-being is important as it has been shown to have a significant impact on how employees fare in their work. Specifically, employee well-being is related to organisational performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Wright & Cropanzano, 2000; Danna & Griffin, 1999), organisational citizenship behaviours (Podsakoff et al., 2000), and absenteeism and turnover (Spector, 1997, as cited in Grant, Christianson & Price, 2007).

Indeed, well-being in the workplace has been described as an overarching satisfaction in one’s life between work/job-related and non-work domains (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Employee well-being may not necessarily be confined within the work environment but also considers the extent to how one positively feels and views his or her experiences in non-work contexts. Since family and work situations are integral facets of an individual’s life, consideration for the employee well-being within the scope of work and health, relations with one’s family and overall life satisfaction is paramount (Zheng, Zhu, Zhao, & Zhang, 2015). Thus, using general measures of well-being to capture employee well-being may also be inadequate as experiences in work and home domains may influence well-being in different ways.

The second aim of this research program is to determine the relationship between the two types of passion and employees’ IRBs, OCBs, job satisfaction and life satisfaction. This study contributes to existing literature by examining the extent to which passion enables or deters successful work performance and employee well-being. Popular press has revered passion for work as a strong force that enable employees to
have a sense of purpose and engagement at work, which consequently renders the organisation efficient and profitable (Tucker, 2002). However, given what is available in the passion literature, the way in which passion is translated into these positive outcomes that are beneficial for the organisation remains unclear (Perrewé et al., 2013). Therefore, an empirical examination of these relationships provides a broader understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of possessing a particular type of passion towards work.

This study can also be a valuable addition to existing studies on passion and employee well-being. Investigating how passion for work impacts job and life satisfaction shows a holistic approach to employee well-being. Indeed, attaining well-being at work plays a significant role in employee productivity, decision making, and contribution to the organisation (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Further, conceptualisation of employee well-being should also recognise the role of mental health, which includes subjective and psychological well-being at its core (Zhang et al., 2015). This study illustrates how passion for work may influence an individual’s life in more than one domain (i.e., work and non-work context). As such, this further extends the scope and establishes the predictive power of the DMP in explaining work-related outcomes.

**Research Aim 3: Mediating mechanism linking passion for work and employee outcomes**

Finally, the current passion literature also reflects limited mediating mechanisms that explain job performance and well-being outcomes among passionate employees. Examining mediating mechanisms extends the existing knowledge by identifying relevant processes that enable passionate employees to achieve certain work outcomes. Specifically, this study demonstrates how having a particular passion towards work play a role in one’s ability to manage one’s work-life balance, which in turn, influence one’s job performance and well-being.
Previous research on mediating mechanisms of passion and employee outcomes such as performance and well-being involve internal processes such as flow (Lavigne et al., 2012), cognitive engagement (Ho et al., 2011), organisational identification (Astakhova & Porter, 2015), needs satisfaction (Forest et al., 2011), rumination (Donahue et al., 2012), work satisfaction and depression (Houlfort, Philippe, Vallerand, & Ménard, 2013), and on/off-task work-life thoughts (Thorgren, Wincent & Sirén, 2013). Mediating mechanisms that imply an interference approach to engaging at work among passionate employees have been explored. For instance, researchers have investigated the relationship of passion for work on health and well-being outcomes via work conflict, work hours (i.e., time spent at work) and work-life thoughts (Vallerand, et al., 2010; Caudroit, Boiche, Stephan, Le Scanff, & Trouilloud, 2011; Thorgren et al., 2013). The common pattern of the findings was, unlike those with harmonious passion for work, the obsessively passionate are more susceptible to greater work-life conflict and spending longer work hours. These eventually have more negative consequences, such as emotional exhaustion, less involvement in leisure time physical activity and lower levels of well-being.

These existing mechanisms have been contextualised within one’s participation in one’s work. This means that existing mediating variables that contribute to work outcomes arise when one is currently engaged at work, or as a consequence of interference from two seemingly competing contexts that the individual accommodates. Indeed, passionate employees can be viewed as those who are highly involved with their work. However, literature about the current mechanisms understates the role of maintaining a state of equilibrium in terms of involvement and satisfaction in one’s work and non-work experiences. It is important to recognise that passionate employees are individuals who must also live through different and significant facets of their personal lives. Given how DMP describes the differences between harmonious and
obsessively passionate individuals in terms of the control they have on their passion, a mediating mechanism that reflects the degree to which employees are able to satisfactorily accommodate their experiences from both work and non-work contexts is beneficial in understanding its impact on employee work outcomes. Thus, work-life balance is proposed as a mediating mechanism between passion for work and employee performance outcomes and well-being.

Work-life balance is a construct that depicts participation in various aspects of an individual’s life, as well as the degree of one’s satisfaction and effective functioning at work and non-work domains (Clark, 2000; Greenblatt, 2002). Previous research on work-life balance signifies its importance through various positive outcomes. For instance, being able to spend adequate time and involvement to both work and non-work (i.e., family life) were found to contribute to higher quality of life and a positive impact on job and marital satisfaction (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003; Voydanoff, 2005).

The theoretical underpinnings of work-life balance revolve around work/family border (Clark, 2000) and enrichment (Rothbard, 2001; Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977) theories. These theories suggest that managing one’s roles and resources in various life domains (e.g., work and non-work) yields both positive and negative consequences in one’s work and personal life. This complements the limitation of the DMP, which explains inherent volitional or non-volitional behaviours that enables or disables passionate employees to attain equilibrium, but less on how managing one’s workplace passion between different life domains impact their performance and well-being at work. Thus, using work-life balance as a mediating mechanism illustrate the extent to which passionate employees are able to manage their work and non-work tasks toward the corresponding consequences.
The final objective of this study is to investigate the mediating role of work life balance in the relationship between employee passion and work outcomes. Work life balance is contextualised in situations with bidirectional interaction between work and non-work/personal life domains (i.e., work to personal life, and vice versa) with interference and enhancement components as a result of participation in these two domains (Fisher, Bulger & Smith, 2009; Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007). By incorporating work-life balance as a mediating mechanism, the present study contributes to existing literature by integrating the Dualistic Model of Passion (DMP, Vallerand et al., 2003), and border (Clark, 2000) and enrichment theories (Rothbard, 2001; Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977) in explaining the mediated relationship. This highlights the difference between harmonious and obsessive passion for work and its impact on the capacity to manage one’s roles and resources by achieving a sense of balance between participation in work and non-work domains.

Summary

This chapter presented the dissertation’s research program that comprises a programmatic series of studies. Study 1 reports a construct validation study of the Passion Scale contextualised in the work setting. Study 2 investigates the relationship between passion for work and work performance (i.e., in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours) and well-being (i.e., job and life satisfaction). Finally, the mediating role of work-life balance in the relationship between passion for work and performance and well-being outcomes is examined in Study 3. As prescribed by Vallerand et al (2003) and Vallerand and Houlfort (2003), working individuals can also exude passion towards their occupation. Hence, employees from various occupational groups comprise the samples across the three studies. The proposed theoretical model is presented in Figures 1A and 1B.
Figure 1A. Proposed theoretical model of the mediating role of work life balance in the relationship between passion for work and performance outcomes.
Figure 1B. Proposed theoretical model of the mediating role of work life balance in the relationship between passion for work and well-being outcomes.
Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The interest in passion as a motivational construct has burgeoned over the last decade (Vallerand et al., 2003; Carpentier et al., 2012). Academic scholars have theorised and empirically investigated passionate individuals’ attitudes and behaviours within the leisure and work-related contexts. This chapter discusses the passion literature and the theorising for the three studies of this research program, illustrated in six sections.

The first section details the conceptual origins of passion, including the distinguishing characteristics of harmonious and obsessive passion. The second section features the affective, behavioural, performance, and health-related consequences of passion both in non-work/leisure and work contexts. This is followed by a section that synthesises the extant literature, highlighting the research gaps and how these will be addressed.

The last three sections focus on the programmatic studies of the present research that include the construct validation, the main effects, and indirect effect mediation studies. The section on construct validation presents the role of context in workplace passion studies as well as its distinct characteristics when compared to other conceptually-similar constructs in the workplace. This is followed by a discussion on the impact of passion for work of an employee leading to outcomes such as in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours, job and life satisfaction. Finally, the mediating role of work-life balance in the relationship between passion for work and employee outcomes are discussed on the last section. Each section provides the theoretical underpinnings as well as the corresponding predictions for the studies.
Concept of Passion

Passion is described as a compelling affinity towards a self-defining activity typically driven by a person’s liking or loving of such activity (Vallerand et al., 2003). The time spent in exploring and honing one’s passions reflects the extent to which it becomes meaningful to the individual. Passionate individuals willingly engage and invest time and effort in interesting and identity-forming activities, which they hold in high regard and value (Vallerand et al., 2003). For instance, individuals with a passion for engaging in sports, listening to music, watching movies or reading literature report spending an average of 8.5 hours per week and almost 6 years involvement in the selected activity. Consequently, the activity gradually becomes embedded in one’s identity such that passionate individuals adopt labels that identify them as ‘do-ers’ of such activity. Thus, those who are passionate about playing the guitar or writing poetry refer to themselves as ‘guitarists’ or ‘poets’ (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010).

Passion is based on two philosophical perspectives (Rony, 1990 as cited in Vallerand, 2010). The first perspective posits that passion reflects a lack of reason and control over an object. Reason is perceived with high regard and the lack of it brings people down to the irrational, animalistic instincts). Unacceptable thoughts were assumed to be a derivative of passion, hence, passionate individuals are viewed as passive actors that are eventually controlled by their passions or enthusiasm or energy. The second perspective presupposes that passion is a human quality that, although need not be shunned, still requires a sense of control in order for it to remain a positive quality. Thus, the second perspective views people to be more active participants toward their passion with the capacity for control resulting in beneficial outcomes (Rony, 1990 as cited in Vallerand, 2010).

Apart from its philosophical underpinnings, passion is also grounded in Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000; 2012). This theoretical perspective
espouses that individuals have psychological needs to satisfy, such as having a sense of autonomy, competence and relatedness. SDT also postulates that humans have the natural tendency to progress towards a more complex self by means of internalising various components of the environment such as values, ideas, or traditions.

In line with the Self-Determination Theory, the Dualistic Model of Passion (DMP; Vallerand et al., 2003) proposes that an individual’s engagement in particular activities throughout life is to be able to satisfy the following: a.) the desire to attain a certain degree of initiative and control over his/her actions and its consequences, b.) the capacity to demonstrate effectiveness in various activities and interactions, and c.) to establish meaningful connections with others. The selection of a specific passionate activity goes through a period of trial and error until a preference is established towards activities that are considered enjoyable and of significant value, that one’s self resonates with, and that meet the basic psychological needs satisfactorily. Thus, passion (for an activity) is regarded as one’s strong inclination towards something valuable and self-defining that one acquires over time and engages in a regular fashion.

DMP regards that one’s passion towards an activity is internalised within one’s identity such that the values and the fundamentals that encapsulate the activity become meaningful and important to the individual. Two types of passion are proposed as, namely, harmonious and obsessive passion. These two constructs differ in the way the activity is internalised, whether in an autonomous or controlled manner.

Despite claims that passion drives individuals to be highly involved in their selected activity, it is imperative to identify what sets passion apart from similarly conceptualised constructs. In the process of constructing the passion scale, Vallerand and colleagues (2003) have examined related elements and outcomes that were associated with passion for activities. For instance, they found that both harmonious and obsessive passion significantly and positively correlated with activity valuation,
time and energy invested and the level of inclusion the activity has to one’s core self. Level of conflict between the activity and other activities in one’s life significantly correlated with obsessive passion, but was unrelated with harmonious passion. Outcomes such as flow, positive emotions and concentration were all found to positively and significantly correlate with harmonious passion but not with obsessive passion. Negative emotions and cognitions were positively associated with obsessive passion, particularly when prevented from engaging in the activity.

While mostly conceptual in comparison, Vallerand (2010) also identified other constructs such as intrinsic motivation, interest and grit that are considered to share similarities with passion. For instance, he explains that intrinsic motivation does share some conceptual similarities with passion in such a way that intrinsically motivated individuals express interest and liking toward an activity. The difference, however, is that activities driven by intrinsic motivation are not necessarily internalised in the person’s identity. Moreover, intrinsic motivation typically results in positive outcomes while the duality of passion renders the possibility of either positive or negative consequences.

Hidi and Renninger (2006) defined interest as, “the psychological state of engaging or the predisposition to reengage with particular classes of objects, events or ideas over time” (p.112). The potential for interest to develop relies on the person, while the content and environment determine the direction of the interest, and its function in its continuation and progression. This construct is similar with passion in a sense that one’s passion is developed through the interaction of the individual with the environment as one goes through trial and error in finding out one’s passionate activity. However, interest is different from passion as the former is conceptualised as a singular construct in comparison to the dualistic nature of passion. Moreover, interest also emphasises cognitive functions such as attention and concentration in the process of its
development, while passion focuses on the internalisation (whether autonomous or controlled) of the activity.

Finally, Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews and Kelly (2007) described individuals who demonstrate grit as persevering and passionate towards long term goals. Grit, or commonly known as strength of character, also involves maintaining interest and effort while continuously working on challenges despite failure, adversity or plateaus in progress. This places emphasis on the idea that ‘gritty’ individuals remain on course of the goal, without changing the trajectory even in the face of disappointment or boredom. Persistence, in this case, depends on one’s grit—which is similar to what a passionate individual is able to do. However, where persistence from grit is conceptualised to be non-stop, persistence fuelled by passion may or may not cease depending on the type of passion the individual holds towards a particular activity (Vallerand, 2010).

The Dualistic Model of Passion suggests that passionate individuals identify with their choice of activity as a result of their valuation towards it. As individuals immerse themselves in the activity, they are able to gauge the extent to which they recognise its importance. Such immersion allows them to interact with the environment which may expose them to factors that promote an autonomous or controlled internalisation of the activity and consequently develop into either a harmonious or obsessive passion (Vallerand et al., 2003). For instance, when music students, musician apprentices or athletes are provided with an autonomy-supportive learning or training environment, they are likely to develop a harmonious passion towards their specific field. Thus, providing autonomy support allows for autonomous internalisation of behaviour which facilitates the development of harmonious passion (Bonneville-Roussy, Vallerand, & Boufard, 2013; Mageau et al., 2009). Autonomy orientation within a team and organisational level also facilitate the harmonious passion among employees aiding in their job creativity (Liu et al., 2011).
In contrast, obsessive passion was found to be a result of a non-autonomous and a more controlling environment. Individuals who experienced psychological control from their older mentors (e.g., teachers or parents telling them how things ‘should’ be done or are being very critical) or mentors who demonstrate a high valuation towards the passionate activity facilitates the development of obsessive passion (Bonneville-Roussy et al., 2013; Mageau et al., 2009). Individual and team competence were also found to predict obsessive and harmonious passion among team members and leaders, respectively (Thorgren & Wincent, 2013).

Recent scholarly work also shows that passion may be induced through experimental manipulation or priming. For instance, interventions that tap into one’s use of signature strengths facilitate harmonious passion among students with part-time jobs (Forest, et al., 2012). Essay writing exercises about an individual’s experiences that reflect the typical behaviours of being harmonious or obsessively passionate (e.g., when their favourite activity was in harmony or in control of their life) were also used (Bélanger, Lafrenière, Vallerand, & Kruglanski, 2013; Lafrenière, Vallerand, & Sedikades, 2013).

Being harmoniously and obsessively passionate also plays a moderating role among predictors of well-being. For instance, in contrast with harmoniously passionate gamers, highly obsessive passionate gamers reported decreased levels of well-being the more hours spent on gaming (Przybylski et al., 2009). Similarly, highly obsessive passionate gamers are inclined to be more reactive towards how they fare in their games, which ultimately influences their self-esteem (Mageau, Carpentier, & Vallerand, 2011). Finally, obsessively passionate individuals experience higher levels of satisfaction from a self-enhancing vantage point in comparison to others (Lafrenière et al., 2013).
Consequences of Passion

The DMP highlights the type of internalisation in determining whether an individual is harmoniously or obsessively passionate over an activity (Vallerand et al., 2003). When individuals autonomously internalise their passions, they acquire a semblance of control in the activity. They are able to demonstrate a degree of flexibility such that they can participate in their passionate activity of choice but at the same time, freely attune themselves to other activities unrelated to the passionate activity. The case is different for those whose passions were internalised in a controlled fashion. Obsessively passionate individuals rely heavily on engaging in their passionate activities for ego-related contingencies. This reliance renders them to have a more rigid approach in participating and disengaging from their passionate activity. The different internalisations enable passionate individuals to experience varied, and sometimes, opposite outcomes.

Affective consequences. Indeed, several empirical studies have shown that having a particular passion towards a leisure activity impacts an individual’s intrapersonal and interpersonal outcomes. Findings generally lean towards the advantages of harmonious passion over obsessive passion in terms of emotional and behavioural experiences. For instance, harmoniously passionate individuals are more likely to experience positive emotions such as excitement or pride, whereas obsessively passionate individuals are more likely to experience negative emotions such as nervousness or distress (Vallerand et al., 2003; Stoeber et al., 2011).

Passion also exerts influence over an individual’s interpersonal experiences, of which self-determined motivation and affect plays a mediating role. From internet romantic partners to athlete-coach relationships, harmoniously passionate individuals demonstrate lower levels of conflict, higher levels of adjustment and better quality of
interpersonal relationships. Findings for obsessive passion are contrary, where higher levels of conflict and lower levels of adjustment are more imminent (Seguin-Levesque et al., 2003; Philippe et al., 2010).

**Behavioural consequences.** While typical passionate activity includes leisure activities that are either sport or arts-related, it also includes those that may predispose an individual to self-defeating behaviours. In the case of passionate gamblers, the same pattern of findings were found during and after their participation in gambling. Specifically, harmoniously passionate gamblers experience more positive emotional outcomes whereas gamblers with obsessive passion experience negative emotional outcomes, including anxiety and guilt (Mageau, Vallerand, Rousseau, Ratelle, & Provencher, 2005). Additionally, obsessively passionate gamblers are at greater risk of acquiring problematic gambling behaviours than their harmoniously passionate counterparts (Ratelle, Vallerand, Mageau, Rousseau, & Provencher, 2004; Vallerand et al., 2003). Athletes who are harmoniously passionate are less likely to display aggressive sports behaviour than those who are obsessively passionate, who typically resort to situational aggressive behaviours in situations that threaten their identity (Donahue et al., 2009). Finally, a recent study about ideological passion suggests that identity-threatening situations, harmonious ideological passion are less likely to display aggressive and violent activist tactics in comparison with those who have obsessive ideological passion (Rip, Vallerand & Lafrenière, 2012).

**Outcomes related to individual performance.** Passion enables individuals to become driven participants in their respective activities. Empirical findings suggest that it is not just about the presence of passion but identifying which is more beneficial should also be considered. Similar with previous findings, the advantages of being harmoniously passionate over obsessive passion is apparent. Harmonious passion was related to educational persistence while obsessive passion was unrelated to it
Further, harmoniously passionate musicians, athletes and students are more likely to perform better than those who are obsessively passionate. Specific goal orientations facilitate performance outcomes among these individuals. The harmoniously passionate are more goal-orientated that leads to better performance while the obsessively passionate tend to display all forms of goal orientation, which may or may not contribute to successful performance (Vallerand et al., 2007; Vallerand et al., 2008; Bonneville-Roussy, Vallerand, & Boufard, 2011).

The relationship between harmonious passion with learning goal orientation, and obsessive passion with performance goal orientation highlights the difference in the degree of self-determined, autonomous internalisation. A harmoniously passionate person rely less on generally extrinsic or ego-contingent motives (e.g., rewards, self-esteem) as opposed to those with obsessive passion. For example, when obsessively passionate physical training-enthusiasts were primed to failure information, they performed well in a handgrip dynamometer task regardless whether the information is related or unrelated to their passionate activity. In contrast, performance did not change among those with harmonious passion (Bélanger et al, 2013).

**Outcomes related to mental health.** Passion also plays a salient role in individuals’ psychological health. For instance, harmonious passion for an activity has been consistently associated with well-being, with various operationalisations such as its hedonic and eudaimonic forms, as satisfaction towards life or the experience of positive affect (Vallerand et al., 2007, 2008; Philippe et al., 2009; Bonneville-Roussy et al., 2011). Findings are mixed for obsessive passion, which are either negatively associated or unrelated to well-being (Vallerand et al., 2007, 2008, Boneville-Rousy et al., 2011), and positively related with indicators of ill-being as well as burnout (Curran, Appleton, Hill, & Hall, 2011; Stenseng et al., 2011). Variables such as self-determined motivation, positive affect, flow, neglect and rumination serve as mediating
mechanisms in these relationships (Carpentier et al., 2012; Rousseau & Vallerand, 2008; Curran et al., 2011; St. Louis, Carbonneau, & Vallerand, 2016). Nevertheless, the general consensus in these findings is that harmonious passion facilitates higher levels of well-being, while obsessive passion can be considered as a potential deterrent.

**Passion and Work-Related Outcomes**

**Attitudinal and behavioural outcomes.** Preliminary investigations about the applicability of passion for work began with the utility of the passion scale among several samples of various members of the workforce (e.g., teachers, technicians, managers) (Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). The findings highlight two important points. First, responses across samples reported that workers experience liking, valuing and spending time and energy towards one’s job, reflecting the basic criteria of passion. Second, factor analyses showed harmonious and obsessive passion as two distinct structures of passion (Houlfort, Koestner, Vallerand & Blanchard, 2003a; Houlfort, Koestner & Vallerand, 2003b, both cited in Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). Since then, research on passion for work gradually emerged in an attempt to substantiate anecdotal accounts about the relevance of passion in the work context.

Being passionate at work determines the extent one appraises demands and resources at work, and the degree of work satisfaction that influences the experience of job strain and turnover intentions. Specifically, harmoniously passionate teachers reported lower perceptions of work overload, greater levels of job control and positive support. The opposite is true for those with obsessive passion, who reported being overloaded with work, and perceived less job control and support (Lavigne et al., 2014). Harmoniously passionate teachers also tend to be more satisfied with their jobs, which makes them stay with the organisation. In contrast, obsessively passionate teachers are more likely to experience depressive symptoms in their current jobs contributing to the increased likelihood of their departing from their organisation (Houlfort et al. 2013).
In the area of entrepreneurship, being passionate puts entrepreneurs simultaneously at an advantage and disadvantage. For example, passionate entrepreneurs are driven to be persistent and enthusiastic despite the presence of challenges, however, such passion may make it difficult for them to let go of a venture where failure is imminent (Cardon, Zeitsma, Saparito, Matherne, & Davis, 2005). Nevertheless, passion fuels entrepreneurs’ cognitions which trigger relevant entrepreneurial behaviours that lead to effective entrepreneurship. This is evinced by harmoniously passionate entrepreneurs who are able to demonstrate entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Cardon, Wincent, Singh, & Drnovsek, 2009; Murnieks et al., 2014).

The vast majority of the passion for work literature delineates the favourable outcomes of harmonious passion and detrimental role of obsessive passion. However, some studies suggest some counterintuitive findings. For instance, Omorede, Thorgren, & Wincent (2013) found that obsessively passionate team leaders fare better in attaining more challenging goals. Similarly, Thorgren and Wincent (2013) suggest that harmonious and obsessive passion can impact a team’s degree of pursued goal challenge. Passionate individuals are prone to engaging in swift goal-setting process which compromises the goals’ degree of difficulty. They formulate goals in less time rendering the goals to be less challenging.

**Performance and well-being in the workplace.** The popular press typically portrays passionate employees and the work they do in a very positive light. This can be partially substantiated as employers usually look for passionate employees who are driven and enthusiastic at work (Perrewé et al., 2013). Furthermore, studies about work performance are surfacing gradually albeit with varied operationalisations, illustrating Perrewé and colleagues’ suggestion for further exploration of how passionate employees fare at work.
Earlier empirical works suggest that passion impacts individual task completion as well as performance outcomes among artists and athletes. Essentially, those who are harmoniously passionate generally fare better (e.g., Bélanger et al., 2013; Vallerand et al., 2008; 2007). Similar findings are found in the work context. For instance, among a sample of insurance firm employees, those who were harmoniously passionate had higher ratings of work performance as measured by employee performance appraisal. Further, cognitive processes such as attention and absorption mediate this relationship such that harmoniously passionate employees are more cognitively engaged at work, rendering them to perform well. On the other hand, obsessive passion for work renders the individual to experience less attentional processes and was unrelated to absorption and overall performance (Ho et al., 2011).

Recent work by Astakhova and Porter (2015) also found harmoniously passionate employees to perform better at work, mainly as a result of their inherent identification with the organisation. Obsessive passion was unrelated to work performance and the indirect effect of organisational identification was not significant. However, boundary conditions such as fit perceptions between employees and organisations play relevant roles in the relationship between passion, organisational identity and performance. Congruence in the employee-employer values as well as what employees need and what the organisation can offer may further accentuate the indirect effect of organisational identity among the performance of harmoniously passionate employees. Further, these boundary conditions also enable obsessively passionate employees to identify with the organisation and ultimately perform better.

The types of passions employees hold for their job also impacts macro-level performance. For instance, being harmonious or obsessively passionate entrepreneur can influence their networking practices, which can be pertinent in acquiring information and establishing contacts for future clients. Harmoniously passionate
entrepreneurs are more likely to take the initiative and reach out to potential customers in contrast to obsessively passionate entrepreneurs, who are less likely to approach or be approached by potential clients. As a result, harmoniously passionate entrepreneurs contribute to the firm’s financial performance by generating greater referral and business income (Ho & Pollack, 2014). The working environment also plays a role in highlighting the role of passion to firm performance. In a sample of passionate team leaders, those who were harmoniously passionate were able to contribute to job creation in a working environment that require information processing, making strategic choices and systematic decision-making. Obsessively passionate team leaders excel at creating jobs if the working environment is dynamic and unpredictable (Patel et al., 2015).

Another typical anecdotal claim about passionate employees is that they tend to be happier and brimming with enthusiasm because they are doing what they love. On the contrary, studies about passionate employees’ well-being and mental health suggest that this is not the case. Despite being passionate towards their jobs, the chances of experiencing burnout, psychological well-being, distress and dissatisfaction depends whether such passion is either harmonious or obsessive in nature.

In general, harmoniously passionate employees experience more satisfaction in their work than obsessively passionate employees. Harmonious passion consistently relates positively to work satisfaction while obsessive passion is unrelated to it (Thorgren et al., 2013; Carbonneau et al., 2008). Similarly, harmoniously passionate teachers have more time for physical leisure activities and have less occurrence of work-family interference, than obsessively passionate teachers (Caudroit et al., 2011). Indeed, passionate individuals may have varying degrees in their preoccupation with work, whether it entails the hours spent doing work or thinking about work. This is especially detrimental among obsessively passionate individuals. For instance, work satisfaction of obsessively passionate employees is likely to be curtailed since they tend
to entertain thoughts about work even when they are no longer at work, eventually contributing to their dissatisfaction at work (Thorgren et al., 2013). Further, the excessive time spent at work by obsessively passionate employees makes them susceptible to interferences between their work and family responsibilities (Caudroit et al., 2011).

Findings from a wide array of professionals further suggest that those with harmonious passion fare better in their general well-being than their obsessively passionate counterparts. Specifically, their autonomous internalisation of work makes them less likely to experience symptoms of burnout and psychological distress and more likely to acquire a sound well-being (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Forest et al., 2011; Donahue et al., 2012). Additionally, their harmonious passion gives them the capacity to utilise recovery strategies such as relaxation and control, to satisfy the basic needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness, and to experience flow and work satisfaction which contribute to higher levels of well-being (Vallerand et al., 2010; Forrest et al., 2011, Donahue et al., 2012). In contrast, the controlled internalisation of obsessive passionate employees increases their likelihood of burnout symptoms, such as emotional exhaustion (Lavigne et al., 2012). These individuals are more susceptible to work-personal life conflict and ruminative experience that further predisposes them to experience burnout (Vallerand et al., 2010; Lavigne et al., 2012; Donahue et al., 2012).

Figure 2 presents a summary of extant literature of passion both in non-work and work contexts.

**Literature Review Synthesis**

Despite the growing number of scholarly works that describe what passionate individuals are capable (or incapable) of, there is still room for further investigation to address theoretical, empirical and methodological limitations. This section will elaborate on such gaps and describe ways in which these will be addressed throughout
the research program. Specifically, the theoretical anchors, methodological approach as well as the practical implications of the studies will be outlined.

Perrewé and colleagues (2013) recommend that further empirical exploration is warranted regarding the idea of work passion, citing the need to expand on its nomological networks. Extant literature on work passion looked into the capabilities and outcomes available to passionate employees by adapting the passion scale in the work context. An abundant number of passionate employee samples from previous studies hail from westernised and developed nations, but very limited studies are contextualised in developing nations that highlight a less individualised cultural practice. The first gap this research program aims to address is the limited validation studies of the passion construct as applied in the work context, particularly among samples that may have varied environmental or culturally-determined work motives. Workers from such contexts may or may not afford to be passionate over their work due to potential differences in motivation, thus, not taking them into account raises the issue of generalisability of the passion construct.

The second gap inherent in the existing work passion literature is the limited accounts of specific work performance outcomes, as well as a holistic view of employee well-being. Employee work outcomes have been investigated in the work passion literature, albeit minimally and with a focus on fulfilling expected work-related tasks (Ho et al., 2011; Astakhova & Porter, 2015). While this can demonstrate the extent to which passion for work does impact employees, it foregoes other aspects of employee performance such as voluntary, altruistic behaviours that employees are also capable of.

General well-being and mental health are the most common outcome variable associated with passion, both in the non-work/leisure and work contexts. Among employee samples, well-being and mental health are contextualised solely within the boundaries of work (e.g., satisfaction from work, emotional exhaustion from work) and
does not account well-being measures derived from non-work contexts (e.g., satisfaction with life, satisfaction with family). Adopting this singular perspective discounts the interplay of the multi-faceted domains as well as the various roles that individuals have. The depletion and enrichment perspectives that guided previous research on the impact of work and family dynamics demonstrate that different life domains influence the individual.

Extant literature also suggests a number of mediating mechanisms that take into account personal psychological processes (e.g., attention, self-efficacy, conflict) as well as constructs that pertain to interference and conflict in explaining employee outcomes. However, less attention is given to variables that reflect accommodation for both work and non-work contexts. Hence, the final gap pertains to the mediating mechanism that enables passionate employees to perform well and maintain a healthy well-being.

The present research program addresses these gaps in three important ways. First, a construct validation was conducted to establish the applicability and generalisability of the passion construct in the work context among different samples from the Philippines. This is followed by an examination of the relationship between passion for work and work outcomes, as well as the role that work-life balance plays in enabling passionate employees to do well and be well at work. This research utilises the Dualistic Model of Passion (DMP), Border and Enrichment theories as overarching frameworks. The sections that follow detail a discussion on the theorising and hypotheses pertaining to the programmatic studies in the present research.
Figure 2. Conceptual map of the consequences of passion with mediators and moderators.
Construct Validation of the Passion for Work Scale

**The role of context.** Bagozzi, Yi, and Phillips (1991) suggest that a scale designed to measure a theoretical construct may also reflect random errors that can contribute to inaccurate research conclusions and threats to research validity. Using multiple responses is likely to reduce the occurrence of random error (Schmidt & Hunter, 1996), however, construct validation allows for estimation and correction of these errors rendering the theory testing to be less ambiguous and the hypotheses to be less likely accepted or rejected due to measurement error (Bagozzi et al., 1991). Thus, validation studies should focus not only on having additional sets of respondents to further establish the validity of the work passion construct, but to also take into account the role of context that may contribute to variations in research outcomes.

Context is defined as “situational opportunities and constraints that affect the occurrence and meaning of organizational behaviour as well as functional relationships between variables.” (John, 2006, p.386). One’s context plays a role in shaping one’s meaning-making processes about different situations. This is observed in cases where one’s cultural context that may sometimes ‘dictate’ what or how things should be perceived or acted upon. Indeed, context brings about differences in various areas of human behaviour, including motivation. For instance, Markus and Kitayama (1991) noted distinctions among those from Western and non-Western contexts in terms of the way they view themselves and their personal motivation. In particular, motives of individuals from Western contexts tend to be individually-centred, driven with an internal need to achieve or enhance self-esteem, while individuals from non-Western contexts tend to be other-oriented (i.e., considerate and receptive towards others). In terms of work motives, external environmental characteristics such as economic factors (e.g., unemployment or underemployment) or even situations that reflect greater
financial needs can play a role in job-related behaviours (e.g., job-selection) (Leana & Feldman, 1995; Perry & Porter, 1982).

Existing investigations about passion for work have comprised samples that are contextualised in relatively developed nations where majority of the studies were situated in Western contexts. The present construct validation of the passion for work scale was done among samples from the Philippines, a non-Western, developing country. The recent economic update by the World Bank (2014) evaluated the Philippines as a country that, while having an optimistic prognosis of development, continues to face its fair share of economic challenges, including poverty as well as the limited availability of better jobs. In response, Filipino employees continue to demonstrate their motivation to pursue work that can aid them in coursing through their daily living.

Apart from bonuses and fringe benefits, other intrinsic rewards that working Filipinos found valuable in their jobs are the workplace’s motivation for employee’s to demonstrate individual abilities, acquire feelings of accomplishment for the job and the availability of opportunities for advancement (Arce & Poblador, 1977; Arce & Porio, 1978). This pattern seems to persist across time, as recent studies on Filipino workers show that values such as job security, growth opportunities and good pay are deemed important. However, despite the salience of poverty and the valuation of certain extrinsic rewards (e.g., money for spending) intrinsic and intangible rewards such as autonomy, a sense of challenge to one’s ability, enjoyment and learning remain equally important and highly valued (e.g., Ilagan, Hechanova, Co & Pleyto, 2014; Hechanova, Uy & Presbitero, 2005; Yao, Franco & Hechanova, 2005). There is further valuation on establishing and maintaining inter-personal relationships, particularly with the family that influences one’s outlook and behaviour towards work and career (Ilagan et al., 2014; Salazar-Clemena, 2002; Arce & Pobaldor, 1977).
In sum, the motivation behind Filipino employees seems to be shaped from specific contextual factors such as cultural values or economic situations. However, it is also noteworthy that despite these features, Filipino employees also put emphasis on the preference for enjoyable and challenging work. The high regard for one’s family and interpersonal relationships also signify the importance of one’s immediate environment in being driven towards work.

As the Dualistic Model of Passion is anchored in self-determination theory, which explains that an individual is potentially motivated by the satisfaction of autonomy, competence and relatedness needs, it is plausible for Filipino employees to feel passionate towards their work. Furthermore, the presence of internal (e.g., enjoyment, learning) and external factors (e.g., personal relationships) that contribute to one’s work motives may also reflect the degree to which work is fully internalised within one’s self, thus, eliciting potential distinctions between harmonious and obsessive passion for work. Therefore, similar with previous validation studies, it is expected that the passion scale adapted in the work setting among Filipino samples will yield a two-factor structure, with adequate fit as well as satisfactory reliabilities for each passion subscale.

**Convergent and divergent validation.** Establishing a measure’s convergent and discriminant validity are effective ways of determining its construct validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Hinkin, 1998). Convergent validity pertains to the degree of significant positive correlations between the measure under study and other conceptually similar or theoretically relevant constructs. Discriminant, or sometimes referred to as divergent validity, pertains to the low or non-significant correlation between the measures under study and conceptually distinct or unrelated constructs (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2005, Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Bennett & Robinson, 2000).
In the work setting, passion can also be likened to similar work-related constructs such as work involvement, goal orientation and workaholism. As DMP presupposes differences in the degree of internalisation between harmonious and obsessive passion, it is expected that both types of passion will yield different levels of relationships with such constructs. These differences in the direction and strength of relationships can serve as indicators of convergent or divergent validity. Overall, it is proposed that passion for work is a distinct construct in comparison with other work-related constructs such as work involvement, goal orientation, workaholism, work engagement and calling. Table 1 presents a summary of the similarities and differences between passion for work and other work-related constructs.

**Work involvement.** Work involvement is defined as a psychological state that pertains to the central role of work into one’s self-concept (Gorn & Kanungo, 1980; Kanungo, 1982). Being involved in one’s work is not dependent on a particular job’s ability to satisfy one’s salient needs, but instead, it is drawn from a normative belief regarding one’s valuation of work. These beliefs about the importance of work are thought to come from socialization with one’s families, friends, and social environment. Through such personal interactions, one comes to believe how and why work is a central component in their lives (Kanugo, 1982; Paullay, Alliger & Stone-Romero, 1994).

Given the conceptualisation behind work involvement, certain similarities between work involvement and the two types of passion can be observed. For instance, the emphasis on the importance of work to the individual reflects some similarity with activity valuation in passion. Passionate employees highly value their work, in the same way for employees who are involved in their work. Another similarity is the manner in which work involvement and both types of passion recognise the role of work in one’s self-concept. Passionate individuals identify with their passions and label themselves
accordingly, thus, employees who are passionate towards their work would identify themselves as “teacher” or “entrepreneur”.

Despite these notable similarities, what sets passion for work apart from work involvement is the former’s internalisation process into one’s identity (Vallerand et al., 2003). The autonomous internalisation of work among those who are harmoniously passionate allows them to continue acting on their passion (i.e., work) without compromising other aspects in their non-work activities. In such cases, the harmoniously passionate individual is in control of his or her involvement at work. The opposite is true for the obsessively passionate, where the controlled internalisation allows the activity to control the individual instead. Internalisation in a less autonomous way renders the obsessively passionate to hold on to work as a means to attain the ego-invested contingencies, and thus, spends more time working than their harmoniously passionate counterparts.

Based on the above reasoning, it is expected that harmonious and obsessive passion will have a moderate, positive relationship with work involvement. Furthermore, the relationship between obsessive passion for work and work involvement will be stronger than the relationship between harmonious passion for work and work involvement.

**Goal orientation.** Goals are considered as drivers of behaviours that represent concrete targets which individuals set in order to satisfy the more abstract reasons behind such goals. Motivation entails a particular aim (i.e., direction) and the reason behind one’s desire for the aim (i.e., energization). For instance, one’s aim is to become better than others *because* one wants to demonstrate certain positive characteristics, display pride or gain approval from others (Elliot & Thrash, 2001). Goals, therefore, represent a general orientation to the task that includes a number of related beliefs about purpose, competence, success, ability, effort, errors and standards (Pintrich, 2000).
Goals are characterised according to learning or performance (Dweck, 1986). Learning goals serve to motivate an individual by the desire to master a particular task and acquire further skills and knowledge. One is motivated to explore and pursue tasks that promote growth and deeper understanding of the task. To attain this, learning goal-oriented individuals are willing to risk showing uncertainty and errors for the sake of learning, self-improvement and progress. On the other hand, performance goals center on displaying one’s ability, particularly in terms of superiority, besting others in comparison or preventing one’s weaknesses to be seen. One is motivated to obtain favourable judgment of ability or conceal one’s lack of ability to avoid negative evaluation. To attain this, performance-oriented individuals would favour opportunities to look smart or avoid participating in tasks that would expose their lack of capability or incompetence towards a specific task.

Performance-oriented goals are further distinguished between prove-performance and avoidance-performance dimensions (Van de Walle, 1997) or otherwise labelled as performance-approach orientation and performance-avoidance orientation (Elliot & Church, 1997). Individuals who are performance-approach goal oriented are motivated to engage in activities that allow them to display their competencies and gain favourable judgments. Performance-avoidance goal-oriented individuals do not engage in activities that will likely expose their weaknesses and discredit their competencies.

A general similarity between passion and learning goal orientation lies in its motivational component where both constructs can be recognised as motives that drive an individual to action. While conceptualised differently, the types of passion and goal orientation do operate on similar premises. Harmonious passion involves the degree of autonomous regulation of the activity and the other’s emphasis on the achievement-oriented direction and reason for engaging in the task. For instance, the harmoniously passionate is considered as someone who can fully partake in the activity, without
having to be concerned with ego-related contingencies (e.g., feelings of social acceptance) attached to the activity. Engagement in the activity is intrinsic, fuelled by enjoyment and the potential for improvement which bears similarity with learning oriented goal orientation. This was evident in a study by Vallerand and colleagues (2007, 2008) where they found harmonious passion for a non-work activity was related with learning goal orientation. Thus, it is expected that harmonious passion for work and learning goal orientation will have a significant, positive relationship with moderate strength.

On the other hand, the controlled internalisation of work as the passionate activity among those who are obsessively passionate with work can be likened to performance goal orientations. Among the obsessively passionate, ego-invested contingencies are attached with work—participation at work gives them opportunities to potentially gain approval or boost their self-esteem. In a similar vein, such dependence on how the external environment can provide an evaluation of their performance is evident among individuals with a performance approach goal orientation. Indeed, Vallerand and colleagues (2007, 2008) also found that obsessive passion for an activity positively related to all types of achievement goals. Thus, it is expected that obsessive passion for work and performance approach and avoidance goal orientations will have a significant, positive relationship with moderate strength.

The similarity between harmonious passion for work and learning goal orientation, as well as obsessive passion for work and performance approach and avoidance goal orientations may also indicate convergent validity. However, the dissimilarities between harmonious passion for work and performance approach and avoidance goal orientations, as well as obsessive passion and learning goal orientation may establish divergent validity; hence, no significant relationship between the two sets of constructs are expected.
Workaholism. Adapted from the idea of alcoholism (i.e., ‘excessive alcohol intake’), workaholism is described as a salient behaviour, where one is seen to carry out more work tasks than the average employee—more often than not, even when unnecessary (Oates, 1968). Thus, the ‘workaholic’ does a large amount of workload and spends a great deal of time doing work. Scholars have since begun exploring the notion of “excessive working”, which have been considered to have an addictive component with a much broader scope than simply “spending too much time at work”.

Patterns unique to workaholics include excessive time spent at work, persistently thinking about work when one is no longer at work, and working beyond what is reasonably accepted in order to attain job demands or basic economic needs (Scott, Moore & Miceli, 1997; Schaufeli, Shimazu & Taris, 2009). Indeed, as workaholics tend to devote more time for their work, time for other aspects of their lives such as family, personal life or leisure and recreational opportunities become compromised. Moreover, they have the tendency to ‘create’ more opportunities to work, such as complicating a task to extend immersion with the work. The conceptualisation of workaholism highlights the motive behind the behaviours (i.e., over-involvement at work) and cognitions (i.e., persistent thoughts about work) which sets it apart from other individuals who work equally hard for different reasons without having to experience an uncontrollable drive to repeatedly immerse themselves at work.

Given such level of involvement and irresistible drive to work, workaholics tend to have low levels of enjoyment for the work that they do and are more susceptible to the act of working rather than appreciating the nature of the work (Schaufeli et al., 2009; Ng, Sorensen & Feldman, 2007). Another possible explanation for such behaviour is the presence of identity issues such as low self-esteem or underdeveloped self-concept that workaholics compensate with through working constantly. Being able to demonstrate how much more work they could do may elicit positive feelings about
the self and the potential consequences such as external rewards, raises, promotions or other recognitions can be seen as an opportunity to highlight their efforts (Porter, 1996).

In comparison to passion for work, workaholism appears to closely resemble obsessive passion rather than harmonious passion. The autonomous internalisation of work among harmoniously passionate employees indicates a clear distinction from those with tendencies of workaholism. Since the harmoniously passionate are in control of their passions, they are able to freely engage in work and non-work activities, without having to deal with the urge to do or think about work. Indeed, Vallerand (2010) suggests that while a passionate activity can cause psychological disadvantages for some, it can be a source of pleasure or harmless distraction to others. For instance, when individuals are harmoniously passionate about gambling, they experience more positive affective experiences and are less likely to engage in pathological gambling (Mageau et al., 2005; Philippe & Vallerand, 2007).

On the other hand, the controlled internalisation of work among the obsessively passionate makes them behave in ways similar to workaholics. For instance, the presence of an urge to continue doing work, the inability to prevent work-related thoughts in intruding within non-work contexts or the reliance towards work to satisfy esteem-related issues (i.e., via contingencies associated with work) puts the obsessively passionate in a similar platform with those who veer towards workaholism. However, obsessively passionate individuals and workaholics do have their differences—at least to the extent of liking or loving the work they do.

As passionate individuals, those with obsessive passion identify themselves with the job or work that they do, (i.e., an “entrepreneur”, or a “musician”) and to some degree, still carry some semblance of enjoyment. Nevertheless, being obsessively passionate does have its disadvantages, as it has been found to predict pathological gambling (Philippe & Vallerand, 2007; Ratelle et al., 2004). Thus, based on the above
reasoning, harmonious passion for work is not expected to correlate with workaholism. In contrast, it is expected that obsessive passion for work and workaholism will be positively related.

**Work engagement.** Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter and Taris (2008) proposed a shift in focus from the negative aspects of work (e.g., stress) towards a more positive psychological state in response to the needs of organisations with preference for proactive and committed employees who are absorbed, energetic and dedicated in their work. This reflects the earlier work of Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma and Bakker (2002) that defined work engagement as “a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterised by vigor, dedication and absorption” (p.74). Vigor reflects high energy levels while at work, the willingness to put in effort and demonstrate persistence and mental resilience during times of difficulties. Dedication is depicted by a degree of psychological involvement that encompasses both cognitive and affective states, as employees exude “a sense of significant, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge” (p. 74). Absorption is characterised by an individual’s full concentration and engrossment at work, such that the time passes quickly during engagement and the individual may experience difficulties letting go of work.

Work engagement is also conceptualised as the positive counterpart of burnout (Schaufeli et al., 2002). This is based on two dimensions that define work-related well-being, namely activation and identification. Exhaustion and vigor qualify under the activation dimension, while cynicism and dedication comprise the identification dimension (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001, as cited in Schaufeli et al., 2002). Exhaustion and cynicism characterise burnout, which reflects low activation and low identification, while engagement is characterised by high activation (i.e., vigor) and high identification (i.e., dedication). Schaufeli and colleagues reiterate that while some characteristics of burnout and work engagement are direct opposites, it does not apply to the remaining
characteristics of the two constructs, that is, reduced efficacy (for burnout) and absorption (for engagement) are not direct opposites of each other.

Passion for work and work engagement bear similarities in terms of the motivational nature between the two constructs. For instance, individuals who are passionate or engaged at work are both characterised as having a degree of being engrossed in what they do such that time passes unnoticeably or quickly, or be persistent at work (Vallerand et al., 2003; Schaufeli et al., 2002). However, Bakker and colleagues (2008) note that this conceptualisation of work engagement highlights the reference to the activity (i.e., work), rather than the individual’s role. This marks the distinction between passionate and engaged employees, where the former emphasises internalisation of work to one’s identity, which may be reflected in the identifiable labels associated with the work (e.g., teacher, musician). Engaged employees focus on the task at hand and the work that needs to be done, to which they may not necessarily share some ingrained identification to. Thus, a weak to moderate relationship is expected between harmonious and obsessive passion with work engagement.

**Calling.** Passionate employees may be regarded as simply responding to a calling or vocation. Calling and vocation have common characteristics where both approaches a specific life role that is geared towards exhibiting or deriving a sense of purpose or meaningfulness, as well as holding other-oriented or prosocial values and goals as primary sources of motivation. Both constructs are considered to be stable, individual characteristic and not a function of one’s working environment (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Dik & Duffy, 2009). However, the main difference between calling and vocation is that the former is considered “a transcendent summon… originating beyond the self” (p. 427), while the latter’s approach to work does not necessarily come from an external source (Dik & Duffy, 2009).
Passion is similar with calling and vocation as these constructs are all relatively stable individual characteristics. Like calling and vocation, passion entails a sense of meaning-making that allow for identifying passionate targets. Passion is also generally unwavering, which is reminiscent of the stable characteristic of calling and vocation—a person does not arbitrarily feel passionate for one thing at one time and another thing at a different time. However, unlike calling and vocation, one’s passion does not necessarily reflect a pro-social quality or at least, does not take direct precedence in the selection of the passionate activity. Passion is also primarily based on what an individual finds meaningful, which reflects its significance to one’s identity, and not from an externally ordained source. Thus, positive but weak relationships are expected between calling and both types of passion.
Table 1

*Summative descriptions between passion for work and conceptually-relevant constructs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Conceptual Similarities with Passion for Work</th>
<th>Conceptual Differences with Passion for Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>A psychological state referring to the central role of work towards an individual.</td>
<td>Importance placed on one’s work is akin to the activity valuation component of passion. Work is integrated in one’s self-concept.</td>
<td>Does not take into account the degree of internalisation of work in one’s identity, whereas passion distinguishes between autonomous and controlled internalisation of work that shapes one’s self-concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Orientation</td>
<td>A reflection of one’s belief and abstract motives behind the attainment of one’s goals. Generally typified into learning and performance-goal orientations.</td>
<td>Motivational component that drives individuals into action.</td>
<td>Typology is based on achievement-oriented direction and rationale for task engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaholism</td>
<td>The practice of excessive engagement at work beyond what is necessary.</td>
<td>More predominant with obsessive passion, given the urge to continue doing work and the ruminative thoughts about work.</td>
<td>Workaholic behaviours are more akin with obsessive passion rather than harmonious passion. However, unlike obsessive passion, workaholics do not necessarily like (of love) the work they do, nor experience a semblance of enjoyment when engaging to it. Primarily focuses on the participation towards work, rather than the individual’s role relative to one’s job. The content of work may not necessarily be internalised within the person’s identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>A state where individuals demonstrate vigour, dedication and absorption towards work.</td>
<td>The experience of being highly engrossed when at work, where the passage of time goes unnoticed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>Unique life role aimed at responding to a perceived “summon” with a sense of purpose and meaningfulness, and typically hold prosocial values and motives.</td>
<td>A personal quality that is not arbitrary</td>
<td>Emphasis is on the relevance of a pro-social stance and other-oriented nature of the activity, whereas passion may not necessarily have this condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Effects of Passion for Work on Performance and Well-being Outcomes

Performance outcomes. This current research program focuses on two sets of work outcomes. The first set refers to performance at work, which can be further classified into in-role (or task performance, or in-role behaviours, IRBs) and extra-role performance (or commonly referred to as organisational citizenship behaviours, OCBs).

In-role behaviour. In-role behaviour is considered as an essential behavioural outcome that contributes to a functioning organisation, where designated roles and tasks must be accomplished within the required set criteria (Katz, 1964). On the other hand, as a volitional act that goes beyond one’s job requirement, organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) benefits either the members of the organisation or the organisation itself (Williams & Anderson, 1991). These outcomes are also considered relevant indicators in employees’ performance assessment. Indeed, managers and supervisors from various occupations recognise IRBs as important components of an employee’s overall performance (Rotundo & Sacket, 2002). OCBs also play a relevant role in managers’ performance assessment and decision-making process (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff et al., 2000). For instance, Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Hui (1993) found that managers may consider OCBs as part of employee performance evaluation, hence rate the employee relatively higher for the following reasons: a.) OCBs are considered as a distinctive behaviours on top of what’s required for the job, b.) OCBs are included in a manager’s conception of a ‘good employee’, or, c.) as a benchmark of perceived reciprocity or fairness among those who performed OCBs. Indeed, OCBs were positively associated with managerial evaluations of employee performance and reward allocation decisions (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009).

Following Vallerand and colleagues’ (2003) definition, passionate employees are characterised by liking, high valuation, effort and time-bound engagement toward their work. The high importance placed on the activity, and motives behind
engagement enable passionate employees to continue participation in their chosen work. DMP regards that harmonious and obsessive passion depict autonomous or controlled motives for activity engagement, where the former takes part in the activity out of a sense of volition and the latter, as a result of the ego-invested contingencies attached to the activity. Harmoniously passionate individuals take into account the enjoyment and further mastery that are gained through activity engagement, while the obsessively passionate individuals take part in the activity in order to maintain a perceived sense of self-worth.

In line with self-determination theory and the DMP (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Vallerand et al., 2003), as autonomous internalisation reflects an inherently intrinsic motive (e.g., mastery of skill), individuals are deemed to experience positive outcomes. In contrast to controlled internalisation, the contingencies attached to the activity thwart the capacity of the individual to be completely volitional, which may result in negative outcomes. Thus, in terms of performance, those who are autonomously motivated tend to have better performance outcomes that those who have a controlled motivation over a task.

Studies in the areas of entrepreneurship and organisational behaviour generally suggest that harmonious passion is related to positive work outcomes. For instance, optimum performance in both individual and firm levels benefit are typically demonstrated by harmoniously passionate employees. They are able to meet the task requirements for the job (e.g., performance appraisal) and at the same time even influence incursion of income from entrepreneurial clients. Harmoniously passionate individuals are also capable of utilising cognitive processes and strategies that enable them to meet the demands of work. In contrast, the general consensus of the studies about obsessive passion for work is that it places employees at a disadvantageous position in terms of work outcomes. Specifically, how they are less likely to utilise
attentional or absorptive processes, or possess a more passive approach to networking practices prevents them from adequately fulfilling their task requirements at work (Ho et al., 2011; Ho & Pollack, 2014; Astakhova & Porter, 2015).

Given that harmoniously passionate individuals tend to have an autonomous motivation towards a work as their passionate activity, and obsessively passionate ones carry a controlled motivation, the following predictions are proposed:

*Hypothesis 1a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to in-role behaviours.*

*Hypothesis 1b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to in-role behaviours.*

**Organisational citizenship behaviour.** It is also proposed that harmonious and obsessively passionate employees will differ in their OCBs. The DMP posits that as a result of the autonomous internalisation of the passionate activity (i.e., work), the harmoniously passionate are the ones in control over the extent of their participation at work. They demonstrate flexibility in terms of their choice whether to engage in it or not, as well as the extent to which they involve themselves in work-related and non-work related activities. Since they engage in the activity for the intrinsic reasons such as enjoyment or enhancement of skills, engaging in other tasks will be easier for them. In contrast, the controlled internalisation and contingency-based characteristics of the obsessively passionate contribute to rigidity in participation in other activities outside of the passionate activity. The contingencies attached to the passionate activity drive them to continue engaging in the activity as disengagement may mean loss of the benefits they get from the contingencies. As a result, the obsessively passionate cannot help but engage in the passionate activity (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010). Indeed, obsessively passionate individuals experience more conflict between the passionate activity and other life activities, compared with their harmonious counterparts, in both
leisure and work contexts. For instance, the time that should be spent by the obsessively passionate with family, friends, studies or work is taken up by the activity, and leave little room for engagement in these non-passionate activities (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand et al., 2010).

Therefore, it is proposed that the volitional and inherent flexibility of the harmoniously passionate will not only enable them to accomplish their work but also engage in OCBs, since they can freely choose the extent to which they can engage in various tasks at work. Conversely, the contingencies attached to work that are valued by the obsessively passionate may prevent them from engaging in other activities beyond their formal set of tasks to accomplish and are unlikely to engage in OCBs. The following predictions are proposed:

**Hypothesis 2a:** Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to organisational citizenship behaviours.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to organisational citizenship behaviours.

**Well-being outcomes.** The second set of outcomes that this research program aims to investigate is well-being in the workplace. In a broad sense, well-being pertains to an “optimal psychological functioning and experience” (Deci & Ryan, 2001, p.142). Two paradigms are typically referred to when describing well-being. The first is hedonic, which depicts well-being as the experience of happiness and the second is eudaimonic, where well-being is described as a potential-fulfilling, self-actualising characteristic (Waterman, 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2001).

When contextualised in the organisational setting, employee well-being characterises optimal experiences of employees during work, which encompasses physical, psychological and social aspects of the individual (Grant et al., 2007). Other variables associated with employee well-being include affective states, emotional
exhaustion, job satisfaction, flow and general positive functioning (Sonnentag & Ilies, 2011; Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009). However, recent work by Zheng et al (2015) proposed an operationalisation of employee well-being, which took into account a working individual’s subjective (e.g., life satisfaction), personal (e.g., autonomy, purpose in life) and work well-being (e.g., job satisfaction). This definition of employee well-being echo Danna and Griffin’s (1999) definition of well-being in the workplace as “an encompassing satisfaction between one’s life/non-work and work/job-related domains”.

The field of employee well-being has been regarded as an important matter of study in organizational research as one’s physical and psychological experiences at work—may it be generally good or bad—will have an impact on how one does his or her work (Danna & Griffin, 1999; Zhang et al., 2015). For instance, the occurrence of potential threats in the workplace ranging from occupational hazard and safety, to specific situations such as workplace aggression, harassment and even threats to working relationships have been found to have an impact on employee well-being (O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin & Glew, 1996; Martell & Sullivan, 1994; Cooper & Cartwright, 1994). Nurturing employee well-being had since been a significant endeavour in the workplace as it impacts employee productivity, decision-making and over-all contribution to the organisation (Danna & Griffin, 1999; Zhang et al., 2015).

Looking after the well-being of employees could reap long-term benefits, not only at an individual level but in an organisational level as well. Knowledge obtained about the level of well-being among workers can be used by management for proactive stance to assess, diagnose and monitor employee’s psychological health. In turn, managers can utilise this to nurture their employees eventually reaping beneficial returns for the organisation (Zhang et al., 2015). Indeed, this highlights the pivotal role
of employee well-being in the continued growth of organisations (Spreitzer & Porath, 2012).

**Job and life satisfaction.** Job and life satisfaction are in line with the conceptualisation of employee well-being that account for generalized life and job-related experiences (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Job satisfaction is defined as “…a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values” (Locke, 1969, p.316). On the other hand, life satisfaction is a cognitive assessment of one’s satisfaction with life relative to one’s personal set standards (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985). Apart from extending the separate findings from previous work (Lavigne et al., 2012; Forest et al., 2012), having both job satisfaction and life satisfaction as outcomes in this study represent a relatively comprehensive account of employee well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999).

It is proposed that harmoniously and obsessively passionate individuals will differ in their levels of job satisfaction and life satisfaction. The DMP postulates that as a result of the autonomous internalisation of work among harmoniously passionate individuals, this enables them to display the flexibility to choose the extent to which they will engage or disengage with their work. Since harmoniously passionate employees display volitional behaviours, they are able to accommodate the demands of their work and life domains. Being able to choose whether to concentrate on their work or enjoy a non-work-related activity instead, it is very likely for harmoniously passionate employees to attain satisfaction in both domains. These propositions have been demonstrated in workplace passion literature, where harmonious passion was found to relate with vitality, psychological well-being, life satisfaction and work satisfaction (Forest et al., 2012; Forest et al., 2011; Carbonneau et al., 2008).
In contrast, the obsessively passionate employees may be restrained by rigidity to continue engaging in their work as a result of controlled internalisation. In particular, the ego-invested contingencies they attach to their work contribute to why their work controls them; therefore, they continue to engage in their work even on occasions when they need to refrain from it. Thus, DMP postulates that the lack of autonomy among obsessively passionate employees may render them susceptible to negative affective experiences at work such as frustration or disappointment.

Empirical findings for obsessive passion and well-being are mixed, but generally indicate a disadvantageous outcome for the individual. For instance, obsessively passionate employees were found to be more prone to emotional exhaustion and burnout, as well as experience less optimum mental health (Lavigne et al., 2012; Forest et al., 2011). Mediating mechanisms such as work-personal life conflict and rumination typically contribute to decreased levels of well-being. Previous studies also found that obsessive passion for work was unrelated to job satisfaction, (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Vallerand et al., 2010; Thorgren et al., 2013). However, when taken into account the tendency of obsessively passionate employees’ mediating factors such work-related thoughts in non-work situations, the negative relationship between obsessive passion for work and work satisfaction becomes significant (Thorgren et al., 2013).

Among varied non-working samples, obsessive passion was also found to be either related (e.g., Vallerand et al., 2007, 2008; Carpentier et al., 2012) or unrelated with life satisfaction (e.g., Vallerand et al., 2007; Bonneville-Roussy et al., 2011). However, when taking into account mediating mechanisms such as negative affect or rumination, obsessive passion becomes negatively related with life satisfaction. Thus, in line with the postulates of DMP and the empirical findings on passionate individuals’ well-being, the following hypotheses are proposed:
Hypothesis 3a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to life satisfaction.

The Mediating Role of Work Life Balance

Overview of work-life balance. Several mechanisms that explain why harmonious and obsessive individuals experience specific consequences at work were identified within the DMP literature. The nature of these mechanisms encompasses a various range of psychological processes. For instance, cognitive absorption and attention, as well as organisational identification mediate the relationship of passionate individuals with their performance at work (Ho et al., 2011; Astakhova & Porter, 2015). Other mechanisms such as needs satisfaction, work-life thoughts, conflict, work satisfaction, depression, rumination and recovery, and flow mediate the relationship of harmonious and obsessive passion with psychological well-being and mental health (Forest et al., 2011; Thorgren et al., 2013; Vallerand et al., 2010; Houlfort et al., 2010, Donahue et al., 2012; Lavigne et al., 2012).

These studies highlight the advantages of being harmoniously passionate with work as it leads to better performance by being able to focus and concentrate on tasks at hand with minimal distraction, and adapt a self-defining beliefs about one’s organisation. Further, employees with harmonious passion are likely to be satisfied and feel less depressed about work, able to meet autonomy, competence and relatedness at work, as well as having the likelihood of using recovery processes (e.g., relaxation) in
order to facilitate higher levels of well-being. On the other hand, being obsessively passionate typically does not predict performance at work, unless under conditions of fit between the employee and organisation. Further, obsessively passionate employees are more likely to experience burnout, distress and are less likely to be satisfied with work (Donahue et al., 2012; Lavigne et al., 2012).

The aim of this study is to extend previous work on the impact of passion for work in the domains of work and non-work by taking into account the process of work-life balance highlighting the absence of interference, and the harmony achieved from active participation from both domains. Work-life balance entails experiencing satisfaction in all life domains by attaining optimum functioning at work and home domains with minimum role conflict, and a potential for consonance between work and non-work domains, such as adequate allotment of resources like time, energy and commitment (Clark, 2000; Greenblatt, 2002; Kirchmeyer, 2000, as cited in Lyness & Judiesch, 2008; Fisher, 2001, as cited in Bulger et al., 2007).

The recognition of ‘work-life balance’ emerged as a response to the evolution of traditional working schema, with the introduction of technological advances and the increasing globalisation of businesses giving rise to the notion of working “24/7” (Shortland & Cummins, 2007, p.28). This means time and distance become malleable, and boundaries as to what constitutes as work and non-work space become blurred. While this broadens one’s choices as to when and where to work, the possibility of work superseding one’s personal life and leisure experiences is apparent (Lewis, 2003). Apart from technology, social forces such as changes in personal expectations dictated by one’s generation brought attention towards achieving balance between work and non-work experiences (Greenblatt, 2002).

Indeed, prior studies that addressed the issues regarding the interchange between work and non-work context focused on work-family conflict (e.g., Allen, Herst, Bruck
The idea of work-life balance emerged in consideration of the evident diversity in families, the changes in marital and childbirth practices, as well as in recognition of other employees with non-familial responsibilities but instead have accountabilities in other areas of their lives (Fisher et al., 2009).

Work-life balance has been defined in terms of satisfaction and good functioning at work and non-work contexts, typically within the family, with minimum role conflict (Clark, 2000). Similarly, work-life balance implies having acceptable levels of conflict between work and non-work demands. It is also dependent on the acquisition and management of resources to attain satisfaction of the needs of individuals and their significant others. These resources include time, money, degree of control over one’s environment and personal capabilities such as fitness, intellectual capacities, social skills and other competencies (Greenblatt, 2002).

The studies of Fisher et al (2009), Hayman (2009, 2005) and Bulger et al. (2007) operationalised work life balance in terms of the experience of both work/non-work interference and enhancement that are reflected in four dimensions, namely, work interference with personal life, personal life interference with work, work enhancement of personal life and personal life enhancement of work. These dimensions demonstrate the following: a.) the extent to which one perceives one’s work to be in conflict with his or her personal life and vice versa, and b.) the extent to which work has a positive impact in his or her personal life and vice versa. Thus, work-life balance is experienced if there are low levels of interference and high levels of enhancement.

Definitions of work-life balance reflect notions of equivalent degree of participation and the perceived capacity to meet the demands from both work and non-work contexts. This is also in line with the description that perceived compatibility of
work and non-work activities promotes growth and is aligned with a person’s current priorities (Kalliath & Brough, 2008). While objective indicators (e.g., equal amount of time and involvement) provide clear-cut measures of ‘balance’, subjective measures of perceived degree of balance are also important in order to assess whether employees actually feel balanced and satisfied, or whether they perceive conflict in their work and non-work lives (Reiter, 2007; Greenhaus et al., 2003). Indeed, the notion of balance can be relative, such that what one perceives as ‘balanced’ in numbers may not be seen as ‘balanced’ by another (Guest, 2002).

Theoretical underpinnings of work-life balance

**Border theory.** Clark (2000) explains that balance may be attained by recognising borders between work and non-work contexts. Border theory posits that a worker’s life generally involves two domains, which are the home and work. Each of these domains are characterised by different sets of rules, thoughts and behavioural patterns. Domains serve as a context that provides individuals what they need and ways of attaining for their personal and professional lives. For example, the work context becomes a place where job-related tasks are accomplished in order to get compensation, while family interaction serves as the ways to attain an atmosphere of warmth and affection. Individuals manage how they thrive in each domain by examining the borders that demarcate the two domains. Borders manifest in a physical form (e.g., work stations, office building), a temporal form (e.g., office hours) or psychological form (e.g., thoughts, feelings and behaviours appropriate in only one domain) (Clark, 2000).

Individuals who define and demarcate the family and work domains are referred to as border-crossers (Clark, 2000). Qualities such as having internalised the culture and values of a particular domain, exhibit competence relative to one’s responsibilities, connectedness towards others and identification with domain responsibilities enable
border-crossers to manage borders better. There is emphasis on the importance of identification with one’s domain as this make border-crossers committed in such domain and manages it in such a way that they can contribute and excel. More importantly, it is through identification with roles in both work and non-work contexts facilitate border and domain management which consequently leads to the attainment of balance.

Borders are characterised by their permeability and flexibility (Clark, 2000; Hall & Richter, 1989). Permeability pertains to the extent to which elements from one domain penetrate the other domain. Examples include allowing family members to enter one’s office space during work or transference of emotions or skills derived from work to the family context. Flexibility refers to degree by which borders can be extended or restricted based on the demands coming from either one of the domains. Examples include an individual working either in a fixed or flexible working hours, anywhere or at a specific place, or when thinking about work when at home, and vice versa. Clark (2000) adds the notion of blending, where borders become enmeshed such that the exclusivity of each domain diminishes. This is exemplified when an individual attends to work and family matters simultaneously, interacting with family members while running a family business. Blending is also evident when experiences in one context are used to enrich experiences in another context. Therefore, border characteristics such as permeability, flexibility and blending depict the degree to which borders are either weak or strong (Clark, 2000). The stronger the border between domains, the more impermeable and inflexible the border and blending is unlikely to occur. Conversely, the weaker the border, the more permeable and flexible it is, and facilitative of blending.

In a study by Bulger and colleagues (2007), employees who have the ability to exercise flexibility in the work domains experience less work interference with personal
life and greater work enhancement of personal life. Individuals who are also able to leave work behind in order to attend to their personal lives experience greater enhancement of personal life. However, individuals with higher work permeability experience more interference in their personal lives. They also found that those who demonstrate flexibility in one’s personal life experience less interference at work, while high personal life permeability contributes to work interference. Their findings support how one’s capacity to manoeuvre through one role to another renders effective performance and enrichment in other domains.

**Enrichment perspective.** Indeed, roles reflect the social positions and expectations that each individual assumes. One’s social identity and situation determine the differences in the ways individuals behave (Biddle, 1986). As individuals progress in their lives, they accumulate roles such as those related to work (e.g., supervisor) and non-work (e.g., spouse), and increasing roles may lead to difficulties in accomplishing one role over the other. For instance, depletion perspectives posit that individuals have limited resources at their disposal to be able to attend to different roles. Trade-offs are made to accommodate the undertaking of these roles, and this process puts the individual under the risk of potential stressors and strains (Rothbard, 2001).

However, managing multiple roles has also been recognised as a means for enrichment, where resources can be renewed and replenished (Fisher et al., 2009). Rothbard (2001) emphasises the need to recognise the importance of the enrichment process, where engagement in one role can relate to further engagement in a different role. Grounded from research on role accumulation and multiple roles (Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977), the enrichment perspective postulates that the more roles one is committed to can actually be beneficial rather than a source of drain. Rothbard suggests that one context affects another and looking into the enrichment process emphasises an alternative perspective to resource depletion. Thus, accumulation of roles provides the
individual more resources that can benefit one’s performance in other roles or capacities (Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977). For instance, exposure to both work and family experiences can have a cumulative positive effect to well-being, including as a buffer from stress and the means to transfer positive experiences from one role to the other (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Similarly, involvement in one role can provide opportunities to acquire inside knowledge or skill enhancement from one role that can be applied to another role. Thus, managing multiple roles may provide a way to acquire beneficial resources such that completing the demands of one role aid in the successful participation of a different role (Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977). For instance, work-life balance was depicted in terms of the subjective perception of the sufficiency of time that is allotted for the fulfilment of work and non-work roles (Gröpel & Kuhl, 2009). They found that work-life balance facilitates subjective well-being when a resource (i.e., time) is available in order to attend to a person’s needs (i.e., attainment of goals). Work-life balance provides individuals the opportunity to use ample time in a meaningful manner paving way to increased well-being.

Beauregard and Henry (2009) highlight the issue of work-life balance in the field of human resources management. Decisions and practices that determine the WLB policies are being endorsed in the hopes of enabling working individuals to manage their work and non-work roles and potentially reduce work-life conflict. For instance, Hayman (2009) found that flexible working hours contribute to work-life balance among office-based employees. Employees who were perceived to have a higher work-life balance by their peers and supervisors were also found to have greater career advancement potential (Lynees & Judiesch, 2008). Enhanced social exchange processes, cost saving, improved productivity and reduced turnover are other potential
pathways where work life balance practices may influence organisational performance (Beauregard & Henry, 2009).

McCarthy, Darcy and Grady (2010) also found pertinent attitudes and behaviours such as involvement in WLB policy, perceived policy instrumentality and utility can impact WLB policy outcomes such as policy awareness, uptake and satisfaction. Finally, Beauregard (2014) highlights the impact of fairness perceptions of WLB initiatives in counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), where CWB served as a negative emotional response towards unfairness as well as means to reclaim justice between the individual and the organisation.

In line with self-determination theory and the DMP, harmoniously passionate employees are more likely to experience work life balance as opposed to those who are obsessively passionate, and consequently perform better at work and experience greater job and life satisfaction. Self-determination theory (SDT, Deci & Ryan, 2000) distinguishes autonomous and controlled motivation, where the former is characterised for its agentic nature (i.e., personal causation) as opposed to the latter that is characterised by a pressure from inter- or intrapersonal forces to behave in certain ways. This is akin to the conceptualisation of harmonious and obsessive passion, where the former’s autonomous internalisation allows for the flexibility in behaviour choice while the latter’s controlled internalisation causes the rigidity in one’s behaviour. Ego-invested contingencies (e.g., sense of self-worth) that impose on sustaining the passionate activity do not matter as much for the harmoniously passionate, as compared to the obsessively passionate. This means that the harmoniously passionate can easily let go of a passionate activity because it bears no consequences to one’s self-worth, unlike the obsessively passionate who rely on it to nurture one’s sense of self-worth.

Thus, the nature of harmonious and obsessive passion illustrates how internalisation of the passionate activity (i.e., work) reflects the degree of control one
has over the passionate activity (i.e., work) and the DMP posits that this may play a role in the experience of conflict in one’s life in terms of the amount of time spent for work. For instance, Vallerand, and colleagues (2010) found that nurses who were obsessively passionate at work experienced more work-related conflict with their personal lives, leading to burnout. Similarly, Caudroit et al. (2011) reported that obsessively passionate teachers spend more time in their work and this played a role in their experience of conflict between work and family life. In both studies, harmonious passion for work was unrelated to conflict or excessive time spent at work.

Moreover, SDT also presupposes that autonomous motivations positively relate to feelings of interest and enjoyment, while controlled motivations have been linked with feelings of pressure and tension (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Indeed, autonomous motivation was positively related to subjective vitality (Nix, Ryan, Manly & Deci, 1999; Ryan & Frederick, 1997), which has positive implications to psychological well-being and health. The DMP literature also show that the harmonious and obsessively passionate individuals also differ in the extent they experience levels of positive affect during activity engagement and non-engagement. Individuals with harmonious passion for an activity experience high levels of positive affect during activity disengagement, while the opposite is true for the obsessively passionate. Obsessively passionate individuals were likely to experience decreases in positive affect when they disengage from the passionate activity as opposed to the times that they engage in it (Mageau & Vallerand, 2007; Stoeber et al., 2011). The extent to which passionate employees are able to disengage themselves from work and attend to other life activities may be the approach to attaining a sense work-life balance.

In line with the role accumulation and enrichment perspectives, being able to attend to various roles contribute to adaptive outcomes. Engagement in other roles serves as opportunities to reduce stress experienced from a different role or to obtain
resources, solutions or skills that may be beneficial for another role (Sieber, 1974; Rothbard, 2001; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Further, border theory posits that the capability to shift from work to non-work domains is a reflection of how individuals manage their work and personal lives by constructing boundaries of varied permeability and flexibility (Clark, 2000). Certain boundaries have been found to be ideal, for instance, being able to exercise greater work and personal life border flexibility results in increased enhancement and less interference in both work and non-work domains (Bulger et al., 2007). Thus, these perspectives suggest that work-life balance may be attained through engagement in both work-related and non-work related roles as well as the capacity to manage boundaries between work and non-work domains. Consequently, attaining balance between these two domains lead to adaptive outcomes (e.g., Gröpel & Kuhl, 2009; Beauregard & Henry, 2009)

With the ability of employees with harmonious passion to let go of their work and engage in activities outside of the work domain, they can potentially manage the boundaries and role expectations from both work and personal life domains. Furthermore, personal resources are not expended on dealing with interference, and the adequate participation in both work and non-work contexts can serve as means to replenish exhausted resources. On the contrary, obsessively passionate employees are likely to encounter less balance, as a result of the rigidity to remain active only in the work domain. This prevents them in attending to non-work domain roles as well as limiting their opportunities for replenishing resources spent at work.

With ample resources brought about by the likelihood to experience work life balance, harmoniously passionate employees are able to utilise such resources to be able to comply with the tasks required in their jobs, and experience employee well-being through higher levels of job and life satisfaction. In contrast, the imbalance between work and personal life may prevent obsessively passionate individuals from fully
accomplishing their work tasks, as well as preventing them from experiencing high levels of employee well-being. Given these theoretical considerations, it is predicted that:

*Hypothesis 5a*: Harmonious passion for work is indirectly related to in-role behaviours via work-life balance.

*Hypothesis 5b*: Obsessive passion for work is indirectly related to in-role behaviours via work-life balance.

*Hypothesis 6a*: Harmonious passion for work is indirectly related to organisational citizenship behaviours via work-life balance.

*Hypothesis 6b*: Obsessive passion for work is indirectly related to organisational citizenship behaviours via work-life balance.

*Hypothesis 7a*: Harmonious passion for work is indirectly related to job satisfaction via work-life balance.

*Hypothesis 7b*: Obsessive passion for work is indirectly related to job satisfaction via work-life balance.

*Hypothesis 8a*: Harmonious passion for work is indirectly related to life satisfaction via work-life balance.

*Hypothesis 8b*: Obsessive passion for work is indirectly related to life satisfaction via work-life balance.
Chapter 3

Study 1A: Testing the Factor-Structure of the Passion Scale

Introduction and Hypothesis

The purpose of Study 1A is to validate the Passion Scale as a measure for passion for work. Specifically, this study aims to further establish the psychometric properties of the passion scale as adapted in a different context such as the work setting. Indeed, context influences the display of organisational behaviours and shapes the meaning-making faculties of individuals in different situations (Johns, 2006). The reliability and validity of the Passion Scale has already been established upon its construction (Vallerand et al., 2003). However, showing further evidence for the validity of the factor structures that depict the dualistic model of passion as applied in a different context can contribute to the broadening of scope of the passion construct. Further, using samples from a non-Western, developing nation also strengthens the applicability of the passion construct over working individuals with varied cultural and economic backgrounds.

Drawing from the Dualistic Model of Passion, Vallerand and colleagues (2003) constructed the passion scale that reflected one’s harmonious or obsessive passion for a particular activity. Using a random sample of 284 college students, an exploratory factor analysis using maximum likelihood solution with oblimin rotation was performed in an initial pool of 34 items. From this analysis, the 14 items that had the strongest factor loading on each factor, thus comprising each factor with 7 items, underwent a second exploratory factor analysis. Findings showed a two-factor solution, with 7 theoretically aligned items that loaded onto the HP and OP factors. Confirmatory factor analysis on the 14-item scale was done on a separate sample that comprised of 235 participants. Results showed a good fit and confirmed the hypothesised factors that emerged from the exploratory factor analysis. The passion scale had undergone minor
revisions, reducing the items for each subscale to six but still yielded strong correlations with the original subscale (Vallerand, 2010).

Validation studies of the passion scale that were adapted in different contexts have also reported a two-factor solution. For instance, initial attempts to measure passion for an activity have been done by Rousseau and colleagues (2002) in the gambling context. The 10-item Gambling Passion Scale (GPS) underwent exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis among French-speaking participants. Two factors were extracted and identified as harmonious and obsessive passion for gambling, having five items for each. Confirmatory factor analysis showed fit indices that revealed a satisfactory fit of the model. Castelda and colleagues (2007) replicated the same scale in its English version among undergraduate psychology students who scored one or greater in the South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS, Lesieur & Blume, 1987). Subsequent factor analyses also revealed similar results.

The use of the passion scale in the work passion research is abundant, yet few have reported validity studies following the preliminary studies of Houlfort and colleagues (2003, as cited in Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). Fairly recent investigations by Ho and colleagues (2011) and Astakhova and Porter (2015) examined the validity of the passion scale among varied working samples and found support for the two-factor model of job passion. In line with the DMP and prior research, it is hypothesized that the Passion Scale will consist of a two-factor structure, with each passion subscale having a satisfactory reliability.

Method

Participants

To establish sample diversity and allow for variation in responses, the participants came from two separate groups: an academic institution and business organisations in the Philippines. A total of two hundred seventy-eight employees
(males = 110, females = 168) with a mean age of 35.7 years old participated in the study. Participants were recruited from various business sectors such as the academia (47.5%), banking and finance (14%), government and public service (7.6%), hotel and restaurant (6.8%), manufacturing and production (6.8%), information technology (6.5%), consulting (5%), marketing and sales (3.6%) and health care (2.2%). The employees have been working in their respective organisations on an average of 7.66 years. Majority of the respondents held a permanent work status (87%), while a little over a tenth are under probationary status.

**Procedure**

The assistance of various human resource and academic department heads were sought in recruiting the respondents. Request letters were sent seeking permission to administer surveys to their staff/faculty. The letter contained details about the study as well as researcher contact information in the event of questions or inquiries. Once approval was granted, distribution and collection of survey questionnaires commenced via the coordination with the respective department heads.

The participants received a survey kit that contained a formal letter that introduces the researcher and the research aims, a consent letter and the survey questionnaires to be accomplished by the respondent. Participants were reassured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their participation by emphasising such clause in the formal letter, and by assigning an anonymous code. The anonymous code was generated by using the first two letters of their first name and the last two letters of their surname. Upon completion of the surveys, the respondents were asked to return the surveys to the department head’s office to be later retrieved by the research assistant.

A total of three hundred survey questionnaires were collected. In line with previous research (e.g., Philippe et al., 2009; Vallerand et al., 2003), only those participants who were identified to be passionate about their work were included in the
study using the passion criteria subscale of the passion measure. Respondents who reached the cut-off point of an average of 5 and above on the passion criteria that measured love, value, time spent on work and passion for work were retained. Thus, from an initial sample of 150 teachers and 150 professionals, only 132 teachers and 146 professionals were retained. The final sample comprised of a total of 278 participants.

Measure

The Passion for Work Scale by Vallerand et al. (2003) and Vallerand (2010) was used in this study. It consists of 16-items that include four items that reflect the passion criteria and subscales for harmonious passion (HP) and obsessive passion (OP) for work with six items each. This scale measured the extent to which the respondents find their participation to their work as valuable and dear to them. The scale also measures if a passionate activity have been internalised in an autonomous (i.e., harmonious passion) or controlled (i.e., obsessive passion) fashion. This questionnaire was prepared in English, as Filipinos are known to speak this language (Bernardo, 2004) and rated by the respondent using a 7-point Likert scale.

The passion criteria correspond to the employees’ love, value, time spent on the activity and passion for the activity (i.e., work). Sample items include, “I love my work.”, and “I spend a lot of time doing my work.” Sample items for the HP subscale are, “The new things that I discover with my work allow me to appreciate it even more.”, and “Activities about my work allow me to live a variety of experiences.” Sample items for OP subscale include, “Activities related to my work are so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.”, and “I have an impression that the activities I do related to work control me.”

Based on previous studies (e.g., Vallerand et al., 2003; Philippe et al., 2009), the internal consistency of harmonious, obsessive and passion criteria measures were
acceptable, with alpha values above .70 (Nunnally, 1978). The reliability coefficient of this measure for this study is reported in the next section.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Principal components analysis was conducted to determine whether previous validation studies about the two types of passion are replicated and the passion items load into different factors. The Dualistic Model of Passion suggests that harmonious and obsessive passion are related subscales, thus, an oblimin factor rotation was used to obtain a two-factor solution. The psychometric criteria used in identifying factors include eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and factor loadings greater than +/- .40 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998; Floyd & Widaman, 1995).

Two factors emerged explaining 61.07% of the variance, with HP having an eigenvalue of 4.46, while OP yielded a value of 2.87. Six theoretically relevant items loaded under harmonious passion for work, with factor loadings ranging between .62 and .76. The remaining six items loaded under obsessive passion for work, with factor loadings ranging from .68 to .90. No cross-loadings were observed among any of the items.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The goal of conducting confirmatory factor analysis is to estimate a population variance in the covariance matrix in comparison with the observed covariance matrix derived from a sample and determine the amount of discrepancy it has (Holmes-Smith, 2010; Schrieber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, & King, 2006). It is ideal that the differences between the estimated and observed matrices are minimized (Schreiber et al., 2006).

A model is considered to have good fit if it adequately meets the cut-offs from various goodness of fit indices. The following fit indices indicate a good-fitting model: a) chi-square p value of greater than .05, b) the normed chi-square ($\chi^2$/df of greater than
1 but less than 2), c) the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of less than .05, d) the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) of less than .05, e) the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) of greater than .90, and, f) a smaller Akaike’s Information Criterion (AIC) statistic when comparing two or more models (Holmes-Smith, 2010; Byrne, 2001).

The CFA showed that the two-factor model was of poor fit. The CFI marginally approached the criterion of good fit (CFI = .90) while the remaining fit indices did not meet the minimum cut off for good fit, $\chi^2 = (53, \text{N}=278) = 231.43$, $p<.000$, $\chi^2/df = 4.37$, TLI = .88, SRMR = .06, RMSEA = .11 (CI 90%: .096 - .125). In this model, HP and OP correlated at .01, ns. Following initial confirmatory factor analysis, areas of misfit were identified and modifications were made. Byrne (2001) suggests that looking into the adequacy of parameter estimates can help identify potential sources of misfit. In particular, correlations greater than zero, negative covariances, excessively high or low standard errors and critical ratios that are lower than +/- 1.96 should be considered. Further, referring to modification indices and standardized residuals of value greater than 2.58 can also identify areas of misfit in the model.

An examination of the original CFA indicated acceptable parameter estimates. Modification indices indicated that allowing the error variance of items OP2 (“I have almost an obsessive feeling for my work.”) and OP6 (“I have an impression that my work controls me.”), as well as HP1 (“My work is in harmony with the other activities in my life.”) and HP2 (“The new things that I discover about my work allow me to appreciate it even more.”) to co-vary could enhance the fit. However, fit statistics only showed minimal improvement in the overall goodness of fit in comparison to the original model when such error terms were allowed to co-vary (CFI = .941 $\chi^2 = (51,$
Further examination of the standardized residuals revealed that the items HP1
(“My work is in harmony with the other activities in my life.”) and OP2 (“I have
almost an obsessive feeling for my work.”) were highly correlated (i.e., coefficients
between of 2.2 and 2.80) with some other harmonious passion items. These items were
dropped and resulted in an improved model fit, CFI = .97; $\chi^2$ = (34, N=278) = 73.13,
p<.000, $\chi^2$/df = 2.15, TLI = .96, SRMR = .05, RMSEA = .06 (CI 90%: .044 - .085). In
this modified model, HP and OP were correlated at -.03.

The modified one factor model provided a worse fit (CFI = .87; $\chi^2$ = (35, N=278)
= 192.35, p<.000, $\chi^2$/df = 5.50, TLI = .84, SRMR = .275, RMSEA = .13 (CI 90%: .110 -
.145). Apart from the fit statistics, the AIC (Two-factor AIC = 115.13, One factor AIC
= 232.35) and the chi square difference test between the two-factor and one factor
models suggests that the two-factor model still had the better fit (Two-factor vs. One
factor, $\chi^2$/diff (1) = 119.20, p<.01).

Overall, the final scale contains a total of ten items, where harmonious and
obsessive passion for work subscales has five items each. The reliability coefficients
are .76 and .90 for harmonious passion and obsessive passion, respectively. Harmonious
and obsessive passion were not significantly correlated with each other (r=-.046, p=.45).

Discussion

The purpose of Study 1A was to examine the factor structure of the passion
scale. The results are consistent with the Dualistic Model of Passion as well as previous
validation literature First, harmonious and obsessive passion were found to be distinct
constructs from each other which further establishes the duality of the passion construct
(Vallerand et al., 2003). Second, the findings lend further support to the notion that
work can also be an activity that individuals may feel passionate about, which can be internalized in either an autonomous or controlled fashion (Ho et al., 2011).

In line with Ho and colleagues, a good fit can only be established through model modification (i.e., item deletion), which can substantiate the potential breadth of the passion construct. This demonstrates that passion can be utilised in contexts beyond its initial conceptualisation associated with leisure activities, as well as working samples with varied cultural and economic backgrounds. However, while the results provide an empirical basis for the distinction between the two types of passion, it does not provide empirical evidence that these two constructs are distinct from other conceptually-related constructs. This limitation is addressed in Study 1B.

**Study 1B: Convergent and Divergent Validation of the Passion Scale**

**Introduction and Hypothesis**

The purpose of Study 1B is to extend the findings of Study 1A by further establishing the construct validity of harmonious and obsessive passion for work. Construct validation involves accumulating evidence about the operationalization of a measure by showing the relationship between such measure and other theoretically relevant constructs (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2005). Construct validity is achieved by examining the extent to which the construct is said to have convergent and discriminant validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Hinkin, 1998). Convergent validity can be established in various ways such as when scales correlate with other measures designed to assess conceptually similar or theoretically-relevant constructs. On the other hand, discriminant or divergent validity can be established by having the construct under investigation to have weaker or null correlations with conceptually distinct or unrelated constructs (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2005, Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Bennett & Robinson, 2000).
Vallerand and colleagues (2003) have examined related elements and outcomes that were associated with passion for activities. They found that both harmonious and obsessive passion significantly and positively correlated with activity valuation, time and energy invested and the level of inclusion the activity has to one’s core self. Level of conflict between the activity and other activities in one’s life significantly correlated with obsessive passion, but was unrelated with harmonious passion. Outcomes such as flow, positive emotions and concentration were positively correlated with harmonious passion but not with obsessive passion. Negative emotions and cognitions were positively associated with obsessive passion, particularly when prevented from engaging in the activity. These findings explored the correlates of passion and demonstrate the positive and negative routes of being either harmoniously or obsessively passionate towards an activity. In particular, Vallerand and colleagues (2003) have established how relevant constructs such as flow and activity internalisation relate to the two types of passion. While Vallerand (2010) further cited other constructs that may be related to passion such as intrinsic motivation, grit and interest, these distinctions have been based on the conceptualization of constructs. Nonetheless, the work of Vallerand and colleagues can be a starting point for further validation, particularly with emphasis on a more specific context such as work.

In this study, construct validity for harmonious and obsessive passion for work are established through correlation with conceptually-similar constructs such as work involvement, goal orientation, workaholism, work engagement and calling. These correlations are derived from a single sample and compared against each other (e.g., correlation between HP and work involvement versus correlation between OP and work involvement) to determine if a significant difference exists between the coefficients (Meng, Rosenthal, & Rubin, 1992; Steiger, 1980). Establishing significant differences between dependent correlations reflects the validity of the construct (e.g., Rowold &
Heinitz, 2007). As DMP posits differences in the degree of internalisation between harmonious and obsessive passion, it is expected that when both types of passion are correlated with each of the constructs, different levels of relationships will emerge.

**Work involvement.** Work involvement is defined as a psychological state of that pertains to the general notion of work that is deemed important or central to one’s self-image or self-concept (Gorn & Kanungo, 1980). It reflects a more stable psychological characteristic that does not depend on a particular job’s ability to satisfy one’s salient needs. Work involvement is a normative belief, as it is a product of one’s socialization where one learns to value work from their families, friends, religion or culture. Through such interactions, once comes to believe how and why work is a central component in their lives (Kanugo, 1982; Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994).

Given the conceptualisation behind work involvement, certain similarities between work involvement and the two types of passion can be observed. For instance, for an activity to be considered as one’s passion relies on the degree of valuation an individual has towards the activity. In the work context, passion for work and work involvement both highlight the importance of work to the individual. Passionate employees highly value their work, in the same way for employees who are highly involved in their work. Further, individuals who are passionate at work also recognise the important role of work in one’s self-concept. Indeed, passionate individuals identify with their work passion as exemplified by referring to themselves as a “musician” or “doctor”.

Despite these similarities, the distinguishing feature between passion for work and work involvement is the degree of autonomous or controlled internalisation of work into one’s identity (Vallerand et al., 2003). The autonomous internalisation of work among those who are harmoniously passionate allows them to keep their act on their
passion (i.e., work) without compromising other aspects in their non-work activities. In such cases, the harmoniously passionate individual is in control on his or her involvement at work. On the other hand, internalisation of work in a less autonomous way renders the obsessively passionate to depend on work as a means to attain the ego-related contingencies, and thus spends more time working than their harmoniously passionate counterparts. Based on this reasoning, it is expected that harmonious and obsessive passion for work will have a moderate and positive relationship with work involvement. It is also expected that obsessive passion and work involvement will have a stronger relationship than harmonious passion and work involvement.

Goal orientation. Goals as motivating agents have been identified as achievement motivation (Dweck, 1986) or achievement goals or goal orientations (Pintrich, 2000) that mobilise individuals to action. These represent a general orientation to the task that includes a number of related beliefs about purpose, competence, success, ability, effort, errors and standards (Pintrich, 2000). In essence, a goal is not simple a target devoid of rationale, but behind each specific targets set by individuals lie a more abstract reason for establishing a particular goal. Goals are typified according to learning or performance goals (Dweck, 1986). Learning goals serve to motivate an individual by the desire for mastery and further skill and knowledge acquisition that promote growth and a deeper understanding of the task. Individuals with a learning goal orientation may willingly expose themselves to uncertainty or errors for the sake of learning, self-improvement and progress. On the other hand, performance goals center on displaying one’s superior ability and outperforming others in comparison or preventing one’s weaknesses to be seen. One is motivated to obtain favorable judgment of ability or conceal one’s lack of ability to avoid negative evaluation. To attain this, performance-oriented individuals would favor
opportunities to look smart or avoid participating in tasks that would expose their lack of capability or incompetence towards a specific task.

Whereas the dichotomy of task and performance goal orientations have been recognized, Van de Walle (1997) proposed to further separate performance goal orientation into two dimensions namely the prove and the avoid dimensions. The prove dimension pertains to the motive of engaging in a task in order to gain favorable judgments towards one’s skill or abilities. The avoid dimension, on the other hand pertains to the motive of not engaging (i.e., avoiding) in a task that can possibly expose one’s lack of ability or skill. In his scale development effort, Van de Walle distinguished the types of goal orientations as: a.) learning goal orientation, or the desire for self-development through skills acquisition, mastery and improvement of competencies, b.) Prove-performance goal orientation, or the desire to demonstrate one’s competencies and receive favourable judgments, and c.) Avoidance-performance goal orientation, or the desire to prevent disapproval of one’s competencies and avoid unfavourable judgments. Elliot and Church (1997) had a similar conceptualization, where the goal orientations are typified as mastery-goal oriented, performance-approach oriented and performance-avoidance oriented.

A general similarity between passion and goal orientation lies in its motivational component. For instance, passion drives an individual’s behaviour through autonomous or controlled regulation of the activity, whereas goal orientation demonstrates reasons for doing a task that are either intrinsic (e.g., mastery and self-improvement) or extrinsic (e.g., praise and recognition) in nature. Thus, the harmoniously passionate and the learning goal oriented individual at work have the intent of further honing one’s ability or knowledge about one’s job. Challenges and potential lapses are not deterrents to further participation at work. Conversely, the obsessively passionate and the performance oriented individual at work would consider ego-related contingencies
attached to the activity. Participation at work is contingent on situations that will promote feelings of social acceptance, recognition or emphasis on one’s ability over potential improvement and enjoyment, and less on those that do not meet such contingencies. For example, Vallerand and his colleagues reported a positive relationship between harmonious passion and learning goal orientation, while obsessive passion was positively related to all types of achievement goals (Vallerand et al., 2008; 2007).

A point of contrast between passion and goal orientation is the extent of identification and valuation of an individual towards the activity or target goal. Identification with the activity as a result of internalisation is a key characteristic among passionate individuals, such that they associate their identity with the activity. Passionate individuals are also described to possess an immense liking or loving for the activity which are expressed through their valuation and frequent participation (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010). Such characteristics may not be applicable to individuals with specific goal orientations.

Based on the above reasoning, it is expected that harmonious passion for work and learning goal orientation will have a positive relationship with moderate strength, while obsessive passion for work and performance approach and avoidance goal orientation will have a positive relationship with moderate strength. It is also expected that harmonious passion for work and both performance goal orientations will not be significantly related. Similarly, a non-significant relationship is expected between obsessive passion for work and learning goal orientation.

**Workaholism.** A “workaholic” individual is described as someone who typically does a great amount of work and spends a great deal of time doing work. It is a salient behaviour, where one is seen to carry out more work tasks than the average employee—more often than not, even when unnecessary (Oates, 1968). Unique
behavioural patterns that depict workaholism also include spending an excessive amount of time at work, over and above what is required or necessary to meet one’s job or economic demands. They also have the tendency to ‘create’ more opportunities to work, such as complicating a task to extend immersion with the work. Workaholics also persistently think about work after work hours, leading to time for other aspects of their lives such as family, personal life or leisure and recreational opportunities to be compromised (Scott, Moore & Miceli, 1997; Schaufeli, Shimazu & Taris, 2009).

Workaholics are also characterised to have a high level of involvement and a strong irresistible drive to work, but experience low enjoyment as they succumb to the act of working rather than enjoying the nature of work (Schaufeli et al., 2009; Ng et al., 2007). Further, workaholics may have identity issues such as low self-esteem or under-developed self-concept which they compensate through working constantly. Being able to demonstrate how much more work they could do may elicit positive feelings about the self and the potential consequences such as external rewards, raises, promotions or other recognitions can be seen as an opportunity to highlight their efforts (Porter, 1996).

While a passionate activity can cause psychological disadvantages for some, it can be a source of pleasure or harmless distraction for others (Vallerand, 2010). In the case of psychological addiction, harmonious and obsessive passion would relate differently, with obsessive passion to be the stronger predictor. Studies within the context of passion and gambling revealed that such is the case, where obsessive passion predicts pathological gambling whereas harmonious passion is unrelated to it (Philippe & Vallerand, 2007; Ratelle et al., 2004). On the other hand, Mageau et al. (2005) found that when gambling is seen as a source of pleasure and enjoyment, harmonious passion for gambling relates to positive affective experiences.

In comparison to passion for work, workaholism appears to closely resemble obsessive passion rather than harmonious passion. The controlled internalisation of
work among the obsessively passionate makes them behave in ways similar to
workaholics. For instance, obsessively passionate employees experience an
uncontrollable urge to keep working and continue to think about work even outside of
the work context. The work they have are also a means by which they can satisfy
esteem needs (i.e., via contingencies associated with work). Obsessively passionate
employees and workaholics do have their differences in terms of the extent of liking or
loving the work they do. Individuals with obsessive passion for work identify
themselves with the job or work that they do and to some degree, still carry some
semblance of enjoyment. Furthermore, workaholism is depicted as a fairly stable
behaviour pattern that can be displayed regardless of type of work or organisational
settings (Scott et al., 1997) while passionate workers can be seen as involved with a
particular job, which encompasses only a specific work context.

On the other hand, a clear distinction exists between harmonious passion for
work and workaholism. The autonomous internalisation of work among harmoniously
passionate employees gives them a clear distinction from those with tendencies of
workaholism. Since the harmoniously passionate are more autonomous and in control of
their passions, they are able to freely engage in work and non-work activities, without
having to deal with the urge to do or think about work. Based on the reasoning above, it
is expected that obsessive passion for work and workaholism will have a positive
relationship of moderate strength, while no relationship is expected between
harmonious passion for work and workaholism.

**Work engagement.** Work engagement is characterised by vigour, dedication
and absorption that enables an individual to display a positive and fulfilling state of
mind at work (Shaufeli et al., 2002). The focal point of work engagement is its
reference to the activity of doing one’s work, more so than the role of an individual at
work (Bakker et al., 2008). Thus, while at work, highly engaged employees are
energetic, persistent and resilient (i.e., vigorous), exude pride and enthusiasm (i.e., dedicated) and are fully concentrated and engrossed (i.e., absorbed).

Passion for work and work engagement bear similarities in terms of the motivational nature between the two constructs. Individuals who are passionate or engaged at work are characterised as being engrossed in what they do such that time passes unnoticeably or quickly, or be persistent at work (Vallerand et al., 2003; Schaufeli et al., 2002). However, the distinction lies in the emphasis on roles at work among passionate individuals, to which they identify with. Engaged employees focus on the task at hand and the work that needs to be done, to which they which may not necessarily share some degree of identification.

Based on this reasoning, it is expected that work engagement and passion for work are moderately correlated. However, since work engagement is conceptualised in a positive nature and the opposite of burnout, it is further expected that harmonious passion for work will yield a positive relationship, while obsessive passion for work will yield a negative relationship.

**Calling.** A person with a calling is described as a) having a perception of being summoned by an external source towards a particular activity, b) exhibits behaviours geared towards making sense of one’s purpose or meaningfulness, and c) holding and demonstrating prosocial and other-oriented values (Dik & Duffy, 2009). Calling and passion are distinct but related constructs. For instance, individuals who felt a calling to their chosen activities--whether it is going to university or a certain career path--also describe themselves to be passionate about such activities (Hall & Chandler, 2005; Hunter, Dik & Banning, 2010). Indeed, passion does share similar qualities with calling, particularly in terms of selection of the passionate activity. Like calling, a person does not arbitrarily feel passionate towards one activity at one time, and a different activity in another. For the passionate employee, one’s work is regarded as
significant and meaningful, just like how individuals feel towards the activity or work they are called to do.

However, calling and passion have a number of remarkable differences. First, passionate individuals are able to arrive at the object of their passion through trial and error over time, where its meaningfulness is reflected in one’s identity (Vallerand et al., 2003). In contrast, individuals with a calling recognise an external, potentially omnipotent and unidentifiable source that guided them to their specific inclinations (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Hunter et al., 2010). Moreover, one’s passion does not necessarily reflect a pro-social stance, whether at the point of selection or execution of an activity. For instance, for employees who are either harmoniously or obsessively passionate, a sense of altruism will not take precedence when it comes to participation in one’s work. As DMP posits, passionate employees are driven either by the desire for enjoyment or mastery, or ego-reliant contingencies (Vallerand et al., 2003). Based on this reasoning, it is expected that calling and both types of passion are different constructs which should yield a weak correlation.

Method

Overview

This study made separate use of the two sample subsets utilised in Study1A. To assess the convergent and divergent validity of the passion scale, seven conceptually-similar constructs were measured in this study: work involvement, three types of goal orientation, workaholism, work engagement and calling. Passion for work was measured in both sample subsets. Work involvement and goal orientation were measured in Sample Subset 1, while workaholism, work engagement and calling were measured in Sample Subset 2.
Passion for Work, Work Involvement and Goal Orientation

Participants. Sample subset 1 consisted of teachers (males= 52, females=80), with an average age of 40.67 years (SD=9.47). Majority of the teachers have permanent employment status and have been teaching for an average of 11 years.

Procedure. The same procedure as in Study 1A was undertaken. Coordination with academic department heads and human resources were done to recruit respondents for both sample subsets. Upon approval, survey administration and collection were facilitated by a research assistant. Respondents were assured of confidentiality, anonymity and their right to discontinue participation in the research without any consequences.

Only participants who were identified to be passionate about their work were included in the study using the passion criteria subscale of the passion measure. Respondents who reached the cut-off point of an average of 5 and above on the passion criteria that measured love, value, time spent on work and passion for work were retained (e.g., Philippe et al., 2009; Vallerand et al., 2003). Thus, from an initial sample of 150 teachers, only 132 met the inclusion criteria and comprised the final sample for subset 1.

Measures. Unless otherwise specified, all measures were rated using a 7-point Likert Scale (strongly agree—strongly disagree) response format. All questionnaires were also prepared in English as Filipinos are known to speak this language (Bernardo, 2004).

Passion for work. This scale measured the extent to which the respondents find their engagement to their work as valuable and dear to them, as well whether work as a passionate activity have been internalized in an autonomous (i.e., harmonious passion; HP) or controlled (i.e., obsessive passion; OP) fashion (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010). Sample items for the HP subscale are, “The new things that I
discover with my work allow me to appreciate it even more.,” and “Activities about my work allow me to live a variety of experiences.” Sample items for OP subscale include, “Activities related to my work are so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.”, and “I have an impression that the activities I do related to work control me.”

This scale was used in both sample subsets. As qualified respondents have already been selected (i.e., those who are passionate at work), only the harmonious and obsessive passion subscales have been included in the analysis. Based from the confirmatory factor analysis performed in Study 1A, five items comprised each of the subscales. For subset sample 1, the reliability coefficient for the HP subscale is .80, while the reliability coefficient for the OP subscale is .85.

**Work involvement.** This was measured using the instrument developed by Kanungo (1982), which consisted of six items. To improve the reliability coefficient from .67 to .79, one item was deleted (“Work should be only a small part of one’s life.”, reverse coded). Sample items include, “The most important things that happen in life involve work.”, and “Life is worth living only when people get absorbed in work.”

**Goal orientation.** This was measured by the scale developed by Van de Walle (1997), comprising of three subscales namely, learning goal orientation, performance approach goal orientation and performance avoidance goal orientation.

**Learning goal orientation.** Among the five items that measured learning goal orientation, one item was removed (“I am willing to select a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from.”) to improve the reliability coefficient from .68 to .84. Sample items include, “I often look for opportunities to develop my new skills and knowledge.”, and “I prefer to work in situations that require a high level of ability and talent”.

**Performance approach goal orientation.** This subscale comprised of four items and had a reliability coefficient of .77. Sample items include, “I try to figure out what it
takes to prove my ability to others at work.”, and “I enjoy it when others at work are aware of how well I am doing.”

Performance avoidance goal orientation. This subscale consists of four items, with a reliability coefficient of .76. Sample items include, “I avoid situations at work where I might perform poorly.”, and “Avoiding a show of low ability is more important to me than learning a new skill.”

Passion for Work, Workaholism, Work Engagement and Calling

Participants. Sample subset 2 consisted of professionals (males=58, females=88) with an average age of 31.36 years who work in various industries such as banking and finance, marketing and consulting, information technology, government and public service, manufacturing, hotel and restaurant management and health care. This sample has been working in their respective industries on an average of 4.20 years, with 75% holding a permanent position while the remaining quarter of a percent was under probationary status.

Procedure. The same procedure as in Study 1A was undertaken. From an initial sample of 150 industry professionals, 146 employees reached the minimum passion criteria which comprised the final sample for subset 2.

Measures. Unless otherwise specified, all measures were rated using a 7-point Likert Scale (strongly agree—strongly disagree) response format. All questionnaires were also prepared in English as Filipinos are known to speak this language (Bernardo, 2004).

Passion for work. For subset sample 2, the reliability coefficients for HP and OP subscales are .71 and .89, respectively.

Workaholism. This was measured using the 10-item Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) developed by Schaufeli et al (2009). This is composed of two subscales, namely, working excessively (WE) and working compulsively (WC).
Example items include “I seem to be in a hurry and racing against the clock.” (WE) and “I feel guilty when I take time off from work.” (WC). A global score based on all items was used, as workaholism is conceptualised as having both excessive and compulsive working behaviours (Schaufeli, Bakker, Van der Heijden, & Prins, 2009). The overall reliability coefficient of this scale is .71.

**Work engagement.** This was measured using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, short form (UWES-9) developed by Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova (2006). The scale consists of three subscales namely, vigour (e.g., “At my work, I feel bursting with energy.”), dedication (e.g., “I am proud of the work that I do.”) and absorption (e.g., “I get carried away when I’m working.”). A composite score based on the three subscales was used, with the scale having an overall reliability of .78.

**Calling.** This was measured using the Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQ, Dik, Eldridge, Steger & Duffy, 2012). The scale has two subscales that pertain to “presence of” and “search for” one’s calling. Each subscale measures the dimensions of calling that include a) transcendent summons, b) purposeful work and, c) prosocial orientation, where each dimension consists of four items. As with previous research (e.g., Hirschi & Hermann, 2013; Allan & Duffy, 2014; Torrey & Duffy, 2012), this study used a composite score based on the Presence of Calling subscale. This subscale consists of 12 items and has an overall reliability coefficient of .74. Sample items include “I believe that that have been called to my current line of work,” “My work helps me live out my life’s purpose”, and “Making a difference for others is the primary motivation in my career.” Each item was rated using a 4-point Likert scale (1- Not at all true of me to 4- Absolutely true of me).
Results

The correlations between the two types of passion and work involvement and goal orientations are presented in Table 2, while the correlations with workaholism, work engagement and calling are presented in Table 3.

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, coefficient alpha, and intercorrelations of passion, work involvement, and goal orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harmonious passion</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Obsessive passion</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work involvement</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learning goal orientation</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance-approach goal orientation</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Performance-avoidance goal orientation</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01

Table 3

Means, standard deviations, coefficient alpha, and intercorrelations of passion, workaholism, work engagement, and calling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harmonious passion</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Obsessive passion</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workaholism</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work engagement</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calling</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01
Correlational analysis was used to test the relationship among these variables to determine convergent and divergent validity. Steiger’s test (1980) was used to determine the significant differences between dependent correlations.

**Passion for Work, Work Involvement and Goal Orientation**

**Work involvement.** Predictions for the relationship between passion for work and work involvement were supported. Both harmonious and obsessive passion for work significantly and positively correlated with work involvement with correlations of $r=.26$, $p<.01$ and $r=.52$, $p<.01$. Those who were obsessively passionate were found to have a stronger relationship with work involvement in comparison with the harmoniously passionate. The difference between the correlation coefficients was significant ($r_{OP,WINV} > r_{HP,WINV}$ [$Z= -2.46$, $p<.05$]).

**Goal orientation.** With the exception of the relationship between harmonious passion for work and performance-approach goal orientation, findings generally lend support to the predictions for passion for work and goal orientation. Harmonious passion for work was found to be moderately and positively correlated with learning goal orientation ($r=.39$, $p<.01$) while obsessive passion and learning goal orientation were unrelated ($r=.15$, $p=.09$). The difference between the correlation coefficients was significant ($r_{HP,LGO} > r_{OP,LGO}$ [$Z= 2.27$, $p<.05$]).

A significant, positive relationship was found between obsessive passion for work and performance-approach goal orientation ($r=.48$, $p<.01$). Harmonious passion for work was found to be positively correlated with performance-approach goal oriented ($r=.20$, $p<.05$), albeit weaker than obsessive passion. Testing for difference between dependent correlations harmonious, obsessive and performance-approach goal orientation showed a statistically significant difference ($r_{OP,PAG} > r_{HP,PAG}$ [$Z= -2.63$, $p<.01$]).
A significant, positive relationship was also found between obsessive passion for work and performance-avoidance goal orientation ($r=.50$, $p<.01$), while the relationship between harmonious passion for work and performance-avoidance goal orientation was not significant ($r=-.07$, $p=.42$). The difference between the correlation coefficients was significant ($r_{OP,PAV} > r_{HP,PAV}$ [$Z=-4.97$, $p<.01$]).

**Passion for Work, Workaholism, Work Engagement and Calling**

**Workaholism.** The predicted relationships between harmonious and obsessive passion for work and workaholism were both supported. A significant and moderate relationship between obsessive passion and workaholism ($r=.55$, $p<.01$), and the non-significant relationship between harmonious passion and workaholism ($r=-.09$, $p=.29$). A significant difference between the two dependent correlations was also found ($r_{OP,WORK} > r_{HP,WORK}$ [$Z=-5.24$, $p<.01$]).

**Work engagement.** Findings lend support to the predicted relationships between harmonious and obsessive passion for work and work engagement. Harmonious passion for work showed a significant positive relationship ($r=.29$, $p<.01$) while obsessive passion showed a significant, negative relationship ($r=-.28$, $p<.01$). The difference between the correlation coefficients was significant ($r_{HP,WENG} > r_{OP,WENG}$ [$Z=4.41$, $p<.01$]).

**Calling.** The predicted relationships between harmonious and obsessive passion for work and calling partially supported. Only harmonious passion for work showed a weak, but significant relationship with calling ($r=.19$, $p<.05$) while obsessive passion for work was unrelated ($r=-.10$, $p=.23$). A significant difference between the two dependent correlations was also found ($r_{HP,CALL} > r_{OP,CALL}$ [$Z=-5.24$, $p<.01$]).

**Discussion**

The construct validity of the passion scale (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010) was established by conducting correlational analyses and tests of difference
between dependent correlations among theoretically-relevant constructs. Specifically, convergent validity between harmonious passion for work and work involvement and learning goal orientation were confirmed. Convergent validity between obsessive passion for work and work involvement, performance-approach goal orientation, performance-avoidance goal orientation and workaholism were also established. With the exception of the relationship between harmonious passion and performance-approach goal orientation, divergent validity was established between the harmonious passion for work and performance-avoidance goal orientation and workaholism. The correlations between the two types of passion with that of work engagement and calling also indicate divergent validity. Based on the findings, the concept of passion for work can be recognized as unique construct. At best, passion shares some qualities that these constructs also possess, however both harmonious and obsessive passion for work possess different conceptualization that allows it to stand on its own as separate constructs.

Summary

Study 1 had two objectives. First, it investigated the factor structure of the Dualistic Model of Passion as applied in the work context (Study 1a). Second, it established that harmonious and obsessive passion are distinct constructs in comparison with other theoretically-relevant constructs by conducting construct validation (Study 1b). The findings from Studies 1a and 1b concur with previous research (e.g., Vallerand et al., 2003; Ho et al., 2011). Having established its construct validity and applicability in the work context, next set of studies aim to examine how being either harmoniously or obsessively passionate towards work impact one’s performance and well-being. Specifically, employee outcomes variables such as in-role behaviour, organisational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and life satisfaction will be examined.
Chapter 4  

Study 2: The Main Effects of Passion for Work on Employee Performance and Well-being Outcomes

Introduction and Hypotheses

The aim of Study 2 is to examine the main effects of passion for work on performance and well-being outcomes among working professionals. Performance at work is classified into in-role behaviour (IRB, or task performance) and extra-role behaviour, or commonly referred to as organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs). In-role behaviour is considered as an essential behavioural outcome that contributes to a functioning organisation, where designated roles and tasks must be accomplished within the required set criteria (Katz, 1964). On the other hand, as a volitional act that goes beyond one’s job requirement, organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) benefits either the members of the organisation or the organisation itself (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Moreover, these outcomes are considered relevant indicators in employees’ performance assessment.

The present study proposes that harmoniously passionate employees will positively predict in-role behaviour while those obsessively passionate towards their work will be negatively related to it. Passion for an activity is characterised by liking, high valuation, effort and time-bound engagement and internalised into one’s identity. According to self-determination theory and the DMP (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2012; Vallerand et al., 2003), an autonomous internalisation reflects an inherently intrinsic motive which enables individuals experience positive outcomes. In contrast, controlled internalisation relies on contingencies attached to the activity which prevents the individual from being volitional, resulting to negative outcomes. Thus, autonomously motivated individuals tend to have better performance outcomes that those who have a controlled motivation over a task. These differences have been observed among
harmonious and obsessively passionate entrepreneurs and other working professionals in terms of their networking performance or cognitive processes that facilitate optimum work performance (Ho and Pollack, 2014; Ho et al., 2011). Therefore, the following predictions are proposed:

*Hypothesis 1a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to in-role behaviour.*

*Hypothesis 1b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to in-role behaviour.*

It is also proposed that harmonious and obsessively passionate employees will differ in the way they demonstrate organisational citizenship behaviours. The DMP posits that the autonomous internalisation of the passionate activity (i.e., work) enables the harmoniously passionate to remain in control over the extent of their participation at work. Those with harmonious passion for work are more flexible in terms of choosing whether to continue doing their work or not. In contrast, the controlled internalisation and contingency-based characteristics of the obsessively passionate contribute to rigidity in engagement to other activities outside of the passionate activity. The contingencies attached to the passionate activity contribute to its persistent involvement as disengagement could mean the loss of the benefits they get from the contingencies.

Therefore, it is argued that the volitional and inherent flexibility of the harmoniously passionate will not only enable them to accomplish their work but also engage in OCBs. Harmoniously passionate employees can freely choose the extent to which they can engage in various tasks at work in contrast with the obsessively passionate ones. The contingencies attached to work that are valued by the obsessively passionate employees may prevent them from engaging in other activities beyond their formal set of responsibilities and are unlikely to engage in OCBs. The following predictions are proposed:
Hypothesis 2a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to organisational citizenship behaviours.

Hypothesis 2b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to organisational citizenship behaviours.

The second set of outcomes pertains to employee well-being, which is operationalized as the degree of satisfaction employees have with their jobs as well as their lives in general (Danna & Griffin, 1999; Zhang et al., 2015). It is proposed that harmoniously and obsessively passionate individuals will differ in their levels of job satisfaction and life satisfaction. The DMP posits that as a result of the autonomous internalisation of work among harmoniously passionate individuals, this enables them to display the flexibility to choose the extent to which they will engage or disengage with their work. Since harmoniously passionate employees display volitional behaviours on whether to continue working or not, they are able to experience concentration on their work if they so choose, or enjoy a non-work activity instead.

In contrast, the obsessively passionate employees may be restrained by rigidity to continue engaging in their work as a result of controlled internalisation. In particular, the ego-involved contingencies they attach to their work contribute to why their work controls them; therefore, they continue to engage in their work even on occasions when they need to refrain from it. Thus, DMP postulates that the lack of autonomy among obsessively passionate employees may render them susceptible to negative affective experiences at work such as frustration or disappointment. Thus, the following predictions are proposed:

Hypothesis 3a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to job satisfaction.
Hypothesis 4a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to life satisfaction.

Method

Participants

One hundred thirty-nine employees (males=62, females=76) with an average age of 31.19 years participated in this study. The participants came from a wide variety of occupations such as accounting and finance (18%), customer service (18.7%), human resources (15.1%). Other occupations include those from information technology (7.9%), sales (6.5%), manufacturing (5.8%) and marketing (5.8%) while respondents from general management, public relations and legal practice make up the remaining 7%. Around 14% of the participants belonged to other professions which they chose not to specify. All participants have been working in their respective professions for about 2.65 years.

Procedure

The same procedure as in Study 1 was undertaken. The researcher coordinated with the human resources head to recruit participants. Upon approval, a schedule for survey administration and collection was set and data collection commenced. Participants received a survey kit that contained an information sheet, a consent form and survey forms for the participant and a survey kit for the co-rater. Participants were also asked to nominate a co-worker that they regularly work with as a co-rater. All respondents were informed of their rights and were assured of confidentiality, anonymity and right to withdraw from participating in the research. Café gift cards were given to the participants as a token of appreciation and gratitude for participating in the study.
To identify passionate employees, the passion criteria subscale incorporated in the Passion for Work scale was used. An employee’s love or liking of the job, time spent at work and perceived valuation and passion for it served as the inclusion criteria and those who reached the minimum cut-off score of 5 and above were retained. Thus, from an original sample of 161 employees, only 139 met the criteria which comprised the final sample.

**Measures**

To determine the main effects of passion for work on performance and well-being outcomes, five scales that measure passion for work, in-role behaviour (IRB), organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), job and life satisfaction were utilised. Unless otherwise specified, a 7-point Likert Scale (strongly agree – strongly disagree) was used to rate all scales. All questionnaires were prepared in English as Filipinos are known to speak this language (Bernardo, 2004). The passion scale was rated by the participants while scales that measured performance and well-being outcomes (i.e., IRB, OCB and satisfaction) were rated by the participant’s nominated co-worker.

**Passion for work.** As with Study 1, the scale developed by Vallerand and colleagues (2003) was used and adapted in the work setting (Vallerand, 2010). The scale comprises of items that refer to the passion criteria (e.g., valuation, time spent at work) and items that measure harmonious (HP) and obsessive passion (OP) for work. Based on the confirmatory factor analysis performed in Study 1, the harmonious and obsessive passion subscales comprise of five items each, with an internal consistency of .88 for HP and .84 for OP. Sample items for the HP subscale include “My work reflects the qualities I like about myself”, and “My work allows me to live a variety of experiences.” Sample items for the OP subscale include, “If I could, I will only do my work”, and “My work is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.” This scale is rated by the participant.
Co-worker ratings of in-role behaviour (IRB). This was measured using a 4-item in-role performance subscale of the employee performance measure by Williams and Anderson (1991). As this was rated by the co-worker, the items pertain to the participant’s in-role performance such as “This person adequately completes assigned duties”, and “This person fulfils responsibilities specified in the job description.” The scale has a reliability coefficient of .83.

Co-worker ratings of organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB). This was measured using the Helping subscale of Van Dyne and Lepine’s (1998) scale for helping and voice extra-role behaviours. As this was rated by the co-worker, the items pertain to the participant’s extra-role performance such as, “This person volunteers to do things for this work group”, and “This person helps others in this group to learn about the work.” The subscale consists of 7 items and has an internal consistency of .92.

Co-worker ratings of job satisfaction. This was measured using the scale developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins and Klesh (1983), which indicates one’s global job satisfaction. The self-report measure consists of 3 items: “All in all, I am satisfied with my job”, “In general, I don’t like my job.”, and “In general, I like working here.” The items were modified to fit the co-worker rating. Items include, “All in all, this person is satisfied with his/her job”, “In general, this person does not like his/her job” (reverse-coded), and “In general, this person likes working here.” The reliability coefficient of this scale is .94.

Co-worker ratings of life satisfaction. Developed by Diener et al. (1985), the Satisfaction with Life Scale was used to measure this construct. This self-report measure comprises five items, with examples such as, “In most ways, my life is close to my ideal” and “I am satisfied with my life.” The items were modified to fit the co-worker rating. Example items are, “This person is satisfied with his/her life”, “In most
ways, this person’s life is close to his/her ideal.” The reliability coefficient of this scale is .86.

**Controls.** Judge and Watanabe (1993) found that demographic variables such as gender, age and tenure may potentially influence job performance and satisfaction, which also served as the control variables in this study. With the exception of gender, age was positively correlated with co-worker-reported job satisfaction ($r = .19, p < .05$) while tenure was positively associated with task performance ($r = .17, p < .05$) and co-worker-reported job satisfaction ($r = .20, p < .01$). Given that gender did not significantly correlate with any of the dependent variable, it was excluded in the subsequent analysis.

**Results**

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics, reliability coefficients, and zero-order correlations of the study variables. Harmonious passion for work was significantly and positively related to all performance and well-being outcomes. Specifically, harmonious passion for work is associated with higher co-worker-reported IRBs ($r = .35, p < .01$) and OCBs ($r = .43, p < .01$). Similarly, harmonious passion was associated with higher levels of job satisfaction ($r = .51, p < .01$) and life satisfaction ($r = .58, p < .01$) as rated by co-workers. In contrast, obsessive passion for work was only positively
Table 4

*Means, standard deviations, coefficient alpha, and intercorrelations of Study 2 variables*

| Variable                               | Mean | S.D. | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    |
|----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Gender                              | .55  | .50  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Age                                 | 31.19| 9.22 | -.04 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. Tenure                              | 2.65 | 1.31 | -.03 | .75**|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. Harmonious Passion                  | 5.82 | 1.02 | .01  | .32**| .26**| ( .88)|      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. Obsessive Passion                   | 3.84 | 1.48 | .14  | .22* | .12  | .37**| ( .84)|      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. In-role behaviour                   | 6.24 | 0.75 | .11  | .14  | .17* | .35**| .16  |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Organisational citizenship behaviour| 6.09 | 0.71 | .02  | .09  | .15  | .43**| .140 | .62**| ( .92)|      |      |      |
| 8. Co-worker-reported job satisfaction | 6.00 | 0.96 | .07  | .19* | .20**| .51**| .27**| .53**| .58**| ( .94)|      |      |
| 9. Co-worker-reported life satisfaction| 5.68 | 0.86 | -.07 | .26**| .26**| .58**| .28**| .39**| .50**| .56**| ( .86)|      |

*p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001 (two-tailed test)
Values in parentheses are reliability coefficients.
related to co-worker-reported job satisfaction ($r=.27$, $p<.01$) and co-worker rated life satisfaction ($r=.28$, $p<.01$).

It is also important to note that some demographic variables were associated with outcome variables. For example, age was positively associated with co-worker-reported job satisfaction ($r=.19$, $p<.05$) and co-worker-reported life satisfaction ($r=.26$, $p<.01$). Tenure also had a positive relationship with co-worker-reported in-role behaviour ($r=.17$, $p<.05$), co-worker-reported job satisfaction ($r=.20$, $p<.01$) and co-worker-reported life satisfaction ($r=.26$, $p<.01$). Based on these findings, age and tenure were used as control variables in succeeding analyses. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to test the hypothesized relationships. The results of the hierarchical multiple regression are presented in Table 5. The standardized regression coefficients and the relevant probabilities (p-values) are also reported.

Table 5

*Results of hierarchical regression analyses of Study 2 variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>In-role Behaviour</th>
<th>Organisational Citizenship Behaviour</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.51*</td>
<td>5.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonious passion</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.444***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive passion</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>8.06***</td>
<td>14.66***</td>
<td>21.60***</td>
<td>28.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.19**</td>
<td>8.31***</td>
<td>13.08**</td>
<td>17.98***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001 (two-tailed test)
For in-role behaviour, age and tenure were entered in Step 1, but the model was not statistically significant ($F(2, 136) = 2.11, p=.13$). Entry of the independent variables (harmonious and obsessive passion) in Step 2 contributed 10% of the variance in predicting in-role behaviour over and above the demographics. Harmonious passion for work was positively related to in-role behaviour ($\beta=.33, p<.001$) while the relationship between obsessive passion and in-role behaviour was not significant ($\beta=.04, p=.69$). Thus, the findings lend support to the hypothesis that being harmoniously passionate towards one’s work predicts higher ratings of in-role behaviour (Hypothesis 1a). However, the prediction that being obsessively passionate towards work will negatively impact in-role behaviour was not supported (Hypothesis 1b).

Organisational citizenship behaviour shares a similar pattern of results with task performance. Age and tenure were entered in the first step, but the model was not statistically significant ($F(2, 136) = 1.64, p=.20$). After controlling for age and tenure in Step 2, harmonious and obsessive passion for work explained additional 18% of variance in predicting OCB. Specifically, harmonious passion for work was positively related with OCB ($\beta=.44, p<.00)$, while obsessive passion for work did not yield a significant relationship ($\beta=-.02, p=.80$). Based on these findings, the hypothesis that being harmoniously passionate towards one’s work predicts OCBs was supported (Hypothesis 2a). In contrast, the prediction that being obsessively passionate towards work will negatively impact OCBs was not supported (Hypothesis 2b).

Age and tenure were also controlled for employee well-being outcomes. For job satisfaction (as rated by co-worker), age and tenure were entered in the first step and the model was statistically significant $F(2, 136) = 3.51, p<.05$). Harmonious and obsessive passion for work was entered in Step 2 and contributed to 28% of total variance in predicting job satisfaction. ($F(4, 134) = 13.08, p<.001$). After controlling for age and
tenure, passion for work accounted for 23% of the additional variance explained in co-worker-reported job satisfaction. Harmonious passion for work was positively related with job satisfaction ($\beta=.46, p<.001$) while obsessive passion was not significant ($\beta=.11, p=.18$). This finding lends partial support for Hypothesis 3 where evidence that harmonious passion for work predicts higher job satisfaction (3a) was demonstrated. In contrast, the prediction that being obsessively passionate towards work will have a negative impact on one’s job satisfaction was not supported (3b).

Finally, age and tenure were entered in the first step for life satisfaction (as rated by co-worker) and the model was statistically significant $F (2, 136) = 3.51, p<.05$). After controlling for age and tenure, entry of harmonious and obsessive passion for work in Step 2 contributed 35% of variance in predicting life satisfaction ($F (4, 134) = 17.98, p<.001$). Passion for work explained an additional 27% variance in life satisfaction over and beyond the influence of the demographic variables. Harmonious passion for work was positively associated with life satisfaction ($\beta=.52, p<.001$) while no relationship was observed with obsessive passion ($\beta=.08, p=.31$). This finding lends partial support for Hypothesis 4 where evidence that harmonious passion for work bears a positive impact to life satisfaction (4a) was demonstrated. The prediction that being obsessive passion for work will predict lower life satisfaction was not supported (4b).

**Discussion**

The purpose of Study 2 is to investigate the main effects of passion for work on outcomes such as in-role behaviour (IRB), organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs), job satisfaction and life satisfaction (as rated by peers). The findings obtained lend partial support to the propositions, specifically, that being harmoniously passionate towards one’s work enables employees to demonstrate the capacity to do work-related tasks expected of them, as well as voluntary helping behaviours that benefits members of the organisation.
In line with the Dualistic Model of Passion, the autonomous internalisation of one’s work in the employees’ identities allows them to benefit from positive and productive outcomes that reflect optimum performance. This is so as harmoniously passionate employees engage in their work through their own volition, typically out of enjoyment and not from external reinforcements. They are also in control of their work, for instance, in terms of when to engage or disengage from it enabling them to be fully immersed and focused in their work. Indeed, Ho et al (2011) noted that harmoniously passionate employees tend to be more absorbed at work, leading to better performance. Harmonious passion for work also serves as a mechanism that enables autonomy thereby harnessing individual creativity in one’s job (Liu et al., 2011).

Performance in non-work settings also favours harmonious passion. For instance, harmoniously passionate individuals have also been regarded as those who are more concerned with task mastery which contributes to their performance (Vallerand et al., 2007, 2008). DMP also posits that harmoniously passionate employees do not rely on ego-invested contingencies for their sustained participation at work. They demonstrate flexibility in the different roles which allows them to engage in non-work related activities, which may include organisational citizenship behaviours.

Despite the non-significant relationship between obsessive passion for work and performance outcomes (i.e., IRBs and OCBs as rated by co-worker), this finding suggest that predominant claims from the popular press about the absolute advantage of being “passionate of one’s work” should be taken with prudence. In line with the findings of Ho and colleagues (2011), employees experience optimum performance at work depending on the kind of passion they hold towards it where those who are obsessively passionate are at a disadvantage.

Findings for well-being outcomes are generally in line with the DMP and previous empirical studies. As posited in the DMP, the autonomous internalisation of
work in one’s identity, the non-reliance towards contingencies, the capacity to have control over the passionate activity and the intrinsic motive to engage in the activity allows harmoniously passionate individuals to experience positive psychological well-being (e.g., Forest et al., 2011, Philippe et al., 2009; Rousseau & Vallerand, 2008). In line with previous research (Carbonneau et al., 2008, Vallerand et al., 2010), Thorgren et al., 2013), being harmoniously passionate towards one’s job enables employees to experience more satisfaction with their job and life in general.

The prediction that obsessively passionate individuals are less satisfied in their job and life in general was not supported. While DMP posits that negative outcomes are expected to arise from obsessive passion due to controlled internalisation of the passionate activity, previous studies found that obsessive passion for work can be unrelated to job satisfaction (Thorgren et al., 2013; Vallerand et al., 2010; Carbonneau et al., 2008). For life satisfaction, results tend to be mixed, where obsessive passion and life satisfaction are either negatively related (e.g., Forest et al., 2011; Rousseau & Vallerand, 2008; Vallerand et al., 2007) or unrelated (Vallerand et al., 2007). Nonetheless, the general implications of these findings point to the disadvantage obsessively passionate employees have in terms of how their passion does not contribute to their work and life satisfaction. Being passionate towards work bears an impact to one’s well-being, and obsessive passion in particular results in little or no benefit for employees.

This study examined the main effects of harmonious and obsessive passion for work. While the results are generally in line with prior research, where harmonious passion is deemed favourable over obsessive passion, it is possible that another variable can serve as a mechanism that link passion for work and its outcomes. For instance, goal orientation, cognitive engagement, affect and needs satisfaction are some of the mediating mechanisms that determine the impact of passion towards performance and
well-being (Vallerand et al., 2007; Ho et al., 2011; Rousseau & Vallerand, 2008; Forest et al., 2011). The subsequent study aims to address this matter.

Nevertheless, this study also brings several strengths. First, performance outcomes were measured by utilising co-worker (or a peer) ratings of in-role and organisational behaviours to minimise issues with common method variance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Second, by investigating the work and life satisfaction, this study demonstrates the extent to which passion for work impacts the well-being of employees evident in the context within and beyond work (Danna & Griffin, 1999).

Summary

Study 2 examined the relationship between passion for work and various performance and well-being outcomes. The findings of this study serve as the groundwork for Study 3 that investigates the variable linking passion for work with performance and well-being outcomes. Specifically, Study 3 extends these findings to include perceptions of work-life balance as the mediating mechanism.
Chapter 5

Study 3: The Mediating Role of Work-Life Balance on Performance and Well-being Outcomes among Passionate Employees

Introduction and Hypothesis

This chapter reports Study 3 which had two main objectives. First, Study 3 aimed to replicate the findings of Study 2 using a different sample (i.e., nurses) in order to address of generalisability of its results. Second, Study 3 aimed to extend Study 2 by examining the mediating role of work-life balance in the relationship between passion for work and performance and well-being outcomes.

Similar to Study 2, the present study hypothesised that harmonious passion for work will be positively related to performance outcomes, while obsessive passion for work will be negatively related. Specifically:

*Hypothesis 1a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to in-role behaviour.*

*Hypothesis 1b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to in-role behaviour.*

*Hypothesis 2a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to organisational citizenship behaviours.*

*Hypothesis 2b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to organisational citizenship behaviours.*

It also predicted that harmoniously passionate employees will experience higher levels of employee well-being as measured by their job and life satisfaction, in contrast with obsessively passionate employees.

*Hypothesis 3a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to job satisfaction.*
Hypothesis 3b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to life satisfaction.

It is also hypothesised that perceptions of work-life balance mediates the relationship between passion for work and performance and well-being outcomes. Work-life balance entails experiencing satisfaction in all life domains by attaining optimum functioning in work and home domains with minimum role conflict and a potential for consonance between work and non-work domains, such as adequate allotment of resources like time, energy and commitment (Clark, 2000; Greenblatt, 2002; Kirchmeyer, 2000, as cited in Lyness & Judiesch, 2008; Fisher, 2001, as cited in Bulger et al., 2007).

Definitions of work-life balance reflect notions of equivalent degree of participation and the perceived capacity to meet the demands from both work and non-work domains. While objective indicators such as equal amount of time and involvement in both domains provide clear-cut measures of ‘balance’, subjective measures of perceived degree of balance are also important in order to account for the relativity whether employees actually feel balanced and satisfied (Reiter, 2007; Greenhaus et al. (2003). Guest (2002) further suggests that the perception of balance can be relative, such that what one interprets as ‘balanced’ may not be perceived in a similar fashion by another.

Border theory states that balance may be achieved through recognising the borders that delineates work and non-work domains (Clark, 2000). It emphasises the importance of identification with one’s domain in order to manage it in such a way that
individuals can contribute and excel. More importantly, it is through identification with roles in both work and non-work contexts facilitate border and domain management which consequently leads to the attainment of balance (Clark, 2000). Managing the permeability and flexibility of domain boundaries also enable individuals to perform effectively and experience enrichment in various domains (Bulger et al., 2007). Managing multiple roles has also been recognized as a means of deriving enrichment where resources can be renewed and replenished (Fisher et al., 2009).

Grounded in research on role accumulation and multiple roles (Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977), the enrichment perspective posits that the more roles one is committed can actually be beneficial rather than a source of drain. Rothbard (2001) further emphasises the need to recognise the importance of the enrichment process, where engagement in one role can relate to further engagement in a different role. Indeed, managing multiple roles has also been recognized as a means where enrichment can be derived from, where resources can be renewed and replenished (Fisher et al., 2009).

The study draws from the Dualistic Model of Passion (Vallerand et al., 2003) and perspectives on enrichment (Rothbard, 2001; Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977) and Border theory (Clark, 2000) in explaining how being harmonious or obsessively passionate towards work may promote or deter work-life balance experiences, and how such balance or imbalance impact work performance and well-being. The degree to which the one’s work is internalised between those with harmonious and obsessive passion for work determines the extent of control one has towards the work (i.e., the passionate activity). With the ability of those with harmonious passion to let go of their work and engage in activities outside of the work domain, they can potentially manage the boundaries and role expectations from both work and personal life domains. Furthermore, personal resources are not expended in dealing with interference, and the adequate participation in both work and non-work contexts can serve as means to
replenish used up resources. With ample resources brought about by the likelihood to experience work life balance, harmoniously passionate employees are able to utilize such resources to be able to comply with the tasks required in their jobs, and experience employee well-being through higher levels of job and life satisfaction.

In contrast, obsessively passionate employees are likely to encounter less balance, as a result of the rigidity to remain only in the work domain, rendering them with the inability to manage boundary and role expectations from work and non-work domains. This also limits their opportunities for replenishing resources spent at work. Furthermore, the imbalance between work and personal life may prevent obsessively passionate individuals from fully accomplishing their work tasks, as well as preventing them from experiencing high levels of employee well-being. Given these theoretical considerations, it is predicted that:

**Hypothesis 5a:** Harmonious passion for work is indirectly related to in-role behaviours via work-life balance.

**Hypothesis 5b:** Obsessive passion for work is indirectly related to in-role behaviours via work-life balance.

**Hypothesis 6a:** Harmonious passion for work is indirectly related to organisational citizenship behaviours via work-life balance.

**Hypothesis 6b:** Obsessive passion for work is indirectly related to organisational citizenship behaviours via work-life balance.

**Hypothesis 7a:** Harmonious passion for work is indirectly related to job satisfaction via work-life balance.

**Hypothesis 7b:** Obsessive passion for work is indirectly related to job satisfaction via work-life balance.

**Hypothesis 8a:** Harmonious passion for work is indirectly related to life satisfaction via work-life balance.
Hypothesis 8b: Obsessive passion for work is indirectly related to life satisfaction via work-life balance.

Method

Participants

One hundred six nurses (male=54, female=52) with an average age of 27.84 years comprised the sample for this study. The participants have been in the nursing industry for an average of 2.26 years. Eighty percent held a permanent employment status, while 7% were under probationary and contractual status; 12% did not indicate their employment status.

Procedure

The same procedure as in Study 2 was undertaken. The researcher recruited the participants by coordinating with the department head of nursing units in various hospitals. Once approval was granted, a schedule for survey administration and collection was set and data collection commenced. Participants received a survey kit that contained an information sheet, a consent form and survey forms for the participant and a survey kit for the co-rater. Participants were also asked to nominate a co-worker that they regularly work with. All respondents were informed of their rights and were assured of confidentiality, anonymity and right to withdraw from participating in the research. Café gift cards were given to the participants as a token of appreciation and gratitude for participating in the study.

Employees who scored at least 5 or higher in the passion criteria subscale incorporated in the Passion for Work scale were included in the study. The subscale assesses the employee’s love or liking of the job, time spent at work and perceived valuation and passion for the job which served as the inclusion criteria. Thus, from an original sample of 134 employees, only 106 met the criteria which comprised the final sample.
Measures

To determine the main effects of passion for work on performance and well-being outcomes, five scales that measure passion for work, in-role behaviour (IRB), organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), job and life satisfaction were utilised in this study. Unless otherwise specified, a 7-point Likert Scale (strongly agree–strongly disagree) was used to rate all scales. All questionnaires were prepared in English as Filipinos are known to speak this language (Bernardo, 2004). The passion scale was rated by the participants while scales that measured performance and well-being outcomes (i.e., IRB, OCB and satisfaction) was rated by the participant’s nominated co-worker.

Passion for work. The scale developed by Vallerand and colleagues (2003) was used and adapted in the work setting (Vallerand, 2010). The scale comprises of items that refer to the passion criteria (e.g., valuation, time spent at work) and items that measure harmonious (HP) and obsessive passion (OP) for work. Based on the confirmatory factor analysis performed in Study 1, the harmonious and obsessive passion subscales comprise of five items each, with an internal consistency of .94 for HP and .88 for OP. Sample items for the HP subscale include “My work reflects the qualities I like about myself.”, and “My work allows me to live a variety of experiences.” Sample items for the OP subscale include, “If I could, I will only do my work”, and “My work is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.” This scale is rated by the participant.

Work-life balance. This was measured using the 15-item scale adapted from Fisher-McAuley, Stanton, Jolton and Gavin (2001), as validated by Hayman (2005). The scale captures items that pertain to subscales such as work interference with personal life (WIPL, “Personal life suffers because of work.”), personal life interference with work (PLIW, “My work suffers because of my personal life.”), and work/personal
life enhancement (WPLE, “Personal life gives me energy for my job.”). A composite score based from the overall items was derived to measure work-life balance. Interference items from WIPL and PLIW subscales were reversed coded. This scale has a reliability coefficient of .83.

**Co-worker ratings of in-role behaviour (IRB).** This was measured using the four-items of Williams and Anderson’s (1991) in-role performance scale with the highest factor loading. Previous research showed that the shortened measure has adequate reliability (Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog & Zagenczyk, 2013; Podsakoff, Bommer, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). As this was accomplished by the co-worker, the items pertain to the participant’s in-role performance such as “This person adequately completes assigned duties”, and “This person fulfils responsibilities specified in the job description.” The scale has a reliability coefficient of .98.

**Co-worker ratings of organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB).** This was measured using the Helping subscale of Van Dyne and Lepine’s (1998) scale for helping and voice extra-role behaviours. As this was accomplished by the co-worker, the items pertain to the participant’s extra-role performance such as, “This person volunteers to do things for this work group”, and “This person helps others in this group to learn about the work.” The subscale consists of 7 items and has an internal consistency of .98.

**Self and co-worker ratings of job satisfaction.** This was measured using the scale developed by Cammann et al. (1983), which indicates one’s global job satisfaction. Self-report and co-worker ratings of job satisfaction were included in this study. The measure consists of 3 items: “All in all, I am satisfied with my job”, “In general, I don’t like my job.”, and “In general, I like working here.” The items were modified to fit the co-worker rating. Items include, “All in all, this person is satisfied with his/her job”, “In general, this person does not like his/her job”, and “In general,
this person likes working here.” The reliability coefficient of this scale for the self-report measure is .87, while the reliability coefficient for the co-worker rated measure is .96.

Self and co-worker ratings of life satisfaction. Developed by Diener et al. (1985), the Satisfaction with Life Scale was used to measure this construct. Self-report and co-worker ratings of life satisfaction were included in this study. This measure comprises of five items, with examples such as, “In most ways, my life is close to my ideal,” and “I am satisfied with my life.” The items were modified to fit the co-worker rating. Example items are, “This person is satisfied with his/her life.”, “In most ways, this person’s life is close to his/her ideal.” The reliability coefficient of this scale for the self-report measure is .92, while the reliability coefficient for the co-worker rated measure is .97.

Controls. As with Study 2, demographic variables such as age, sex and gender were controlled.

Results

Main Effects Analyses

Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics and the zero-order correlations for the study variables. Harmonious passion was significantly correlated with both self-reported and co-worker-reported job satisfaction, with coefficients r=.29 and r=.28, respectively. However, harmonious passion did not correlate with both co-worker-reported in-role behaviour (r=.11, p=.27) and co-worker-reported organisational citizenship behaviour (r=.15, p=.11). A significant, negative relationship was found between obsessive passion for work and work-life balance (r=-.47, p<.01). Among the performance variables, only co-worker-reported in-role behaviour yielded a significant, negative correlation while co-worker-reported organisational citizenship behaviour was
Table 6

Means, standard deviations, reliability, and intercorrelations of Study 3 variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tenure</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Harmonious passion</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Obsessive passion</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work-life balance</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Self-reported job satisfaction</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-reported life satisfaction</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In-role behaviour</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Organisational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Co-worker-reported job satisfaction</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Co-worker-reported life satisfaction</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001) (two-tailed test)
Values in parentheses are reliability coefficients.
unrelated \((r=-.18, p=.08)\). All self- and co-worker-reported job and life satisfaction outcomes were found to be unrelated with obsessive passion for work.

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to test the predicted main effects relationships. Among the demographic variables, only tenure was significantly correlated to both self-reported \((r=.21, p<.05)\) and co-worker-reported \((r=.21, p<.05)\) life satisfaction. Gender and age were not significantly associated with the outcome variables, and hence, excluded in the subsequent analysis. The results of the hierarchical multiple regression are presented in Table 7. The standardized regression coefficients and the relevant probabilities \((p\text{-values})\) are also reported.

Table 7

Results of hierarchical regression analyses of Study 3 variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Self-reported</th>
<th>Co-worker-reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonious passion</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive passion</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>4.61*</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.06**</td>
<td>3.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001 (two-tailed test)

Hypothesis 1 proposes that harmoniously passion will relate positively with in-role behaviour (1a), while obsessive passion will have a negative relationship (1b). Entering tenure in Step 1, the model was not statistically significant \(F(1, 97) = .78, p=.38\). Upon entering the independent variables in Step 2, both types of passion explained additional 10% variance in in-role behaviour over and above the control variable. In particular, the
data did not indicate a significant relationship between harmonious passion and in-role behaviour in-role behaviour ($\beta = .09, p=.36$.), however, obsessive passion for work exerted a significant negative relationship with in-role behaviour ($\beta = -.30, p<.01$). Findings partially support Hypothesis 1, where only the proposed main effect of obsessive passion towards in-role behaviour was supported (1b).

Hypothesis 2 proposes that harmonious passion for work will be positively associated with organisational citizenship behaviours (2a), while obsessive passion will be negatively correlated to it (2b). However, since organizational citizenship behaviour was not significantly correlated with both harmonious and obsessive passion, it was excluded from the regression analyses. As such, Hypothesis 2a and 2b were not supported.

Hypothesis 3 proposes that harmoniously passionate employees will have higher levels of satisfaction with their jobs (3a) in comparison with the obsessively passionate employees, who will report lower levels of job satisfaction (3b). Tenure was entered in the first step for the regression model for self and co-worker-reported job satisfaction, and both models for self ($F (1, 97) = 2.77, p=.10$) and co-worker-reported ($F (1, 97) = 3.70, p>.05$) job satisfaction, were not significant. The inclusion of harmonious and obsessive passion in Step 2 contributed to an additional 9% (self-reported) and 7% (co-worker-reported) variance in explaining job satisfaction. Results showed that harmonious passion for work has a positive relationship with self-reported ($\beta = .27, p<.01$) and co-worker-reported ($\beta = .26, p<.01$) job satisfaction. Obsessive passion for work did not significantly predict job satisfaction for both measures. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported in favour of the prediction for the main effects of harmonious passion for work on job satisfaction (3a).

Finally, Hypothesis 4 proposes that harmoniously passionate employees will have higher levels of satisfaction with their lives (4a) in comparison with the
obsessively passionate employees, who will have lower levels of life satisfaction (4b).

For self-reported life satisfaction, tenure was entered in Step 1 and yielded a statistically significant model ($F(1, 97) = 4.52, p<.05$), with tenure significantly predicting life satisfaction ($\beta=.21, p<.05$). Both types of passion were then entered in Step 2 and contributed 5% additional variance over and above the control variable. Harmonious passion for work was positively related to self-reported life satisfaction ($\beta = .21, p<.05$), while obsessive passion was unrelated ($\beta = .06, p=.57$). However, while the overall model was statistically significant ($F(3, 95) = 3.11 p< .05$), the addition of the passion did not add significant variance in predicting self-reported life satisfaction ($\Delta F = 2.34, \Delta R^2 = .04 p=.10$).

For co-worker-reported life satisfaction, entering tenure in Step 1 resulted in a significant model ($F(1, 97) = 4.60, p<.05$) where tenure was positively related to life satisfaction ($\beta=.21, p<.05$). In Step 2, the inclusion of harmonious and obsessive passion for work yielded a significant model ($F(3, 95) = 4.27, p<.01$) and explained an additional 7% variance in life satisfaction after controlling for tenure. Harmonious passion was significantly and positively related with life satisfaction ($\beta = .27, p<.01$), while obsessive passion was not significant ($\beta = .04, p=.68$). Given these findings, Hypothesis 8 was partially supported in favour of the prediction for the main effects of harmonious passion for work on job satisfaction (4a).

**Mediation Analyses**

In order to assess the indirect effects of harmonious passion and obsessive passion in predicting the work outcomes via work life balance, Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2012) was used. This approach was utilised to determine indirect effects without relying on the assumption of normality in the sample.
As this study identifies harmonious and obsessive passion for work as different independent variables, Hayes (2013) suggests treating one of the independent variables as a covariate. Using only one independent variable would yield its direct and indirect effects on the dependent variable, but possibly includes the effect of the other independent variable that was left out. Thus, treating the other independent variable as a covariate can control these potential effects. Apart from controlling for either harmonious or obsessive passion for work across all dependent variables, tenure was also considered as a covariate for life satisfaction measures as its relationship has been shown (Judge & Watanabe, 1993) and was the only demographic variable that was significantly correlated in this sample. The indirect effect and confidence interval results are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8

*Indirect effects of harmonious passion via work-life balance on employee performance and well-being outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>95% Confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-role behaviour</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[.05, .23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[.46, .21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (Self Reported)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>[.10, .40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction (Self Reported)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>[.08, .37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (Co-Worker Reported)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[.03, .21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction (Co-Worker Reported)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>[.02, .24]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

*Indirect effects of obsessive passion via work-life balance on employee performance and well-being outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>95% Confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-role behaviour</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>[-0.19, 0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (Self Reported)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>[-0.34, -0.10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction (Self Reported)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>[-0.30, -0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (Co-Worker Reported)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction (Co-Worker Reported)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>[-0.20, -0.02]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Harmonious passion and outcome variables.** Hypothesis 5a proposes that the relationship between harmonious passion and in-role behaviour is mediated by work-life balance. After controlling for obsessive passion and tenure, the indirect effects of harmonious passion for work on in-role behaviour via work-life balance was not significant, (indirect effect = .07, SE = .07). The resulting 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the indirect effect ranged from -.05 to .23. The total (B = .14, p=.30) and direct (B=.07, p=.63) effects were also not significant. Thus, the Hypothesis 5a was not supported.

Hypothesis 6a proposed that the relationship between harmonious passion for work and organisational citizenship behaviour is mediated by work-life balance. Non-significant indirect effects were found between harmonious passion and organisational citizenship behaviour (indirect effect = .05, SE = .07). The resulting 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the indirect effect ranged from -.46 to .21. The total and direct effects were also not significant with coefficients of .18 (p=.13) and .13 (p=.32), respectively. Given these findings, Hypothesis 6a was not supported.
Hypothesis 7a proposed that the relationship between harmonious passion for work and job satisfaction is mediated by work-life balance. The indirect effects of harmonious passion for work on self-reported job satisfaction via work life balance was significant (indirect effect = .22, SE = .07) with the 95% confidence intervals ranging from .10 to .40. Total effect was also significant (B=.34, p<.01) while the direct effect was not significant (B=.12, p=.29). Further analyses suggest that the indirect effect between harmonious passion for on the co-worker-reported job satisfaction via work-life balance was not significant (indirect effect = .06, SE = .06, CI [-.03, .21]. However, both total (B=.32, p<.01) and direct (B=.26, p<.05) effects are significant. These findings support Hypothesis 7a.

Finally, Hypothesis 8a proposed that work-life balance mediated the relationship between harmonious passion for work and self- and co-worker-rated life satisfaction. For self-reported life satisfaction, the indirect effect was significant (indirect effect = .20, SE = .07, CI [.08, .37]). The total effect was also significant (B=.26, p<.05) while direct effect was not (B=.08, p=.57). For co-worker-reported life satisfaction, the indirect effect was significant (indirect effect = .11, SE = .06, CI [.02, .24]). The total effect was also significant (B=.29, p<.01) but the direct effect was not (B=.17, p=.13). These findings lend support to Hypothesis 8a.

Obsessive passion and outcome variables. Hypothesis 5b proposed that the relationship between obsessive passion for work and in-role behaviour is mediated by work-life balance. The indirect effects of obsessive passion for work on in-role behaviour via work-life balance was not significant, (indirect effect = -.06, SE = .06). The resulting 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the indirect effect ranged from -.19 to .06. However, regression coefficients of the total (B = -.32, p<.01) and direct (B=-.25, p<.05) effects were significant. Given these findings, Hypothesis 5b was not supported.
Hypothesis 6b proposed that the relationship between obsessive passion for work and organisational citizenship behaviour is mediated by work-life balance. Non-significant indirect effects were found (indirect effect = -.05, SE = .05). The resulting 95% confidence intervals (CIs) ranged from -.16 to .05. Total and direct effects were also not significant with coefficients of .15 (p=.10) and .10 (p=.33), respectively. Thus, Hypothesis 10b was not supported.

Hypothesis 7b proposed that the relationship between obsessive passion for work and job satisfaction is mediated by work-life balance. The indirect effects of obsessive passion for work on self-reported job satisfaction via work-life balance was significant (indirect effect = -.20, SE = .06) with the 95% confidence intervals ranging from -.34 to -.10. Both total and direct effects were not significant, with coefficients -.11, p=.18 and .09, p=.29, respectively. Further analyses suggest that the indirect effect between obsessive passion for on the co-worker-reported job satisfaction via work-life balance was not significant (indirect effect = -.06, SE = .05, CI [-.16, .03]. Both total (B= -.03, p=.71) and direct (B=.03, p=.74) effects were also not significant. Thus, Hypothesis 11b was supported.

Finally, Hypothesis 8b proposed that work-life balance mediates the relationship between obsessive passion for work and life satisfaction. For self-reported life satisfaction, the indirect effect was significant (indirect effect = -.16, SE = .06). The resulting 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the indirect effect ranged from -.30 to .06. The total effect was not significant (B=.03, p=.72) while direct effect was significant (B=.19, p<.05). For the co-worker-reported life satisfaction, the indirect effect was also significant (indirect effect = -.09, SE = .04). The resulting 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the indirect effect ranged from -.20 to -.02. Neither the total (B=.03, p=.73) nor the direct (B=.12, p=.16) effects were significant. Overall, Hypothesis 12b was supported.
Supplementary Analyses

Supplementary analyses were done to examine alternative models that represent work-life balance as a potential moderator. Following border and enrichment perspectives (Clark, 2000; Rothbard, 2001; Sieber, 1977; Marks, 1974), individuals who are able to attend to both work and non-work demands are likely to attain balance in these domains, which is beneficial as resources utilized from both contexts can serve as means to improve performance and well-being at work. Thus, passionate employees are likely to perform better at work and have higher levels of employee well-being if they have high levels of work-life balance.

However, examination of alternative models showed non-significant interaction effects between passion for work and work-life balance. Result showed non-significant findings for the conditional direct effect of harmonious and obsessive passion for both peer-reported IRB (B = -.10, SE = .15, ns for HP; B = -.07, SE = .11, ns for OP); the same findings apply for OCB (B = .05, SE = .13, ns for HP; B = .08, SE = .10, ns for OP).

Non-significant findings were also found for the conditional direct effect of passion for work, for both self- and peer-reported well-being outcomes. Specifically, the interaction terms for HP and work-life balance were not significant for job satisfaction (B = -.08, SE = .11, ns for self-report; B = .06, SE = .12, ns for peer-report), as well as with life satisfaction (B = -.13, SE = .12, ns for self-report; B = -.05, SE = .11, ns for peer-report). Non-significant interaction terms were also found between OP and work-life balance for job satisfaction (B = .01, SE = .08, ns for self-report; B = -.02, SE = .09, ns for peer-report), as well as with life satisfaction (B = -.15, SE = .09, ns for self-report; B = -.06, SE = .09, ns for peer-report).
Discussion

Study 3 investigates the link between passion for work and employee performance and well-being outcomes. The findings of the study lend partial support to the theoretical propositions drawn from the Dualistic Model of Passion, Border and Enrichment theories. For instance, the negative relationship with in-role behaviour and the non-significant relationship with organisational citizenship behaviours show that being obsessively passionate with one’s work is generally not beneficial to an individual’s performance at work. This finding is consistent with previous studies about obsessive passion and its counterproductive consequences on performance, both in non-work (Vallerand et al., 2008, 2007) and work settings (Ho et al., 2011; Astakhova & Porter, 2015).

In line with the hypothesised outcomes, work-life balance also serves as the mechanism that allows passionate employees to experience either satisfaction or dissatisfaction in their work and personal lives. The findings showed that harmonious passion for work results in greater job and life satisfaction via increased perceptions of work-life balance. This is in contrast with those obsessively passionate at work who experience less balance, and were less satisfied in their job and life in general. In accordance to DMP, harmoniously passionate employees were shown to have greater capacity to benefit from work-life balance in contrast to their obsessively, given their flexible nature to shift from work to non-work identities. Conversely, obsessively passionate employees, characterized with rigidity and inflexibility to “shift out” from the passionate activity (i.e., work) may experience higher levels of imbalance between work and personal life. Indeed, this suggests that work-life balance may serve as a mediating mechanism that enables workers to spend adequate time spent in both work and non-work domains (Greenblatt, 2002). Similar with the study of Gröpel and Kuhl
(2009), these findings also highlight the role of work-life balance in promoting well-being.

However, several of the proposed hypotheses were not confirmed. First, an unexpected finding was the absence of relationship between harmonious passion for work with in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours. Two possible explanations are suggested that involve sample characteristics and the utility of alternative measures of performance. While nurses have been utilised in previous passion studies, the primary focus was more about their well-being rather than their performance at work (e.g., Vallerand et al., 2010; Lavigne et al., 2014).

Previous research regarding the nursing profession highlights the nature of its work schedule that centers on shift work, (Coffey, Skipper, & Jung, 1988; Fitzpatrick, While, & Roberts, 1999). Indeed, one’s work schedule is considered a relevant factor in determining variation in work productivity, particularly if changes such as curtailing or extending time for work, are to be implemented (Basset, 1979). In the case of nurses, shift work may comprise of eight to twelve-hour rotating shifts. Findings suggest that effective performance may also depend on specific times of the day, where people work more effectively during day shifts as attributed to the biological sleep-wake processes (Coffey et al., 1988). Additionally, one’s social lifestyle and the means to self-select one’s shift can also influence work performance among nurses (Alward & Monk, 1990). Thus, it is possible that while the sample in this study harbor a harmonious passion for the nursing profession, factors that relate to the nature of their work may have intervened in their capacity to perform optimally. Future research

Another potential explanation lies on the operationalisation of performance. While the use of general measures of IRB and OCB have been utilised in previous organisational behaviour research as a measure of performance (e.g., Shoss et al., 2013; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998), perhaps a more specific or customised measure would be
ideal in technical fields such as nursing. For instance, performance in the nursing profession has been operationalised in terms of quality of patient care or on-call work (Todd, Reid & Robinson, 1989; Smithers, 1995). Thus, using performance measures that depict specific abilities relative to a particular sample may bring about more variation in responses.

The predictions about the mediating role of work-life balance regarding passion and performance outcomes were also not supported. Work-life balance did not mediate the relationship between either types of passion with in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours. There had been evidence of non-significant correlations between employee’s work-life balance (as rated by supervisors) with promotability ratings or actual promotions (e.g., McCauley, Lombardo & Usher, 1989). It is also plausible that providing work-life balance practices may enable employees to attain higher levels of in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours. Provision of work-life practices have been theorised to influence organisational characteristics such as work hours, organisational support, wages and finances, job attitudes and productivity that will ultimately have an impact on organisational performance on an individual and organisational level (Beauregard & Henry, 2009). Further research can look into the role of work-life balance practices among passionate employees.

The present study has limitations that are worth noting. First, as the primary research design is a cross-sectional survey, the findings cannot be used to describe changes in the variables across time. Second, work-life balance was measured using a global self-report measure which reflects a subjective perception of one’s sense of ‘balance’ between work and personal life. While the use of subjective measures has been recognised as a valid way to operationalise work-life balance (Reiter, 2000; Greenhaus et al., 2003), a more comprehensive measure that comprise of both objective (e.g., time spent at work and non-work) and subjective measures of work-life balance
can fully capture work-life balance given the breadth of its conceptualisation. Further, subjective ratings may be prone to common method variance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Finally, as previous empirical work on workplace passion utilised various kinds of working individuals (e.g., teachers, nurses, entrepreneurs), variables relating to type of job (e.g., work hours) were not included in the analysis.

**Summary**

Overall, Study 3 showed mixed results regarding the consequences of passion for work relative to the proposed hypotheses. Specifically, in contrast to harmonious passion for work, theoretical propositions about main effects of obsessive passion for work were confirmed and findings replicated previous research on its disadvantages towards performance and well-being. The findings also suggest that work-life balance acts as a mediating mechanism that influences passionate employees’ job and life satisfaction, rather than performance outcomes such as in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours.
Chapter 6

General Discussion of Key Findings and Conclusions

Research on passion has been steadily increasing over the last decade (Vallerand et al., 2003; Carpentier et al., 2012). These studies showed the breadth of settings that demonstrate the impact of being harmoniously or obsessively passionate towards activities from sports, music, arts, internet-usage and video games, and even gambling. Further, research has also established the positive and negative consequences that result from harmonious and obsessive passion. For example, harmoniously passionate individuals experience more positive emotions, have less conflict and better quality of interpersonal relationships, excel at task performance and educational persistence, and relatively healthy levels of well-being. In contrast, obsessively passionate individuals are more likely to experience negative emotions, become prone to aggressive behaviours and problem gambling, rigid persistence, and relatively lower levels of well-being (e.g., Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand et al., 2007; Mageau et al., 2005; Donahue et al., 2009; Bonneville-Roussy et al., 2013).

Initially associated with leisure activities, subsequent studies have expanded the notion of passion to include organisational settings (Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003; Ho et al., 2011). In these studies, passion for work was found to impact one’s psychological well-being and attitudes at work. In line with earlier literature, harmonious passion has been associated with positive outcomes in contrast to obsessive passion. Specifically, harmoniously passionate employees perceive more support and control in their jobs, utilise more effective networking strategies, are more likely to harness their creativity on the job and are less likely to view themselves as overloaded with work. In contrast, obsessively passionate employees view themselves as more overloaded with work, experience less support and control in their jobs and utilise less than optimal networking strategies (Lavigne et al., 2014; Liu, 2011; Ho & Pollack, 2014).
Another common idea associated among passionate workers is the way their passion makes them successful and happier at work. Extant literature on passion for work have shown that success in terms of performing one’s duties, as well as attaining satisfaction is dependent on the type of passion an individual has. Overall, harmoniously passionate employees are able to accomplish required tasks at work more effectively, and experience sound mental health and well-being than those with obsessive passion for work (Ho et al., 2011; Astakhova & Porter, 2015; Thorgren et al., 2013; Houlfort et al., 2013; Carbonneau et al., 2008).

Despite such studies, several knowledge gaps remain. First, the study on the applicability of the passion construct in non-Western working samples and against conceptually-similar constructs are yet to be explored. Second, there are limited studies about performance outcomes such as in-role (IRB) and organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB), and job and life satisfaction as measures of employee well-being. Finally, the role of passionate employees’ capacity to manage and attend to both work and non-work domains on employee outcomes also warrants further investigation.

The dissertation research program presented here had three objectives. First, it examined the factor structure and construct validity of the passion for work scale. Second, it investigated the relationship between passion for work and IRBs, OCBs, job and life satisfaction. Finally, it examined the mediating role of work-life balance in the relationship between passion for work and employee performance, and well-being. This chapter summarises the major findings of the studies and its contributions to theory and practice. Findings of the three studies are reviewed and integrated, with the implications discussed relative to the proposed objectives.

The first section of this chapter presents and discusses the results of the validation study. The succeeding sections review the findings for the main effects of passion for work and performance and well-being outcomes, as well as the mediating
effect of work-life balance. This is followed by a discussion on the theoretical and practical implications of these findings. Methodological limitations and suggestions for future research directions are also provided. The last section presents the overall conclusions of the dissertation.

**Construct Validation of the Passion for Work Scale**

The first objective in the research program was to examine the applicability of the passion construct in the work setting that comprises samples from a non-Western, developing context. It also aimed to establish the distinctiveness of the passion construct in comparison with other conceptually-similar constructs. These were achieved by identifying the dimensionality of passion for work, as well as conducting convergent and divergent validation studies.

Confirmatory factor analysis showed evidence for a two-factor structure of the Passion Scale that reflected harmonious and obsessive passion for work. In line with previous investigations and the DMP, the findings showed that indeed, harmonious and obsessive passion for work are two distinct constructs as posited by the DMP (Vallerand et al., 2003; Castelda et al., 2007; Ho et al., 2011). Harmonious and obsessive passion are conceptually different constructs that are acquired through the same process (i.e., internalisation of work as passionate activity) but differentiated in the degree of greater or lesser autonomous internalisation (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010). From a theoretical standpoint, these findings support the generalisability of the passion construct and its dualistic nature, as the current sample possesses different qualities and situational context (i.e., working individuals from a developing, non-Western setting) than those that are typically used in the existing passion literature.

It is interesting to note, however, that inconsistent correlations between harmonious and obsessive passion have been observed across the different samples in all studies. For instance, the samples from Study 1A ($r=.01, \text{ns}$; combined sample of
academics and industry professionals), Study 1B (r=.09, *ns*; i.e., sample sub-set of teachers) and from Study 3 (r=-.04, *ns*; i.e. sample of nurses) yielded a non-significant relationship between harmonious and obsessive passion for work. On the other hand, the sample sub-set consisting of industry professionals in Study 1B (r=.37, p<.01) and those from Study 2 (r=-.23, p<.01) showed significant relationships, albeit in different directions, between harmonious and obsessive passion for work.

The inconsistencies of the correlations between HP and OP have been observed in previous work passion literature. As shown in Tables 10 and 11, the significant relationship between harmonious and obsessive passion was observed in predominantly leisure/non-work oriented passion literature, while the non-significant correlations between harmonious and obsessive passion were more apparent in several studies involving the working population. For instance, out of 14 studies that reported the correlation between HP and OP in the workplace, more than 50% found a non-significant correlation between the two types of passion. In particular, characteristics such as having a homogenous sample such as those consisting of only one type of skilled occupation (e.g., coaches, teachers or entrepreneurs) are among those that have non-significant correlations between harmonious and obsessive passion. In the present research, non-significant HP and OP correlations were also observed among teacher and nurse samples. Carbonneau and colleagues (2008) acknowledge that correlations between harmonious and obsessive passion have varied in previous studies and the extent to which the two types of passion are considered related (i.e., orthogonal) or not may be attributed to the type of passionate activity.
Table 10

*Reported correlations between harmonious and obsessive passion in the leisure context*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Passon Scale Language</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville-Roussy, Vallerand and Bouffard (2013)</td>
<td>Study 1: 144 music students</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Study 1: r=.17, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: 218 music students</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Study 2: r=.47, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentier, Mageau and Vallerand (2012)</td>
<td>n=172 college students</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>r=.41, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curran, Appleton, Hill and Hall (2011)</td>
<td>n=149 elite soccer players</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>r=.73, p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue, Rip and Vallerand (2009)</td>
<td>Study 1: n=208 high school and college basketball players</td>
<td>NS (Canada - author affiliation)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Study 1: r=.37, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: n=60 high school basketball players</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Study 2: NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafrenière, Bélanger, Sedikides and Vallerand (2011)</td>
<td>n=105 undergraduate students</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>r=.19, p=.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mageau, Carpentier and Vallerand (2011)</td>
<td>n=40 card gamers (Magic the Gathering)</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>r=.47, p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mageau, Vallerand, Rousseau, Ratelle and Provencher (2005)</td>
<td>n=554 adults engaged in gambling activities</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>r=.44, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Przybylski, Weinstein, Ryan and Rigby (2009)</td>
<td>n=1,324 video game players</td>
<td>NS (USA - author affiliation)</td>
<td>English (Gambling Passion Scale)</td>
<td>r=.27, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousseau and Vallerand (2008)</td>
<td>n=119 older adults participating in</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>r=.63, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study/Year</td>
<td>Sample Size/Details</td>
<td>Language/Country</td>
<td>Correlation/Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenseng, Rise and Kraft (2011)</td>
<td>Study 1: n=207 leisure enthusiasts recruited online</td>
<td>NS (Norway - author affiliation)</td>
<td>r=.29, p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoeber, Harvey, Ward and Childs (2011)</td>
<td>n=168 videogame players</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>r=.34, p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallerand, Blanchard, Mageau, Koestner, Ratelle, Leonard, Gagne and Marsolais (2003)</td>
<td>Study 1: 539 college students - Group 1: EFA (n=284), Group 2: CFA (n=235)</td>
<td>NS (Canada - author affiliation)</td>
<td>r=.46, p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallerand, Mageau, Elliot, Dumais, Demers and Rousseau (2008)</td>
<td>Study 1: n=184 basketball players</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>r=.43, p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: n=67 athletes</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>r=.68, p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallerand, Rousseau, Grouzet, Dumais, Grenier and Blanchard (2006)</td>
<td>n=206 collegiate recreational sport participants</td>
<td>NS (Canada - author affiliation)</td>
<td>r=.48, p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallerand, Salvy, Mageau, Elliot, Denis, Grouzet and Blanchard (2007)</td>
<td>Study 1: n=143 dramatic arts students</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>r=.41, p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: n=130 undergraduate psychology students</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>r=.36, p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NS = Not specified. Language used was not reported. Correlations in bold typeface are not significant.
Table 11

Reported correlations between harmonious and obsessive passion in the work context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Passion Scale Language</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astakhova and Porter (2015)</td>
<td>n=233 workers from service and educator sectors</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>r=.67, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonneau, Vallerand, Fernet, and Guay (2008)</td>
<td>n=494 teachers from French-Canadian schools</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>r=.01, p&gt;.05 (Time 1), .00, p&gt;.05 (Time 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caudroit, Boiche, Stephan, Le Scanff, and Trouilloud (2011)</td>
<td>n=160 married/partnered teachers</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>r= -.04, p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue, Forest, Vallerand, Lemrye, Crevier-Braud, and Bergeron (2012)</td>
<td>Study 1: n=117 professional coaches</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>r=.07, p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: n=118 nurses</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>r=.06, p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest, Mageau, Sarrazin, and Morin (2011)</td>
<td>N=439 service employees</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>r=.35, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho and Pollack (2014)</td>
<td>n=206 entrepreneurs</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>r=.11, p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho, Wong, and Lee (2011)</td>
<td>n=717 full time employees</td>
<td>NS (USA - author affiliation)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>r=.30, p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houfourt, Philippe, Vallerand, and Menard (2014)</td>
<td>n=2,393 teachers</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Study 1: r= -.03, p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=335 teachers</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Study 2: r=.02, p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavigne, Forest, and Crevier-Braud (2011)</td>
<td>Study 1: n=113 young workers</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Study 1: r=.22, p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: n=323 working</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Study 2: r=.01, p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavigne, Forest, Fernet and Crevier-Braud (2014)</td>
<td>Study 1: n=485 teachers</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Time 1: r= -.09, p&gt;.05; Time 2: r= -.09, p&gt;.05; Time 1 HP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The non-significant correlations may also suggest that the specific nature of one’s job may enable the passionate worker to possess both harmonious and obsessive passion towards work. For instance, in the case of entrepreneurs, a harmonious passion towards entrepreneurship does not rule out the possibility of having an obsessive passion towards it as well. Indeed, Cardon and colleagues (2009) explain that entrepreneurs demonstrate their passion for entrepreneurship in a harmonious fashion. However, despite their capacity for enthusiasm and persistence, passionate entrepreneurs are also prone to difficulties of letting go of lacklustre ventures that are likely to fail (Cardon et al., 2005).

In the case of the nursing practitioners, studies suggest that nurses value self-development along with altruism and the desire to care as motivating factors for a career in nursing (McLaughlin, Moutray & Moore, 2010; Law & Arthur, 2003; Kersten, Bakewell & Meyer, 1991). This nurturing aspect of the job is what makes the profession meaningful for them as they put precedence towards providing care, comfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Pearson’s r</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patel, Thorgren, and Wincent (2014)</td>
<td>n=105 project leaders</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>r = .20, &lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorgren and Wincent (2013)</td>
<td>n=134 team project leaders</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>r=.33, p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorgren, Wincent and Siren (2013)</td>
<td>n=704 entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>r=.22, p&gt;.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallerand, Pacquet, Philippe, and Charest (2010)</td>
<td>Study 1: n=97 nurses</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Study 1: r=.35, p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: n=258 nurses</td>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Study 2: r=.19, p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NS: Not Specified. Language used was not reported. Correlations in bold typeface are not significant.
and support to those in need. Thus, the nursing occupation becomes an avenue to be able to demonstrate caring and nurturance towards others.

However, studies have also shown that nurses have begun to underrate the value of altruism towards patients and instead take up the nursing profession to satisfy personal needs (Rassin, 2008). Specifically, rather than keeping the profession ‘others-oriented’, it becomes more ‘self-oriented’ where the need to achieve is prioritised over personal growth and identity formation. It also caters to the improvement of one’s self-esteem and social status by fulfilling the inclination to feel needed and acquire a sense of purpose (Rassin, 2008; Kersten et al., 1991).

From a pragmatic standpoint, the nursing profession provides benefits not only to its practitioners but also their families (Kersten et al., 1991). Nursing provides financial stability (e.g., satisfactory compensation and fringe benefits) and paves the way for employment opportunities rendering the individual to take advantage of job availability, tenure, security, and advancement. Thus, they also benefit from the flexibility of the nursing profession, opportunities for occupational mobility, and a wide range of career options (Law & Arthur, 2003; Kersten et al., 1991; Rassin, 2008).

Taken together, the values inherent in the nursing profession as well as the circumstances associated with nursing practice enable one to exude both harmonious and obsessive passion towards their work. Given the difficulties that the profession entail, such as the amount of work and the time frame to get the work accomplished (i.e., shift work), nurses may very well demonstrate a harmonious passion for their profession. However, while some individuals prefer this profession for the meaning derived from helping others, some might favour a nursing career for the personal gain that nurture their ego and esteem-needs. Thus, being recognised as someone capable of providing help can foster an obsessive passion towards the nursing profession.
Teachers are also typically associated with harbouring a passion towards their profession. Along with qualities such as enthusiasm and commitment, being passionate is considered a non-negotiable characteristic among teachers (Day, 2004). To be a good teacher requires not only mastery of the subject matter and other competencies, but also demonstrate the passion that enables them to establish a connection with their students and deliver challenging, yet enjoyable learning experience (Hargreaves, 1998). The presence of older or veteran teachers impact pre-service teachers positively by serving as an inspiration for the novice educators which nurtures their passion for the teaching profession. Pre-service teachers also learn how to be resilient and develop an emotional connection with teaching that contributes to their commitment for the profession (Santoro, Pietsch & Borg, 2012).

However, teaching can be a difficult and strenuous profession. School teachers are typically subjected to interactions with colleagues, students and students’ parents and these may elicit perceived pressures that contribute to negative consequences such as stress and burnout (Stoeber & Rennert, 2008). Pelletier, Seguin-Levesque, and Legault (2002) also found that various types of perceived pressures such as ensuring high quality student performance, conformity to colleagues’ teaching methods and school activities, or being constrained in their influence of designing a curriculum were found to be negatively related with autonomous teaching motivation.

In line with self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; 2012), an autonomy-supportive, or controlling environment can facilitate or curtail the development of one’s autonomous motivation. The extent of engagement among students in a class can also influence teachers’ beliefs about their teaching experience. Specifically, teachers may perceive highly engaged students as those who are interested and appreciative of the teaching efforts while disengaged students may be perceived as unmotivated and aversive. These perceptions can have a positive or negative impact on teachers’ beliefs
about their teaching that can eventually lead to greater or lesser self-determined teaching behaviour (Pelletier et al., 2002; Roth, Assor, Kanat-Maymon & Kaplan, 2007).

Indeed, these findings suggest that one’s situational context may diminish self-determined behaviour among teachers. These perceptions may not only influence passionate teachers’ behaviours toward their students, but also in the way they manage their overall profession. For instance, when students are perceived as receptive towards the way classes are conducted, teachers may continue to hold on to their harmonious passion towards teaching, focusing on the enjoyment and extended learning from the experience. In contrast, negative perceptions such as students disliking or are aversive of their teaching can elicit a more obsessive passion towards their teaching; the end goal for teachers is to regain a more positive impression of themselves.

Finally, another consideration is the current study sample that originated from a country that generally gives precedence to intrinsic motives, despite the economic restraints. Filipino employees value autonomy, a sense of challenge and further mastery of their craft that they get from their work (Ilagan et al., 2014; Hechanova et al., 2005; Yao et al., 2005). Hence, possessing these qualities can be ways in which employees are able to nurture harmonious passion towards their respective professions.

However, Filipinos also place one’s family in high regard and the family is typically involved in career selection of children (Go, 1994; Salazar-Clemena, 2002). The family is also recognised as an authority figure among Filipinos, and gaining approval from authority figures is a value inherent among Filipinos (Bulatao, 1962b; Church, 1987). Employee recognition is a typical practice among Filipino organisations and institutions. For instance, accolades such as ‘employee of the month’ or convocations that award top performing teachers are some ways in which recognition is given to employees (Laguador, De Castro & Portugal, 2014; Bay, An & Laguador,
Thus, despite the capacity to appreciate autonomy, mastery and challenge in their jobs, Filipino employees may also lean toward obsessive passion for work when their goal is also to be recognised by family members and colleagues. Obsessive passion for work is likely, especially in cases where one’s family had an influence in the job or career selection, or if one was sought after by the organisation they are working for.

Construct validity was further established by means of presenting evidence based from assessing the relationship between passion for work and similar constructs such as work involvement, the three types of goal orientation, work engagement, calling and workaholism. Both types of passion showed weak to moderate relationships with the aforementioned constructs, thus demonstrating convergent and divergent validity. It is noteworthy that harmonious passion for work was significantly associated with more adaptive constructs such as learning goal orientation and work engagement, while obsessive passion for work was significantly related to less adaptive constructs such as performance-approach goal orientation, performance-avoidance goal orientation and workaholism. Thus, not only do the findings suggest the validity of the passion construct, but it also supports the proposition of the DMP regarding the extent to which passion is beneficial for the working individual.

Establishing the convergent and divergent validity of the passion construct (in comparison to conceptually similar constructs) indicates the appropriateness of capturing passion as applied in the work context and broadens our understanding of the working individuals’ behaviours and motives. This has several implications to theory, particularly in the breadth of the DMP. First, these findings contribute to the current passion for work literature by demonstrating that individual’s work behaviours can also be described to be a result of internalisation of one’s work into one’s identity. Second, as passion was initially conceptualised in leisure and non-work context, the findings of
the validation study also demonstrates the potential scope of the passion construct that cuts across non-leisure settings. Passion for work may also be associated with not just a source of income, but also as a means to express one’s identity through the jobs that passionate employees do. Being able to distinguish the characteristics of passionate workers are characterised may be recognised and incorporated in employee training and development.

**Main Effects of Passion for Work on In-Role Behaviours (IRB), Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB), Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction**

The second aim of this research program is to investigate the relationship between passion for work and various employee outcomes. Specifically, it examined the positive relationship between harmonious passion for IRB, OCB, job satisfaction and life satisfaction, and the negative relationship between obsessive passion for work and the aforementioned outcomes. Table 12 shows the summary of hypothesised findings and showed inconsistent main effect of harmonious passion for work on in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours from Studies 2 and 3.

The findings of Study 2 concur with previous studies about the relationship between passion for work on performance outcomes. Employees who were harmoniously passionate toward their work were found to perform their duties and responsibilities more optimally (Ho et al., 2011; Astakhova & Porter, 2015). While contrary to the hypothesised predictions, the non-significant relationship between obsessive passion for work and employee performance has also been observed in previous work passion literature (Ho et al., 2011; Astakhova & Porter, 2015). The positive outcomes highlight the advantage of harmonious passion over its obsessive counterpart. As with previous research on individual performance—both in the leisure and work contexts, those who are harmoniously passionate perform favourably in their respective fields in contrast to the obsessively passionate.
In Study 3, however, findings for the main effects of harmonious passion for work were non-significant for both in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours. The non-significant findings for harmonious passion for work was unexpected given that a great majority of the passion literature suggests the benefits of being harmoniously passionate towards one’s activity of choice. Indeed, different types of employees such as entrepreneurs, office workers and those from the service and education sectors who expressed harmonious passion for their respective work performed optimally in their required tasks at work. The samples in Study 3 were composed of registered nurses, and it may be possible that the benefits of harmonious passion are dependent on the nature or context of one’s job. While nurses have been samples in previous work (e.g., Donahue et al., 2012; Vallerand et al., 2010), these studies focused on mental health outcomes instead of performance.

Intrinsic and extrinsic factors which includes one’s values, beliefs or motives, as well as their external, social environment affect one’s performance (Motowidlo, Borman & Schmit, 1997; Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Thus, the environmental context where one’s job takes may explain the non-significant relationship between harmonious passion for work and employee performance. The nature of work that nursing practitioners have to endure are dissimilar when compared with typical office workers. Nurses are likely to have a shift-oriented work schedule instead of the standard eight-hour, morning and afternoon schedule.
Table 12

Overview of hypotheses and findings across studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th>Study 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to in-role behaviour.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to in-role behaviour.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to organisational citizenship behaviours.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to organisational citizenship behaviours.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to job satisfaction.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to job satisfaction.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: Harmonious passion for work will be positively related to life satisfaction.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: Obsessive passion for work will be negatively related to life satisfaction.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a: The relationship between harmonious passion for work and in-role behaviour is mediated by work-life balance.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b: The relationship between obsessive passion for work and in-role behaviour is mediated by work-life balance.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H6a: The relationship between harmonious passion for work and OCB is mediated by work-life balance.

H6b: The relationship between obsessive passion for work and OCB is mediated by work-life balance.

H7a: The relationship between harmonious passion for work and job satisfaction is mediated by work-life balance.

H7b: The relationship between obsessive passion for work and job satisfaction is mediated by work-life balance.

H8a: The relationship between harmonious passion for work and life satisfaction is mediated by work-life balance.

H8b: The relationship between obsessive passion for work and life satisfaction is mediated by work-life balance.
Research evidence suggest detrimental effects of shift work in terms of the necessary skills needed to perform well. Shift work can include the amount of hours per shift, the rotation of shift as well as the frequency of the shift work (Fenwick & Tausig, 2001). For instance, a nurse may have a daily, 12-hour night shift for a specified number of weeks (Coffey et al., 1988). Thus, shift work may entail deprivation of sleep hours resulting into a disturbance of one’s circadian rhythms (Gold et al., 1992). Studies also show that shift work, especially, those that involve 10-12 hour shifts not only place the workers’ health at risk, but also contribute to a decline in their performance such as increased error rates in patient care (Coffey et al., 1988; Caruso, 2006; Gold et al., 1992). One’s work shift, which includes the length and designated time of the shift and the workload that goes along with it contribute to mental fatigue and lapses in cognitive functions such as attention and vigilance which dampens one’s work performance (Barker & Nussbaum, 2011; Fitzpatrick et al., 1999; Gold et al., 1992).

Apart from the shifting schedules at work, nurses also need to contend with the demanding nature of their profession. Nursing work requires a significant amount of time and energy. Those in the nursing profession are especially susceptible to social (e.g., difficult interactions with peers and physicians), environmental (e.g., working conditions) and technological (e.g., equipment issues) obstacles that may hamper their effectiveness (Gurses, Carayon & Wall, 2009). Nurses are also exposed to fatigue, work overload and potential uncooperative patients. Consequently, these situations negatively impacts nurses’ performance in-patient care tolerance and sensitivity, perseverance and adaptability, and concentration in patient monitoring and documentations (Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986; Barker & Nussbaum, 2011).
Thus, it is possible that while they may harbour a harmonious passion towards their nursing duties, the situational factors may hinder them from displaying optimal levels of performance. Despite having an autonomous internalisation of the nursing profession and having the capacity to enjoy and take control of the work (as opposed to the work controlling the individual), perhaps what constitutes an optimal performance at work has less to do with being harmoniously passionate, but more with being able to endure the demands of the job. In contrast, the arduous nature of the nursing profession, along with its work schedule may be more amenable among the obsessively passionate who thrives on continuously immersing themselves at work. Perhaps this hectic work environment becomes an opportunity for those who are able to withstand gruelling work and shift hours to be recognised. However, as with previous studies (e.g., Vallerand et al, 2003), such level of persistent involvement may not necessarily result to productive outcomes.

The nature of the nursing profession may also explain the non-significant findings for organisational citizenship behaviour for both harmonious and obsessive passion. Given the hectic work schedule and tedious workload towards their patients, passionate nurses may not have enough latitude to further extend voluntary, altruistic behaviours towards their employers. Priority attention for care is likely reserved for patients as they are the ones in need of aid and nurturance (McLaughlin et al., 2009; Law & Arthur, 2003; Kersten et al., 1991). The findings imply that even if harmoniously passionate nurses may have ample time to engage in OCBs, it does not necessarily follow that they do. Previous studies in the medical field cite variables such as mutual trust, supervisor support and justice that enable health practitioners to engage in OCBs (Van Dyne, Graham & Dienesch, 1994; Chen, Wang, Chang, & Hu, 2008; Cohen & Kol, 2004). Thus, in the case of harmoniously passionate nurses, workload and other intervening variables should also be considered.
Further, while the hypothesis that being obsessively passionate has a negative impact on involvement with OCBs was not confirmed, the non-significant findings were still consistent with previous studies on employee performance. In line with the DMP, the overall implication of the disadvantages of being highly obsessive towards one’s job is very clear, as such kind of passion does not bring anything beneficial, and at times, can even be detrimental to one’s performance (Vallerand et al, 2003). Being obsessively passionate at work also prevents workers from doing tasks that are not compensated, or specifically prescribed in their job descriptions. Thus, obsessive passion for work not only prevents employees from optimally performing their job, they may also have less inclination to engage in helping behaviours towards colleagues and the organisation.

Additionally, organisational culture could also potentially explain the inconsistencies between the main effect findings of harmonious passion and performance outcomes in Studies 2 and 3. Organisational culture is described as the shared cognitions of a group. This is typically depicted as a set of values that are reflected to symbols, ceremonies, language and other activities that direct the behaviour of members of the organisation (Enz, 1998). Organisational culture is also not monolithic, and various industries reflect different manifestations of culture (Chatman & Jehn, 1994; Vandenberghhe, 1999; Tepeci & Bartlett, 2002).

In hospital settings, in particular, organisational culture can be manifested in the professional nature of hospital staff (Vandenberghhe, 1999). A professional culture reflects autonomy, meaningful and challenging work, expertise, and dedication to service. In contrast, a corporate culture reflects work standardization, control and productivity (Raelin, 1986). A strong organisational culture is beneficial in service related industries since employees who interact with customers are responsible for delivering service, which plays a significant role in customer perceptions of service
quality and satisfaction (Chatman & Jehn, 1994; Tepeci & Bartlett, 2002). Moreover, congruence between values espoused by the organisation and the individual contributes to positive outcomes such as commitment and loyalty (Mercer, 1988). Among hospital employees, including the nursing staff, value congruence contributes to retention of health-care professionals (Gifford, Zammuto, & Goodman, 2002).

Thus, value congruence between employee and the organisation may be a considerable factor towards favourable performance outcomes. Nurses advocate a range of values that range from an ‘others-oriented’ approach to a more ‘self-oriented’ one (McLaughlin, Moutray & Moore, 2010; Law & Arthur, 2003; Kersten, Bakewell & Meyer, 1991; Rassin, 2008; Kersten et al., 1991). Furthermore, the intense working environment that Filipino nurses are subjected to where they attend to high patient load, high supervisory and managerial control, and reliance on protocols may also signal a different working culture (Turnipseed & Turnipseed, 1997). In this case, even with a harmonious passion towards work, a mismatch in value orientation may prevent employees from performing optimally at work. Indeed, establishing fit between the passionate individual and the relevant context (i.e., leisure or work) were found to be important factors in predicting high levels of performance outcomes (Amiot et al., 2006; Astakhova & Porter, 2015).

Predictions for employee well-being outcomes were partially supported given the positive association between harmonious passion for work with job and life satisfaction, and the non-significant relationship with obsessive passion for work. The findings are generally in line with the DMP and empirical work on well-being in the workplace (e.g., Forest et al., 2011, 2012) and well-being in general (e.g., Carpentier et al., 2012). This brings forth consistent evidence that being passionate towards work may have more to do with an employee’s general well-being, which Deci and Ryan
(2001) described as one’s capacity for “optimum psychological functioning and experience” (p.142).

**Mediating Effect of Work-Life Balance in the relationship between In-Role Behaviours (IRB), Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB), Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction**

Work-life balance only mediated the relationship between passion for work and well-being outcomes, while non-significant findings were found for both measures of performance (i.e., IRB and OCB). This has some implications regarding the explanatory power of work-life balance as a mediating mechanism for performance. Indeed, work-life balance has been associated with people’s capacity to thrive and develop psychologically through the fulfilment of autonomy, competence and relatedness (Westman, Brough, & Kalliath, 2009). Further, work-life balance has been described as the ‘satisfaction and good functioning in both work and home…” (Clark, 2001; p.349) and have been empirically tested with outcomes such as subjective well-being and quality of life (Gröpel & Kuhl, 2009; Greenhaus et al., 2003). Thus, the current findings suggest that perception of work-life balance is a more suitable mechanism to explain well-being.

Indeed, Grover and Crooker (1995) suggest that organisations that promote work-life balance practices send the message that it also values its employees’ well-being over its earnings and revenues. However, it may be possible that taking into account the utility of available practices that promote work-life balance, can further elicit a significant effect on performance measures at work. Provision of work-life balance initiatives by one’s organisation may also be seen as a way for employees to “return the favour” and improve the services rendered for the organisation. This means that having been given the opportunity to attend to different facets of one’s life may compel employees to act on contributions toward success of the organisations, exert
effort on performance and align personal goals with that of the organisation (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007). Further, the availability and utility of work-life balance practices were posited to relate to outcomes such as perceived work-life balance, organisational support and time spent at work which ultimately influences employee productivity and work-life conflict (Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Hayman, 2009).

Another possible explanation of the non-significant findings for employee performance lies on the research sample’s job. As previously explained, nurses typically follow a non-standard work schedule, that is, a shift work system that requires them to attend to their work at specific times within 24 hours. The shift work schedule is implemented by the specific organisation or institution (e.g., hospitals) and is usually mandatory (Lozano-Kühne, Aguila, Manalang, Jr., Chua, Gabud, & Mendoza, 2012). Nurses also endure overtime work that is usually imposed by their employer on top of their required shift (De Castro, Fujishiro, Rue, Tagalog, Samaco-Paquiz, & Gee, 2010).

Given an intensive and demanding work environment, this introduces the possibility that depending on one’s job, the chances of exploring opportunities for professional growth might be compromised. According to enrichment and role accumulation perspectives (Rothbard, 2001; Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977), attending to more roles does not necessarily result in resource depletion and drain. In fact, maintaining multiple roles from different life domains is recognised as a way to broaden one’s knowledge or enhance one’s skills to improve performance at work. However, nurses may be hindered to explore these opportunities due to their irregular and demanding work schedule, as well as not having the prerogative to customise their work schedule. In the Philippines specifically, this may be compounded with the shortage of nurses given the propensity of most nurses to find work overseas (Lorenzo, Galvez-Tan, Icamina & Javier, 2007).
On the other hand, the findings for employee well-being confirmed the hypotheses. The indirect effect of work-life balance enables harmoniously passionate employees to experience satisfaction at work and in their lives in general. The opposite was observed among the obsessively passionate, where such passion prevents them from perceiving a balance between work and non-work life, which negatively impacts their job and life satisfaction. The findings are in line with the assumptions of the DMP (Vallerand et al., 2003), where the type of internalisation of the passionate activity, may influence the perception of balance between work and non-work life. Because harmoniously passionate employees have autonomously internalised work, the inherent flexibility in engaging and disengaging from work enables them to have a semblance of balance between their work and non-work lives. In contrast, the inherent rigidity from engaging and disengaging from work and the dependence on the ego-invested contingencies among those with obsessive passion makes them focus too much on work and lessening their opportunity to experience balance between their work and non-work lives.

Further, according to border and enrichment theories (Clark, 2000; Rothbard, 2001; Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977), being able to manage borders in flexible manner as possible and accommodate various roles enable the individual to experience greater satisfaction by participating in tasks and activities relevant to one’s roles. Despite eight, ten or twelve-hours work shifts, nurses are still provided days off as mandated by law (Lozano-Kühne et al., 2012). Thus, harmoniously passionate nurses may be able to utilise these opportunities for respite better than obsessively passionate nurses, which consequently contributes to the former’s higher levels of employee well-being.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The research program presented contributes to theoretical literature in several important ways. First, while the Passion Scale has been widely utilised in different
contexts beyond leisure activities, there are limited reports on its construct validity. In this research program, this gap is addressed by establishing the validity of the passion scale, tested within varied working samples and validated against several conceptually-similar constructs relevant to the work setting. In general, the findings lend further support about the passion construct and the Dualistic Model of Passion (DMP, Vallerand et al., 2003) which posits that the types of passion are derived internalisation of the passionate activity. If a passionate employee internalised his or her work in either autonomous or controlled fashion, he or she is likely to develop a harmonious or obsessive passion towards his or her job.

Alongside extant literature about work passion, the current findings provide further support for the varied application of the passion construct in work and non-work settings. An additional contribution of this research is establishing the applicability of the work passion construct among employees with different cultural and economic backgrounds. Thus, this study provided empirical support for the generalisability of the two-factor structure of passion as applied in the work context and among samples distinct from earlier studies.

Evidence from this study also underscores passion for work as a construct that bears its own distinct characteristic in comparison to other conceptually similar constructs. To date, passion has been differentiated against motivational constructs such as intrinsic motivation and interest (Vallerand et al., 2003, Vallerand, 2010). Establishing the validity of work passion in contrast to these constructs lends legitimacy to the DMP that defines passion as a distinct and empirically-sound construct. Further, it portrays being passionate at work as a unique characteristic embodied by employees and potentially sought after by employers.

This research also contributes to the work passion literature by offering an explanation regarding the non-significant relationship between harmonious and
obsessive passion, which tends to be observed more often in the work context (e.g., Lavigne et al., 2012; Donahue et al., 2012; Thorgren et al., 2013). The DMP conceptualised harmonious and obsessive passion as related constructs and each individual is thought to have both types of passion (Vallerand et al., 2003; Vallerand, 2010). While Vallerand (2010) initially presupposes the possibility of “temporary fluctuations” (p.109) between harmonious and obsessive passion, findings in the non-work context have generally supported this (e.g., Bonneville-Roussy et al., 2013; Vallerand et al, 2007; Przybylski et al, 2009). However, an increasing number of studies predominantly within the work context, including findings in this research program indicate that harmonious and obsessive passion may not always be correlated with each other (e.g., Lavigne et al, 2014; Donahue et al., 2012).

Indeed, Carbonneau and colleagues (2008) attributed such relationships as a function of passionate activity. In addition to internalisation processes that determine the two types of passion, these findings may also suggest the importance of contextual factors that may prompt a particular passion towards work. Bélanger et al. (2013) suggests that an individual may have both harmonious and obsessive passion, with one type is higher than the other, but what determines the predominant type is situation or context-dependent; an autonomy supportive environment fosters harmonious passion, while a less autonomous and more controlling environment fosters obsessive passion. Thus, one’s working conditions or the nature of the job may also be a determining factor in exercising harmonious or obsessive passion towards one’s work. Further, considering one’s job context is also important as it can be a possible factor that could determine how harmonious or obsessively passionate employees’ fare in their work performance.

Second, this research extends the passion literature by addressing limited research on how passion for work accounts for optimal performance at work. Popular
press and lay anecdotes have lauded passion as the “key to success at work”, but such claim has received little empirical support. The findings of Study 2, as well as recent empirical work on the role of work passion and employee performance (e.g., Ho et al., 2011; Astakhova & Porter, 2015) lend support to this notion. The implications of the findings suggest that the benefit passionate employees will derive depends on the kind of passion they hold towards their work. The main effects of passion for work generally confirm the DMP in explaining the said outcome, which highlights the preference for harmonious passion for work. Thus, from a practical standpoint, organisations are likely to benefit those individuals who possess a harmonious approach towards work. While the present research equally supports this assertion, the current findings also suggest the possibility that working conditions or characteristics may also support or hinder the influence of passion towards employee performance regardless of type.

Moreover, this research program also investigates the impact of passion for work on employee well-being. Indeed, the passion literature—both in the work and non-work contexts—investigated well-being as an outcome operationalised as subjective, hedonic and eudaimonic or psychological (Philippe et al., 2009; Rousseau & Vallerand, 2008). The present study contributes to the understanding of passion for work by including job and life satisfaction as indicators of employee well-being. Specifically, this extends the scope of harmonious passion that nurtures a ‘holistic’ nature of well-being that encompasses work and non-work domains. The findings may also provide the popular press a more accurate portrayal of the passionate employee. The commonplace notion is that people who are passionate about the job that they do experience a sense of “work not feeling like work at all”. Indeed, being passionate towards work is advantageous granted that one possesses the harmonious type and the benefits impact one’s well-being.
Finally, this research program explored work-life balance as an intervening mechanism between passion for work and employee outcomes by integrating the DMP with Border and Enrichment theories (Clark, 2000; Rothbard, 2001; Sieber, 1974; Marks, 1977). The DMP explains that passion for work is an inherent quality that can enable or disable a working individual from attaining balance between work and non-work domains. Border and Enrichment perspectives explain the utility of such balance in attaining favourable outcomes at work. Using work-life balance as a mediating mechanism highlights the importance of maintaining a sense of equilibrium between work and non-work tasks, particularly in areas of job and life satisfaction. This further depicts passionate employees as individuals who have various roles that they need to accommodate, and the extent to which they do so have implications on their work outcomes. Taken together, the findings of this study extend our understanding of how passion for work enables or deters employees from adaptive approaches to managing one’s work and non-work related activities.

While performance outcomes may vary among passionate employees, harmoniously passionate employees are more likely to perceive some semblance of balance between their work and non-work lives than their obsessively passionate counterparts. However, work life balance explains employee well-being but not IRBs and OCBs among passionate employees. The findings demonstrate that in contrast to the controlled internalisation of work passion, an autonomous internalisation of one’s work enables harmoniously passionate employees to discern and accommodate work and non-work roles. Consequently, harmoniously passionate employees reap benefits for the well-being more so than their obsessively passionate counterparts.

When it comes to performance outcomes, however, the mixed findings for harmonious passion may bear implications on the potential influence of sampling characteristics and specific measures of performance. It may be equally important to
consider whether or not work passion discriminates against specific professions. Thus, having a harmonious passion for work, with the capacity to manage one’s multiple roles to achieve balance may not automatically facilitate optimum work performance unless one’s job characteristic or work environment (e.g., work schedules) are taken into consideration.

The findings of this research program highlight several implications for management practice. First, claims from popular press regarding the relevance of passion in the work setting have been supported by empirical evidence. In particular, varied types of employees tend to benefit more from having a harmonious passion towards work. Harmonious passion is borne from an autonomous internalisation of the self, typically achieved in environments that promote autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Vallerand et al., 2003). Managers can engage in autonomy-supportive practices in several ways. For instance, they can provide their employees with ample freedom and choices in the ways they accomplish their work. Managers can also articulate the reasons behind relevant protocols and prohibitions within the scope of the job, and they can also acknowledge how their subordinates feel when doing their jobs (Koestner, Ryan, Bernieri, & Holt, 1984).

Since those who are harmoniously passionate rely less on ego-invested contingencies, promoting knowledge and skill mastery and enjoyment at work are also suitable approaches to mitigate the possibility of associating one’s work experience and performance with self-worth. This can be accomplished in the way managers provide feedback to their subordinates. Deci, Connell, & Ryan (1989) found that the common types of feedback employees receive in organisations tend to be demotivating due to its negative content and delivery. Instead, managers can provide corrective feedback regarding job performance without impeding on their subordinates’ sense of
competence. Mistakes on the job or sub-par performance can be articulated as areas of improvement, instead of highly critical scrutiny of the individual (Deci et al., 1989).

The research findings also have implications on human resources practices. For instance, Studies 2 and 3 showed the extent to which passion can be an advantage or deterrent of positive work outcomes. This can then inform recruitment and selection practitioners of the extent to which ‘being passionate’ can be a desirable characteristic among prospective employees. Drawing from the dissertation’s findings, a more beneficial workplace passion is the one driven by a volitional engagement at work geared towards attaining expertise. Thus, organisations may also consider selecting individuals who are enthusiastic about self-improvement and interested in directing their own growth and development at work.

Designing training programs geared towards promoting harmonious passion may be beneficial towards attaining positive work outcomes. Harmoniously passionate employees exude autonomous and agentic behaviours, as well as the value of mastery and enjoyment at work (Vallerand et al., 2003). These characteristics are akin to qualities that foster successful learning and acquisition of relevant knowledge and skills at work (Noe, 1986). For instance, Noe suggests that individuals who are eager to learn and improve take the initiative to explore ways to foster self-improvement, as well as to acknowledge and act on feedback regarding their strengths and weaknesses. Harmoniously passionate employees also possess a good control over the extent of their engagement at work (Vallerand et al., 2003). Thus, training programs that reinforce self-regulatory behaviours such may also contribute to engagement in work-life balance practices.

Finally, organisations can promote work-life balance practices to enable their members to achieve a sense of balance in their engagement with their work and personal lives. Specifically, top management can espouse the instrumentality and importance of
work-life balance programs as means to recognise how such initiatives can help employees in coping with different challenges they face within and outside of work (McCarthy et al., 2010; Hobson, Delunas, & Kesic, 2001). Line managers, in particular, can also play a crucial role in advocating work-life balance initiatives especially when equipped with the awareness and knowledge of how such initiatives can be taken advantage of by employees (McCarthy et al., 2010). Along with the organisation’s support, line managers can focus on acknowledging their subordinates work-life balance needs. They can advance work-life balance initiatives by coordinating with human resources in designing and developing policies, and articulating its availability and eligibility conditions to employees (McCarthy et al., 2010; McConville & Holden, 1999).

**Methodological Limitations and Strengths of the Research Program**

This research program is not without its limitations. First, all three studies were conducted using a cross-sectional design that assessed the variables at one point in time. While such practice has been done in previous work passion studies (e.g., Thorgren & Wincent, 2013; Ho & Pollack, 2014), cross-sectional designs are unable to address changes over time between the variables under study and also limit causal inferences. The use of prospective designs to address this limitation by collecting data at two time points, from three to six month interval have been carried out by earlier studies on workplace passion (e.g., Lavigne et al; 2014; Vallerand et al., 2010).

Second, this dissertation further explored the distinctiveness of passion for work against other constructs that are viewed from a motivational or engagement lens. In doing so, the findings of the construct validation utilised correlations and a test of dependent correlations to establish convergent and discriminant validity between harmonious and obsessive passion for relative to similar constructs used in organisation research. This approach has been implemented in previous studies with the aim of
establishing construct validity of a new measure (e.g., Ferris, Brown, Berry, & Lian, 2008; Rowold & Heinitz, 2007). However, Hinkin (1998) suggests the use of confirmatory factor analysis to further substantiate the assessment of the convergent and divergent validity. The use of CFA was considered in the present research program, however, correlations were instead utilised due to sample size restrictions.

Finally, the samples in this research program came from a diverse group of working individuals. However, the heterogeneity of samples were not maintained across all studies and thus, a study either had respondents from various professions (e.g., Study 2) or only homogenous sample from one profession (e.g. Study 3). While studies among passionate employees belonging in one profession such as coaching staff, project leaders, entrepreneurs, teachers and nurses have been done previously (e.g., Vallerand et al., 2010; Donhaue et al, 2012; Patel et al., 2015; Ho & Pollack, 2014), studies about individual performance outcomes among passionate individuals have used generally mixed samples of employees from different organisations (e.g., Astakhova & Porter, 2015). Thus, the potential influence of job context may not be highlighted as opposed to the studies that used a sample from one profession. Indeed, job or work context that may include situational or procedural constraints, organisational goal conflicts and ambiguity, supporting co-workers, available resources and competing time demands play a role in various employee performance and motivational outcomes (Maurer & Tarulli, 1996; Wright, 2004; Shalley, Gilson & Blum, 2009).

Directions for Future Research

To date, a considerable number of empirical studies about passion and its impact in the workplace have been undertaken. The findings have substantiated what popular media claim about passion at work to some extent, but not without a caveat as to the specific type of passionate employees that organisations can benefit from. Nonetheless, the quest to attain greater understanding of passion for work remains as an important
aim in organisational behaviour research. As passion inevitably contributes to working individuals, it is a worthy endeavour to continue examining how passion for work is nurtured and how it may relate to other mechanisms that can explain its advantageous or disadvantageous impact among employees and the organisation (Perrewé et al., 2013). Thus, several recommendations are offered to address some limitations of the current research program, as well as to further expand the scope of workplace passion research in the field of management.

First, exploring passion for work from the lens of Conservation of Resources (COR; Hobfoll, 1989) highlights the important role of resources on how employees sustain their passion towards their job, especially if the nature of the job is highly demanding and beyond their control (e.g., unstandardised work schedules). Conservation of Resources (COR) theory posits that people acquire resources that they value and benefit from, and striving to maintain the availability of such resources. COR highlights the importance of refraining from work demands and activities that would drain one’s internal resources needed for work, and acquiring new resources that help replenish depleted resources from work engagement. For instance, passionate employees whose resources get depleted due to the high demands of their work may become less passionate towards it, consequently affecting their performance and well-being on the job. However, opportunities that enable passionate workers to replenish their depleted resources may further restore their passions and the capacity for optimum performance and well-being at work.

In line with COR (Hobfoll, 1989), there is value in having opportunities for respite that serve to restore exhausted resources from one’s job. One relevant construct is psychological detachment from work, defined as mentally disengaging oneself from work and other job-related concerns (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Being psychologically detached from work via weekends or off-days provides employees the time to recover,
conserve, or replenish the resources needed (e.g., energy, affect or self-efficacy) as preparation for succeeding rounds of work. This can be an important mechanism that enables individuals to recover from the pressures and fatigue acquired from fulfilling one’s job, which consequently contributes to better performance on succeeding work experience. Employees who psychologically detach themselves from work are able to perform their designated tasks and display helping behaviours at work (Binnewies, Sonnentag, & Mojza, 2010). Psychological detachment from work is also associated with adaptive outcomes such as increased positive affect and psychological well-being (Sonnentag, Mojza, Binnewies, & Scholl, 2008; Fritz, Yankelvich, Zarubin, & Barger, 2010).

The DMP (Vallerand et al., 2003) and COR complement each other in explaining how passionate employees psychologically detach themselves from work. The difference between the autonomous and controlled internalisations among passionate individuals is highlighted in their ability to forego thoughts about disengagement from the passionate activity, which may play a mediating role in their capacity to psychologically detach from work. This may potentially put harmoniously passionate employees at an advantage over the obsessively passionate individuals, who are held back by contingencies. Consequently, employees with harmonious passion are likely to perform more optimally and experience higher levels of job and life satisfaction in contrast to those with obsessive passion. Indeed, exploring how psychological detachment impact employee performance and well-being also contribute to the expansion of nomological networks of work passion (Perrewé et al., 2013).

Second, future research may also examine the promising role of mindfulness intervention in facilitating detachment from work or attaining balance between work and non-work among passionate employees. Mindfulness is described as a state of consciousness that depicts attention and awareness of the moment, which includes one’s
thoughts, feelings and bodily sensations (i.e., internal stimuli), as well as one’s physical and social environments (i.e., external stimuli). While awareness and attention are considered to comprise the fundamental nature of mindfulness, it is important to note that it also involves withholding one’s judgments, evaluations or cognitive impositions on both experienced internal and external stimuli (Brown & Ryan, 2003; Glomb, Duffy, Bono, & Yan, 2011).

When investigated in the context of the workplace, mindfulness contributes in attaining the central outcome of improved self-regulation of one’s way of thinking, feeling and behaving, including expression of physiological reactions (Glomb et al., 2011). Essentially, as an individual engages in mindfulness training, primary (i.e., core) and secondary self-regulatory processes are initiated. Core processes include acknowledging the sensory experience of one’s life events, thoughts and emotions without imposing any interpretations, recognising the here-and-now, and achieving a steady regulation of one’s physiological responses while maintaining feelings of calm and connectedness.

Secondary processes include decreased rumination, increased empathy, ability to harness the feeling of positive affect, and restraint from impulsive actions towards internal or external stimuli (Glomb et al., 2011). Application of the mindfulness intervention in the workplace paved way to beneficial outcomes such as decreased emotional exhaustion and increased job satisfaction (Hülsheger, Alberts. Feinholdt, & Lang, 2013), reduction in employee distress (Flaxman & Bond, 2010; Wolever et al., 2012), and improved sleep quality and autonomic response (Wolever et al., 2012). Incorporating an intervention addressing the impact of cognitive and emotional self-regulatory processes among passionate employees also addresses the call of future research work proposed by Perrewé and colleagues (2013).
Mindfulness is anchored from self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2012) which suggests that awareness plays an essential role towards achieving an integrated self. In this case, autonomy characterises an optimal, self-functioning individual, wherein actions are self-endorsed and congruent with one’s values and goals that lead to self-determined behaviour. Individual actions are not fuelled by external forces, nor self-concept based contingencies but instead, are responsive to reality. In the context of SDT, awareness is a type of attention that is relaxed, and bears a reflection of what is presently occurring.

Relative to the DMP, the harmoniously passionate embodies an autonomous, self-congruent individual while the obsessively passionate exemplifies an individual with a controlled motivation, whose behaviours are anchored on ego-invested contingencies. Therefore, the harmoniously passionate may carry the same qualities as that of a mindful individual more so than the obsessively passionate. Upon implementation of the intervention program, both passionate individuals, but more so the obsessively passionate ones may acquire a stronger sense of authentic self. Exposure to mindfulness training may enable the obsessively passionate employees to be more open to psychological detachment from work as well. Mindfulness training may further reinforce the practice of psychological detachment among harmoniously passionate employees. Thus, practicing mindfulness may enable both types of passionate individuals to reap the aforementioned positive outcomes within the workplace and beyond.

Third, exploring the moderating role of work context in harnessing or suppressing the influence of passion towards performance outcomes would address the enabling or constraining role of job type towards optimum performance among passionate employees. The interactionist perspective explains the dynamic interaction between personal and situational characteristics where a continuous and multidirectional
interplay between these characteristics inform the reasons behind various work behaviours (Terborg, 1981; Schneider, 1983). Work context have been found to influence performance appraisal systems, employee motivation and creativity (Maurer & Tarulli, 1996; Wright, 2004; Shalley et al, 2009). Based from an interactionist perspective, passionate employees may be able to perform at optimum levels at work, and experience a well-rounded work-life satisfaction depending on the kind of work environment that they have. For instance, passionate employees that have a regular eight-hour job may more likely perform well and experience higher levels of satisfaction than those with a shifting work schedule. Exploring this possibility determines the extent to which work context can accentuate being a passionate at work and its impact to employee outcomes in a wide range of professions. Additionally, exploring the moderating role of organisational culture in the form of value congruence is also a fruitful endeavour. In line with a person-culture fit perspective (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991), harmoniously passionate employees may exhibit favourable work outcomes in an organisational culture characterised by autonomy and professional expertise.

Fourth, further improvement of measures may benefit future research on passion, work-life balance and employee outcomes. For example, including both subjective (i.e., perceived levels of balance) and objective measures of work-life balance as well as the recently validated measure of employee well-being (Zhang et al., 2015) may provide a more comprehensive account of the constructs under study. Using alternative measures of performance such as competency-based measures may also be beneficial, especially among working samples from specialised fields. In nursing practice, for instance, nursing competencies include broad abilities and practical skills such as critical thinking, leadership, flexibility and resource management, as well as demonstrating precise and meticulous care for the patients, deciphering patients’ needs.
Moreover, it may be also be ideal to consider having patients as co-raters apart from supervisors or peers since service is the main commodity among health practitioners. Patients are at the receiving end of nursing care and are more likely to experience, observe and provide useful insights and gauge the quality of care provided by nurses such as the case of patient satisfaction ratings (Norman, Redfern, Tomalin, & Oliver, 1992; Johansson, Oleni & Fridlund, 2002).

Finally, this research project examined performance (i.e., IRB and OCB) and well-being (i.e., job and life satisfaction) as separate work outcomes. However, previous research indicates that in-role and organisational citizenship behaviours are correlated with job satisfaction (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001) and life satisfaction (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2010; Jones, 2006). Thus, future studies can re-examine the proposed model and taking the performance-satisfaction relationship into consideration.

**Overall Conclusions**

Extant literature about workplace passion grounded the assumptions regarding passionate employees and brought out informed knowledge about its consequences at work. Nevertheless, research on the role of passion for work has yet to be saturated and provides leeway for further examination particularly in the area of construct validation and consequences for employee performance and well-being. Guided by the DMP, Border and Enrichment theories, the findings of this research program advance the current workplace passion literature in three ways. First, the construct validation studies strengthen the breadth of the construct’s applicability to various occupations and working samples with different economic and cultural backgrounds. Second, the studies affirm the advantage of harmonious over obsessive passion at work, however,
the role of one’s work context and culture are also highlighted as a potential determinant of the impact of passion in work outcomes. Finally, the findings also showed that the degree to which passionate employees can stay attuned to the multi-faceted dimensions of their lives can impact on their performance and well-being at work. That is, employees are able to reap the benefits of a productive and healthy work experience if they embrace a more harmonious and balanced approach to their work.
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Appendix A.1 Participant Information Sheet (Studies 1, 2, and 3)

Participant Information Sheet

Researcher:
Good Day! We are a team of researchers from the Research School of Management-College of Business and Economics at the Australian National University, looking at employee motivations and work outcomes. We would like to seek your participation in this research project.

Project Title: Employee motivations and work outcomes

Jennifer Ann Lajom, PhD Candidate (Tel: +61 2 612 57279; Email: jennifer.lajom@anu.edu.au)
Professor Prashant Bordia (Tel: +61 2 612 57282; Email: prashant.bordia@anu.edu.au)
Professor Simon Lloyd Restubog (Tel: +61 2 612 57319; Email: simon.restubog@anu.edu.au)

General Outline of the Project:
- **Description and Methodology:** This survey asks questions about your motivations towards work, your experiences at work and outside of work (e.g., personal leisure, family), as well as feelings about yourself. This study requires a participant (i.e., an employee) and a co-rater (i.e., a co-worker) who will accomplish the survey questionnaires. This survey will take about 15 minutes to complete.
- **Participants:** Invitation to participate is open to 400 working individuals from varied professions, such as, but not limited to, teaching, banking, medical practice, retail, etc. The participants will nominate a co-worker who will answer survey items that pertain to the participants’ work and life experiences.
- **Use of Data and Feedback:** The findings of this study will be used for research presentations and future manuscripts. A summary of findings will be made available through your department head. This will be in a form of a written report, presented in aggregate and will have no identifying information, secured in a signed and sealed envelope.

Participant Involvement:
- **Voluntary Participation & Withdrawal:** Your participation in this study is voluntary and you will not be required to provide your personal details. You may also withdraw your participation from this study at any point in time without prejudice from the researchers or the ANU. You will receive a survey kit that contains the consent form and survey questionnaires for you (Participant Rating Form; PRF) and for your co-rater (Co-Worker Rating Form; CRF), as well as envelopes for you and your co-rater to place the accomplished questionnaires.
- **What will participants have to do?** If you choose to participate, please make sure to follow the instructions carefully when answering and returning the questionnaire. There are instructions for you to read in the PRF and the CRF. We also request that you answer the survey as honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers so you don’t need to think about your answers for so long. We will also ask you to nominate a co-worker that you regularly work with who will provide feedback regarding your work and life experiences. Should you decide to revoke your consent and exclude your data from our analysis, you may get in touch with the primary investigator or her research assistant expressing your withdrawal from the study and your non-identifiable code. You will receive notification once your responses have been removed.
- **Location and Duration:** Answering the survey will take 15 minutes, which you may do so during your break at work.
- **Incentives:** As a token of our gratitude, you will receive a Php 250 café gift certificate for your participation in the study.
- **Risks:** We acknowledge the possibility that some of the survey items might elicit some negative thoughts and feelings about your general work experience. Should feelings of distress or discomfort...
Appendix A.1 Participant Information Sheet (Studies 1, 2, and 3)

(continued)

arise as a result of participating in this study, please feel free to get in touch with the primary investigator at jennifer.lajem@anu.edu.au or her research assistant (specific details provided below). Alternatively, you may also contact PsychConsult by phone (+632 3576427), mobile (+639178080193) or via email at psychconsult@gmail.com.

• **Implications of Participation:** Rest assured that any data that arises from this study will remain confidential. It will have no bearing to your performance evaluation at work and will only be used strictly for research purposes.

Confidentiality:
• **Confidentiality:** We endeavour to protect the confidentiality of your responses as far as the law allows. As you answer the survey, you will be instructed to generate a non-identifying code that we will refer to instead of your personal details. We also assure you that we are the only ones who have access to your responses and your co-raters’ responses, and the codes will not be shared with anyone else. We will store your responses electronically as a password-protected data file. During presentations and manuscript preparations, your responses will be presented with aggregate, without any identifying information.

Data Storage:
• **Where:** Data collected in this research will be kept in a wooden cabinet under lock and key in Room 1107 PAP Moran Building 26, Research School of Management, The Australian National University. All electronic data will be kept in the primary investigator’s password protected work computer in the same location mentioned above.

• **How long:** The final data sets will be kept for a duration of 5 years following publication.

• **DeSTRUCTION of Data:** Survey data and questionnaires of excluded participants will be deleted/shredded and disposed of after the preliminary analysis. The remaining data sets will be kept for a minimum of 5 years following publication, after which, data will be shredded/deleted and disposed properly.

Queries and Concerns:
• **Contact Details for More Information:** If you have further questions about the study, you may contact the primary investigator, Jennifer Aan Lajem, in the Research School of Management at ANU by phone (+61 2 612 57279) or via email: jennifer.lajem@anu.edu.au. Alternatively, you may contact the primary investigators’ supervisors through the following details:
  o Professor Prashant Bordia (Tel: +61 2 612 57282; Email: prashant.bordia@anu.edu.au)
  o Professor Simon Lloyd Restubog (Tel: +61 2 612 57319; Email: simon.restubog@anu.edu.au)

• **Overseas Contacts (if relevant):** You may also contact the primary investigator’s research assistant for this study in case of further inquiries: Ms. Susan Grace Neri (Mobile: +63922 8110791; Email: susan Grace.neri@gmail.com)

• **Contact Details If in Distress:** If any of the questions that you are asking could be seen as stressful, you may contact PsychConsult by phone (+632 3576427), mobile (+639178080193) or via email at psychconsult@gmail.com.
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Ethics Committee Clearance:

The ethical aspects of this research have been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns or complaints about how this research has been conducted, please contact:

Ethics Manager
The ANU Human Research Ethics Committee
The Australian National University
Telephone: +61 2 6125 3427
Email: Human.Ethics.Office@anu.edu.au
Appendix A.2 Co-rater Information Sheet (Studies 2 and 3)

Co-Rater Information Sheet

Researcher:
Good Day! We are a team of researchers from the Research School of Management-College of Business and Economics at the Australian National University, looking at employee motivations and work outcomes. We would like to seek your participation in this research project.

Project Title: Employee motivations and work outcomes

Jennifer Ann Lajou, PhD Candidate (Tel: +61 2 612 57279; Email: jennifer.lajou@anu.edu.au)
Professor Prashant Bordia (Tel: +61 2 612 57282. Email: prashant.bordia@anu.edu.au)
Professor Simon Lloyd Rettubog (Tel: +61 2 612 57319; Email: simon.rettubog@anu.edu.au)

General Outline of the Project:
- **Description and Methodology:** This survey asks questions about one’s motivations towards work and one’s experiences at work and outside of work (e.g., personal leisure, family). This study requires a participant (i.e., an employee) and a co-rater (i.e., a co-worker) who will accomplish the survey questionnaires. This survey will take about 5-10 minutes to complete.
- **Participants:** Invitation to participate is open to 400 working individuals from varied professions, such as, but not limited to teaching, banking, medical practice, retail, etc. The participants will also nominate a co-worker who will answer survey items that pertain to the participants’ work and life experiences.
- **Use of Data and Feedback:** The findings of this study will be used for research presentations and future manuscripts. A summary of findings will be made available through your department head. This will be in a form of a written report, presented in aggregate and will have no identifying information, secured in a signed and sealed envelope.

Participant Involvement:
- **Voluntary Participation & Withdrawal:** Your participation in this study is voluntary and you will not be required to provide your personal details. You may also withdraw your participation from this study at any point in time without prejudice from the researchers or the ANU. As a nominated co-rater, you will receive a survey kit that contains a consent form and a survey questionnaire (i.e., Co-Worker Rating Form, CRF), as well as envelopes for you to place the accomplished questionnaires. This survey kit will come from our research participants who nominated you as a co-rater.
- **What will participants have to do?** As a nominated co-rater, you will rate the participant whose name is indicated in your survey questionnaire on items that refer to their work and life experiences. If you choose to participate, please make sure to follow the instructions carefully when answering and returning the questionnaire. We request that you answer the survey as honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers so you don’t need to think about your answers for so long. To ensure confidentiality, we ask that you refrain from revealing the name of the participant you rated and from retaining a copy of your ratings. Should you decide to revoke your consent and exclude your responses from our analysis, you may get in touch with the primary investigator or her research assistant expressing your withdrawal from the study and your non-identifiable code. You will receive notification once your responses have been removed.
- **Location and Duration:** Answering the survey will take 5-10 minutes, which you may do so during your break at work.
- **Incentives:** As a token of our gratitude, you will receive a Php 250 café gift certificate for your participation in the study.
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- **Risks:** We acknowledge the possibility that some of the survey items might elicit some negative thoughts and feelings about your general work experience. Should feelings of distress or discomfort arise as a result of participating in this study, please feel free to get in touch with the primary investigator at jennifer.lajorn@anu.edu.au or her research assistant (specific details provided below). Alternatively, you may also contact PsychConsult by phone (+63 2) 3576427, mobile (+63 917) 8080193 or via email at psycheconsult@gmail.com.

- **Implications of Participation:** Rest assured that any data that arises from this study will remain confidential. It will have no bearing to your performance evaluation at work and will only be used strictly for research purposes.

Confidentiality:
- **Confidentiality:** We endeavour to protect the confidentiality of your responses as far as the law allows. As you answer the survey, you will be instructed to generate a non-identifying code that we will refer to instead of your personal details. We also assure you that we are the only ones who have access to your responses, and the codes will not be shared with anyone else. We will store your responses electronically as a password-protected data file. During presentations and manuscript preparations, your responses will be presented in aggregate, without any identifying information.

Data Storage:
- **Where:** Data collected in this research will be kept in a wooden cabinet under lock and key in Room 1037 PAP Moran Building 26, Research School of Management, The Australian National University. All electronic data will be kept in the primary investigator’s password protected work computer in the same location mentioned above.

- **How long:** The final data sets will be kept for a duration of 5 years following publication.

- **Destruction of Data:** Survey data and questionnaires of excluded participants will be deleted/shredded and disposed of after the preliminary analysis. The remaining data sets will be kept for a minimum of 5 years following publication, after which, data will be shredded/deleted and disposed properly.

Queries and Concerns:
- **Contact Details for More Information:** If you have further questions about the study, you may contact the primary investigator, Jennifer Ann Lajorn, in the Research School of Management at ANU by phone (+61 2) 612 57279 or via email: jennifer.lajorn@anu.edu.au. Alternatively, you may contact the primary investigators’ supervisors through the following details:
  - Professor Prashant Borda (Tel: +61 2 612 5722; Email: prashant.borda@anu.edu.au)
  - Professor Simon Lloyd Restubog (Tel: +61 2 612 57319; Email: simon.restubog@anu.edu.au)

- **Overseas Contacts (if relevant):** You may also contact the primary investigator’s research assistant for this study in case of further inquiries: Ms. Susan Grace Neri (Mobile: +63 922 8110791; Email: susan.grace.neri@gmail.com)

- **Contact Details if in Distress:** If any of the questions that you are asking could be seen as stressful, you may contact PsychConsult by phone (+63 2) 3576427, mobile (+63 917) 8080193 or via email at psycheconsult@gmail.com.
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Ethics Committee Clearance:

The ethical aspects of this research have been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns or complaints about how this research has been conducted, please contact:

Ethics Manager
The ANU Human Research Ethics Committee
The Australian National University
Telephone: +61 2 6125 3427
Email: Human.Ethics.Office@anu.edu.au
Appendix A.3 Participant Consent Form (Studies 1, 2, and 3)

WRITTEN CONSENT for Participants

A Study on Employee Motivation and Work Outcomes

I have read and understood the Information Sheet you have given me about the research project, and I have had any questions and concerns about the project addressed to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in the project. YES ☐ NO ☐

I agree to be identified in the following way within research outputs:
Complete confidentiality YES ☐ NO ☐

Signature: ..................................................

The Australian National University | Canberra ACT 0200 Australia | CRICOS Provider No. 00120C
Appendix A.4 Co-rater Consent Form (Studies 2 and 3)

WRITTEN CONSENT for Participants
(Co-rater)

A Study on Employee Motivation and Work Outcomes

I have read and understood the Information Sheet you have given me about the research project, and I have had any questions and concerns about the project addressed to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in the project: YES ☐ NO ☐

I agree to be identified in the following way within research outputs:

Complete confidentiality: YES ☐ NO ☐

Signature: ……………………………………………………..

The Australian National University | Canberra ACT 0200 Australia | CRICOS Provider No. 00120C
Appendix B

Appendix B.1 ANU Human Ethics Protocol Clearance

Human Ethics Protocol 2013/503
aries@anu.edu.au

To: Jennifer Lajom, Jajon.J@yahoo.com; Cc: Human.Ethics.Office@anu.edu.au; [Preserve Formatting]

I am pleased to advise you that your Human Ethics application received approval by the Chair of the Humanities & Social Sciences DERC on 19 December 2014.

For your information:
1. Under the NHMRC/AVCC National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research we are required to follow up research that we have approved. Once a year (or sooner for short projects) we shall request a brief report on any ethical issues which may have arisen during your research or whether it proceeded according to the plan outlined in the above protocol.
2. Please notify the Committee of any changes to your protocol in the course of your research, and when you complete or cease working on the project.
3. Please notify the Committee immediately if any unforeseen events occur that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the research work.
4. Please advise the HREC if you receive any complaints about the research work.
5. The validity of the current approval is five years from the date shown approved. For longer projects you are required to seek renewed approval from the Committee.

All the best with your research,
Kim

Ms Kim Tiffen
Human Ethics Manager
Research Integrity & Compliance,
Research Services,
Ground Floor, Chancellory 108
Ellery Crescent,
The Australian National University
ACTON ACT 2601
T: +61 2 6125 2419
F: +61 2 6125 4807

Kim.Tiffen@anu.edu.au or
human.ethics.office@anu.edu.au
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Appendix C.1 Participant demographic questions and anonymous code

We would like to know some of your background information.

01. Gender (please encircle):  1    Male  2    Female  3 Other

02. Age (as of last birthday): __________

03. How long have you been working with your current organization (please encircle)?

   1    less than 1 year  2    1-5 years  3    6-10 years  4    11-15 years

   5    16-20 years  6    21-25 years  7    26-30 years  8    Over 30 years

To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, a unique personal code will be used instead of your name. We will also use this to match your responses on this survey with your co-rater’s rating of your work behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>YOUR RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your father’s first name</td>
<td>My father’s first name is Mario [M] [A] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your mother’s first name</td>
<td>My mother’s first name is Lita[L] [I] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date (in the month) of your birthday</td>
<td>Born December 3, 1970 [0] [3] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C.2 Passion for work criteria items

Item #
01. I spend a lot of time doing my work
02. I love my work
03. My work is important for me
04. My work is a passion for me
Appendix C.3 Harmonious passion for work items

**Item #**

01. My work is in harmony with the other activities in my life

02. The new things that I discover about my work allow me to appreciate it even more

03. My work reflects the qualities I like about myself

04. My work allows me to live a variety of experiences

05. My work is well integrated in my life

06. My work is in harmony with other things that are part of me
Appendix C.4 Obsessive passion for work items

Item #

01. I have difficulties controlling my urge to do my work
02. I have almost an obsessive feeling for my work
03. My work is the only thing that really turns me on
04. If I could, I would only do my work
05. My work is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it
06. I have the impression that my work controls me
Appendix C.5 Work involvement items

Item #

01. The most important things that happen in life involve work
02. Work is something people should get involved in most of the time
03. Work should be only a small part of one’s life
04. Work should be considered central to life
05. In my view, an individual’s personal life goals should be work-oriented
06. Life is worth living only when people get absorbed in work
Appendix C.6 Learning goal orientation items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>I am willing to select a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>I often look for opportunities to develop my new skills and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I’ll learn new skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>For me, development of my work ability is important enough to take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>I prefer to work in situations that require a high level of ability and talent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C.7 Performance approach goal orientation items

Item #

01. I’m concerned with showing that I can perform better than my co-workers
02. I try to figure out what it takes to prove my ability to others at work
03. I enjoy it when others at work are aware of how well I am doing
04. I prefer to work on projects where I can prove my ability to others
Appendix C.8 Performance avoidance goal orientation items

Item #

01. I would avoid taking on a new task if there was a chance that I would appear rather incompetent to others

02. Avoiding a show of low ability is more important to me than learning a new skill

03. I'm concerned about taking on a task at work if my performance would reveal that I had low ability

04. I prefer to avoid situations at work where I might perform poorly
Appendix C.9 Workaholism items

Item #

01. I seem to be in a hurry and racing against the clock

02. I find myself continuing to work after my co-workers have called it quits

03. I stay busy and keep many irons in the fire

04. I spend more time working than on socializing with friends, on hobbies, or on leisure activities

05. I find myself doing two or three things at one time such as eating lunch and writing a memo, while talking on the telephone

06. It is important to me to work hard even when I do not enjoy what I am doing

07. I feel that there is something inside me that drives me to work hard

08. I feel obliged to work hard, even when it is not enjoyable

09. I feel guilty when I take time off work

10. It is hard for me to relax when I am not working
Appendix C.10 Work engagement items

Item #

01. At my work, I feel bursting with energy
02. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous
03. I am enthusiastic about my job
04. My job inspires me
05. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work
06. I feel happy when I am working intensely
07. I am proud of the work that I do
08. I am immersed in my work
09. I get carried away when I’m working
Appendix C.11 Calling items

**Item #**

01. I believe that I have been called to my current line of work
02. My work helps me live out my life’s purpose
03. I do not believe that a force beyond myself has helped guide me to my career
04. The most important aspect of my career is its role in helping to meet the needs of others
05. I was drawn by something beyond myself to pursue my current line of work
06. Making a difference for others is the primary motivation in my career
07. I see my career as a path to purpose in life
08. My work contributes to the common good
09. My career is an important part of my life’s meaning
10. I am always trying to evaluate how beneficial my work is to others
11. I am pursuing my current line of work because I believe I have been called to do so
12. I try to live out my life purpose when I am at work
Appendix D
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Appendix D.2 Passion for work criteria items
Appendix D.3 Harmonious passion for work items
Appendix D.4 Obsessive passion for work items
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Appendix D.6 Co-worker –rated In-role behaviour items
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Appendix D.9 Co-worker –rated Life satisfaction items
Appendix D.1 Participant demographic questions and anonymous code

We would like to know some of your background information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>01. Gender (please encircle):</th>
<th>1 Male</th>
<th>2 Female</th>
<th>3 Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>02. Age (as of last birthday):</th>
<th>1 less than 1 year</th>
<th>2 1-5 years</th>
<th>3 6-10 years</th>
<th>4 11-15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 16-20 years</td>
<td>6 21-25 years</td>
<td>7 26-30 years</td>
<td>8 Over 30 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, a unique personal code will be used instead of your name. We will also use this to match your responses on this survey with your co-rater’s rating of your work behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>YOUR RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your father’s first name</td>
<td>My father’s first name is <em>Mario</em> [M] [A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your mother’s first name</td>
<td>My mother’s first name is <em>Lita</em> [L] [I]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date (in the month) of your birthday</td>
<td>Born December 3, 1970 [0] [3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D.2 Passion for work criteria items

Item #

01. I spend a lot of time doing my work
02. I love my work
03. My work is important for me
04. My work is a passion for me
Appendix D.3 Harmonious passion for work items

Item #

01. My work is in harmony with the other activities in my life

02. The new things that I discover about my work allow me to appreciate it even more

03. My work reflects the qualities I like about myself

04. My work allows me to live a variety of experiences

05. My work is well integrated in my life

06. My work is in harmony with other things that are part of me
Appendix D.4 Obsessive passion for work items

Item #
01. I have difficulties controlling my urge to do my work
02. I have almost an obsessive feeling for my work
03. My work is the only thing that really turns me on
04. If I could, I would only do my work
05. My work is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it
06. I have the impression that my work controls me
Appendix D.5 4 Co-rater (co-worker) demographic questions and anonymous code

We would like to know some of your background information.

01. Gender (please encircle):  1   Male  2   Female  3   Other
02. Age (as of last birthday):  __________
03. How long have you been working with your current organization?  _____ year(s)  _____ month(s)
04. How long have you worked with the person who gave you this survey?  ______ year (s) ___ month(s)

To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, a unique personal code will be used instead of your name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>YOUR RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your</td>
<td>My father’s first name is Carlos [C] [A]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father’s first name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your</td>
<td>My mother’s first name Esther [E] [S]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother’s first name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date (in the month) of</td>
<td>Born November 8, 1970 [0] [8]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your birthday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D.6 Co-worker –rated In-role behaviour items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>This person…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Adequately completes assigned duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Performs tasks that are expected of him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Meets formal performance requirements of the job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D.7 Co-worker –rated Organisational citizenship behaviour items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>This person…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Volunteers to do things for this work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Helps orient new employees in this group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Attends functions that help this work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Assists others in this group with their work for the benefit of the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>Gets involved to benefit this work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Helps others in this group learn about the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>Helps others in this group with their work responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D.8 Co-worker –rated Job satisfaction items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>This person…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>All in all, is satisfied with his/her job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>In general, likes his/her job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>In general, likes working in this organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D.9 Co-worker –rated Life satisfaction items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>This person…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>In most ways, this person’s life is close to his/her ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>The conditions of this person’s life are excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>This person is satisfied with his/her life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>So far, this person has gotten the important things he/she wants in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>If this person can live his/her life over, he/she would change almost nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix E.1 Participant demographic questions and anonymous code

We would like to know some of your background information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Gender (please encircle):</td>
<td>1 Male  2 Female  3 Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Age (as of last birthday):</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. How long have you been working with your current organization (please encircle)?</td>
<td>1 less than 1 year  2 1-5 years  3 6-10 years  4 11-15 years  5 16-20 years  6 21-25 years  7 26-30 years  8 Over 30 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, a unique personal code will be used instead of your name. We will also use this to match your responses on this survey with your co-rater’s rating of your work behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Your Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your father’s first name</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father’s first name is Mario [M] [A]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your mother’s first name</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mother’s first name is Lita[L] [I]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date (in the month) of your birthday</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born December 3, 1970 [0] [3]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E.2 Passion for work criteria items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>I spend a lot of time doing my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>I love my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>My work is important for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>My work is a passion for me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E.3 Harmonious passion for work items

Item #

01. My work is in harmony with the other activities in my life
02. The new things that I discover about my work allow me to appreciate it even more
03. My work reflects the qualities I like about myself
04. My work allows me to live a variety of experiences
05. My work is well integrated in my life
06. My work is in harmony with other things that are part of me
Appendix E.4 Obsessive passion for work items

**Item #**

01. I have difficulties controlling my urge to do my work
02. I have almost an obsessive feeling for my work
03. My work is the only thing that really turns me on
04. If I could, I would only do my work
05. My work is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it
06. I have the impression that my work controls me
Appendix E.5 Work-life balance items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>My personal life suffers because of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>My job makes personal life difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>I neglect personal needs because of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>I put personal life on hold for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>I miss personal activities because of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>I struggle to juggle work and non-work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>I am happy with the amount of time for non-work activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.</td>
<td>My personal life drains me of energy for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.</td>
<td>I am too tired to be effective at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My work suffers because of my personal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I find it hard to work because of personal matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My personal life gives me energy for my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My job gives me energy to pursue my personal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I have a better mood at work because of my personal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I have a better mood because of my job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E.6 Job satisfaction items

Item #

01. All in all, I am satisfied with my job
02. In general, I like my job
03. In general, I like working in this organization
Appendix E.7 Life satisfaction items

**Item #**

01. In most ways, my life is close to my ideal
02. The conditions of my life are excellent
03. I am satisfied with my life
04. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life
05. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing
Appendix E.8 Co-rater (co-worker) demographic questions and anonymous code

We would like to know some of your background information.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Gender (please encircle):</td>
<td>1 Male</td>
<td>2 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Age (as of last birthday):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. How long have you been working with your current organization?</td>
<td>_____ year(s) _____ month(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. How long have you worked with the person who gave you this survey?</td>
<td>_____ year(s) _____ month(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, a unique personal code will be used instead of your name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>YOUR RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your father’s first name</td>
<td>My father’s first name is Carlos [C] [A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first two letters of your mother’s first name</td>
<td>My mother’s first name Esther [E] [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date (in the month) of your birthday</td>
<td>Born November 8, 1970 [0] [8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E.9 Co-worker – rated In-role behaviour items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>This person…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Adequately completes assigned duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Fulfils responsibilities specified in job description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Performs tasks that are expected of him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Meets formal performance requirements of the job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E.10 Co-worker –rated Organisational citizenship behaviour items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>This person…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Volunteers to do things for this work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Helps orient new employees in this group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Attends functions that help this work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Assists others in this group with their work for the benefit of the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>Gets involved to benefit this work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Helps others in this group learn about the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>Helps others in this group with their work responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E.11 Co-worker –rated Job satisfaction items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>This person…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>All in all, is satisfied with his/her job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>In general, likes his/her job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>In general, likes working in this organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E.12 Co-worker–rated Life satisfaction items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>This person…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>In most ways, this person’s life is close to his/her ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>The conditions of this person’s life are excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>This person is satisfied with his/her life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>So far, this person has gotten the important things he/she wants in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>If this person can live his/her life over, he/she would change almost nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>