Social Psychological Bulletin

Psychologia Społeczna

Work Meaning in Self and World Perspective: A New Outlook on the WAMI Scale

Malwina Puchalska-Kamińska[a], Agnieszka Czerw[b], Marta Roczniewska[c]

[a] *SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw, Poland.* **[b]** *SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Poznań, Poland.* **[c]** *SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Sopot, Poland.*

Abstract

Recent research demonstrates that finding the meaning of work (MW) is a growing need among employees. It thus seems vital to examine the predictors and outcomes of meaningful work with the aim of identifying practical implications for employees and organizations in this area. However, there are several different concepts of MW and only a handful of published measures. Using the framework of the big two we proposed and developed a two-dimensional model of MW: agentic work meaning (the self-perspective) and communal work meaning (the world perspective). The aim of our research was to adapt the Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI; Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012) into Polish and to verify the hypothesis of a two-dimensional model of MW, which is a new perspective on this scale. The three studies conducted amongst employees in Poland (N = 403) supported our ideas. First, confirmatory factor analysis provided support for the two-dimensional model of MW in WAMI-PL, i.e., meaning in the self and in world perspectives. In line with previous studies on MW, these two factors correlated positively with meaning in life, work well-being (work engagement, organizational commitment) and positive work behaviors (in-role and extra-role behaviors, job crafting). Moreover, we demonstrated a relationship between MW and the eudemonic indicators of well-being in the workplace, such as fit and personal development, positive relationships at work, and contribution to the organization. We discuss the theoretical and practical implications of this research.

Keywords

Psychologists and human resource management (HRM) practitioners have become increasingly interested in the meaning of work (MW). In its report on the American labor market, Gallup Organization (2017) demonstrates that employees increasingly list MW as one of the most important needs in the professional field. Similarly, when listing future trends and needs in the field of HRM, the Institute for Employment Studies in the United Kingdom (Fletcher & Robinson, 2016) demonstrates that it is necessary for organizations to aid employees in finding the meaning and significance of their work.

It is worth emphasizing that according to recent research, MW is not a preference, but rather a fundamental human need (Yeoman, 2014), and that work is a key source of meaningfulness in life (Dik, Sargent, & Steger, 2008) and of identity creation (Kuhn, Golden, Jorgenson, Berkelaar, & Kisselburgh, 2008). Moreover, according to an increasing number of studies, finding MW is highly beneficial not only to the employee, but also to the entire organization. MW, inter alia, is related to employees experiencing positive emotions more often (Arnold, Turner, Barling, Kelloway, & McKee, 2007), higher work satisfaction (Kamdron, 2015), the level of employee engagement (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004), as well as reduced work absence (Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes, & Delbridge, 2013) and a higher quality of undertaken tasks (Rodell, 2013).

Given the growing interest in studies that would demonstrate both the antecedents and the consequences of MW, we set out to adapt the Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI; Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012) into Polish. The aim of this paper is twofold. First, we provide a theoretical background of the meaning of work and propose a new outlook on the WAMI scale, suggesting that there are two factors of meaning, rather than three as described in the original version of WAMI. To test this assumption, we conducted three studies to validate the 2-factor structure of the WAMI scale and to its criterion and discriminant validity. The factors that were revealed by our studies are: meaning in the self-perspective and meaning in the world perspective. Subsequently, we comment on the theoretical and practical implications of our research.

MW Theories and Measures

The term 'meaning of work' may not be a recent one; however, only recently has it significantly gained importance. As early as in the mid-1970s, in their job characteristics model, Greg Oldham and Richard Hackman placed MW among the key subjective states of the employee (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). The meaning of work results, among other things, from the significance of the tasks that one undertakes for the benefit of others or the organization. It appears that this model has lost its significance, with contemporary Work and Organizational Psychology rarely using it to explain human functioning. However, recent developments suggest that this somewhat forgotten term might become key in the context of studies on eudemonic well-being at work, since MW seems to be the quintessence of this perspective on professional well-being (Czerw, 2017a, 2017b). Following the assumption that MW can be understood as a phenomenon encompassing a

matrix made of two criteria: micro (specific to organizations) and macro (understood globally), and egotistic (focused on the Self) and altruistic (focused on others) (Czerw, 2015), it becomes evident that this notion is quite complex and could be measured in a number of ways.

According to the authors of the WAMI scale (Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012), work is meaningful and significant when it fulfills three criteria: Positive meaning, Meaning-making through work, and Greater good motivation. Positive meaning, as understood by the authors of this concept, signifies the subjective conviction of the employee that whatever they are doing is important from their individual perspective. The authors introduce this concept along with the job characteristics model, which recognizes meaning as a significant parameter of work, related to the subjective conviction of the employee about the usefulness and importance of their actions. Another factor of meaningful work, namely Meaning-Making through work, is related to perceiving work as a means for creating meaning in one's life. Based on earlier studies, Steger and Dik (2009) assume that meaningful work enhances meaning in life by providing reflections on the self and the surrounding world, which in turn leads to personal development. The third factor of WAMI is perceiving one's work as having an impact on something greater, transcending the individual. Steger et al. (2012) define this aspect as Greater good motivation. It is related to experiencing one's work as a vocation or calling, i.e., the sense of fulfilling a mission at work (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997).

A multi-factor approach to MW can also be encountered in other contemporary concepts of MW (Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009; Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010). Based on long-term studies conducted among employees, some claim that MW is achieved through maintaining equilibrium between fulfilling the needs of the self and the needs of others, as well as the need for being (reflection) and the need for doing (action). In a thorough review of various concepts of MW, Rosso, Dekas, and Wrzesniewski (2010) proposed a similar theoretical model of MW, in which the employee attains MW by concentrating on the self and others. According to researchers, meaningful work is created or maintained through the sense of self-agency and self-communion, as well as other-agency and other-communion. This approach is analogous to the one proposed by Czerw (2015), which distinguishes between the egotistic and the altruistic perspectives.

To the best of our knowledge, WAMI is just one of only several MW measuring methods used in empirical studies. Another instrument to measure MW is the Comprehensive Meaningful Work Scale (Lips-Wiersma & Wright, 2012) which measures MW as a single multidimensional construct. However, rather than measuring the experienced work meaning, this instrument focuses on examining ways to build meaningful work by employees (e.g., item: 'I can talk openly about my values when we are making a decision'). Therefore, we do not deem it accurate for the aim we are proposing. Among other methods used by researchers to measure MW, there are single questions included in multidimensional psychosocial questionnaires (e.g., Job Diagnostic Survey, Hackman & Oldham,

1975; Workplace Spirituality Scale, Ashmos & Duchon, 2000). Although using a single item may be convenient in terms of space and cost, single-item measures have been criticized (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997) because such measures cannot be used in the measurement part of structural equation models (which are becoming very popular). Hence, amongst other methods to measure MW, we chose WAMI as a validated scale with items directly related to the experience of work meaning.

Two-Dimensional Perspectives on MW

A careful analysis of the approaches to MW points to the possibility of a general division of perspectives on work meaning, i.e., agentic work meaning (for the self) and communal work meaning (for others). Interestingly, this division is often encountered in the psychological concepts of a dualistic dimension known as fundamental dimensions or the big two (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014). These dimensions refer to various psychological phenomena, such as social perception (competence vs. warmth; Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007), identity (masculinity vs. femininity; Bem, 1981), or values (individualism vs. collectivism; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990). Bakan (1966) was one of the first to present such a division; he proposed that there are two fundamental modalities of human existence: agency and communion. Agency is defined as the capacity to act with intentionality in the world and is linked to the concentration on the self, whereas communion refers to establishing and maintaining relations with others and is linked with a focus on others (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014) The duality of agentic and communal content reflects the nature of human existence (Bakan, 1966): as individual beings pursuing their own goals (agency) and as parts of society forming relations (communion). These two types of meaning are logically independent and based on different cues. They also function as psychological alternatives in social cognition (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014). For example, research shows that goal activation is linked with positive implicit evaluations of agentic and negative evaluation of communal traits (Roczniewska & Kolańczyk, 2014), while global impressions of other people are better predicted from communal trait ascriptions rather than agentic ones (Wojciszke, Bazinska, & Jaworski, 1998).

The big two perspectives can also be found in the concepts of meaning in life, in which the subject creates the sense of life meaning based on self-realization and based on establishing relations with the world (Emmons, 2005; Schnell & Becker, 2006; Westerhof, Bohlmeijer, & Valenkamp, 2004). Following this dual perspective on human existence, we propose a two-dimensional outlook on MW. Namely, we introduce two overarching concepts of MW: the meaning of work for the self (agentic MW) and the meaning of work for the world (communal MW).

Meaning of work in the self-perspective encompasses perceiving one's work as meaningful to the extent to which the work is consistent with the self and brings personal benefits to the employee, such as giving meaning to one's life, endowing with a sense of development and accomplishing important goals. Understood in this way, it is close to

the eudemonic dimension of well-being, which (as opposed to the hedonistic dimension focused on striving to maximize pleasurable experiences in life) signifies a life in harmony with the self of the subject (Waterman, 1993). The level of consistence between one's personal projects and the most significant aspects of the self (e.g., one's characteristics, competences and values) allows prediction of the experienced sense of meaning in life (McGregor & Little, 1998), and according to studies, this relationship is also significant for the sense of MW (Shamir, 1991).

Meaning of work in the world perspective refers to the degree to which the subject perceives their work as having a beneficial impact on others. A similar notion can be found in the concept of work orientation by Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, and Schwartz (1997), who assume that people treating their job as a vocation experience external motivation for work more often, while declaring a high sense of MW. These assumptions are also consistent with studies which show that altruistic actions (i.e., ones that are selfless and focused on others) contribute to long-term well-being (Connor et al., 2015; Xi et al., 2017).

According to the principles of scientific economy, if reality can be explained using a smaller number of factors, it is advisable to use a model with a smaller number of factors (Ockham's razor). Although the dimensions of the original WAMI scales are clearly presented by the authors from a theoretical point of view, it seems difficult to recognize the difference between the positive meaning dimension and meaning-making through work while analyzing their operationalization, i.e., specific items from the scale. For example, the item 'I understand how my work contributes to my life's meaning' from the positive meaning dimension seems to be similar to an item from the meaning-making through work dimension, i.e., 'My work helps me better understand myself'. Both statements refer to the personal benefits that the employee discovers through work.

Overall, in our adaptation studies, we set out to verify the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: The meaning of work consists of two factors – the self-perspective and the world perspective in work meaning.

The New Outlook on the Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI)

Table 1 presents statements in the original language version of the WAMI Scale, i.e., in English, along with their translation into Polish and the additional information regarding the scale to which a given question belonged in the original version. Participants familiarize themselves with 10 statements and answer to what extent they agree with each statement, on a scale from 1 to 5 (from absolutely untrue to absolutely true).

Table 1

Items From the Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI) and Their Translation Into Polish (WAMI-PL) With New Items' Classification in the Frame of Big Two

Subscale	WAMI item	WAMI-PL item
Positive meaning		
WMS	1. I have found a meaningful career.	1. Obrałem/am drogę zawodową, która ma znaczenie.
WMS	4. I understand how my work contributes to my life's meaning.	4. Rozumiem, w jaki sposób moja praca przyczynia się do nadania sensu mojemu życiu.
WMS	5. I have a good sense of what makes my job meaningful.	5. Wiem dobrze co sprawia, że moja praca ma sens.
WMS	8. I have discovered work that has a satisfying purpose.	8. Znalazłem/am pracę, która ma satysfakcjonujący cel.
Meaning making through work		
WMS	2. I view my work as contributing to my personal growth.	2. Uważam, że moja praca przyczynia się do mojego rozwoju osobistego.
WMS	7. My work helps me better understand myself.	7. Moja praca pozwala mi lepiej zrozumieć siebie.
WMW	9. My work helps me make sense of the world around me.	9. Moja praca pozwala mi nadawać sens światu, który mnie otacza.
Greater good motivations		
WMW	3. My work really makes no difference to the world. (R)	3. Moja praca nie ma żadnego znaczenia dla świata. (R)
WMW	6. I know my work makes a positive difference in the world.	6. Wiem, że moja praca zmienia świat na lepsze.
WMW	10. The work I do serves a greater purpose.	10. Praca, którą wykonuję, służy wyższemu celowi.

Note. An R notes that this item is reverse-scored; WMS = Work meaning in the self-perspective; WMW = Work meaning in the world perspective.

We assumed that all WAMI items connected to employee's personal benefits related to meaningful work would comprise the first dimension, i.e., MW in the self-perspective. Given the definition of MW in the self-perspective that we are proposing, this sub-dimension should consist of items that link one's work with personal meaning and benefits only. Therefore, we propose that it comprises all items from the positive meaning dimension and 2 items from the meaning-making through work dimension (i.e., "I view my work as contributing to my personal growth" and "My work helps me better understand myself").

    The proposed world perspective of WAMI-PL refers to the communion dimension of the big two, i.e., understanding how one's work benefits others. Therefore, it should comprise all the items that refer to the beyond-individual benefits of the work. We propose that this sub-dimension consists of all the items from the greater good motivation dimen-

sion, and 1 item from the meaning-making through work dimension, i.e., "My work helps me make sense of the world around me". This statement relates to the meaning-making mechanism through realizing values related to collectivism, i.e., perceiving one's action from the perspective of the common good (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990). Referring to Bakan's concept (1966), such an action will be closer to the communion rather than to the agency perspective since it is focused on others.

WAMI-PL and its Relationship With Other Constructs

Following the authors of WAMI (Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012) we assumed that MW and its dimensions would correlate positively with other variables related to well-being at work, life well-being and positive work behaviors.

With the aim of examining the validity of the Polish adaptation of the WAMI Scale, in Study 1 we employed some of the variables used by Steger et al. (2012) so as to compare both the direction and the strength of correlations with the results obtained in the original validation study. To this end, variables measuring meaning in life and work orientations were selected. Based on the concept of meaning in life (Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006), two variables were singled out for this study – the presence of meaning in life and the search for meaning in life. In accordance with earlier research (Steger et al., 2012), we assumed that MW will be positively related to the presence of meaning in life, yet not to the search for meaning in life *(H2)*. This assumption is also based on the theoretical concept of MW, according to which MW could be part of a wider construct, i.e., the meaning in life itself (Steger & Dik, 2009). The search for meaning in life, on the other hand, is an activity that requires continuous effort, which is undertaken in order to establish or expand knowledge of the meaning of one's life (Kossakowska & Kwiatek, 2013). Even though such an activity could lead to the presence of meaning in one's life, it is deemed to be an independent category of the construct, since there are individuals who have a high level of meaning in life and at the same time intently search for it, while others have a low level of meaning, but display a high level of activity in searching for it (Steger et al., 2006).

According to the job-career-calling model (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), work orientation is a relatively fixed approach to work that manifests itself in the manner of functioning at work at the cognitive and affective levels, as well as in action. In this model (1997), we can distinguish people who treat their work as a mission (calling orientation); people for whom work is a means of satisfying the need for prestige and power through being promoted (career orientation); and employees who see their work merely as a source of income (job orientation). Following Steger et al. (2012), we also assumed that MW will be positively related to the calling orientation only (H3). Calling orientation is linked with intrinsic work motivation and the sense of calling in one's profession. Moreover, studies show that people who treat their work as a calling declare a high level of MW more often (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). The remaining styles are: job orientation, i.e., treating one's

job as a source of income, which is negatively related to work satisfaction; and, finally, career orientation related to striving for promotion and satisfying the needs linked to prestige and power. Therefore, we assume that job orientation—connected with pressure, obligation and low work satisfaction—will correlate negatively with meaning in work (H4). As for career orientation, which is chiefly linked with the need for promotion and surpassing other people, we also expect a negative correlation with MW (H5). This assumption is once again based on the validation studies conducted by the authors of WAMI and the direction of the obtained relations.

For the validity test, we also decided to use the 'work engagement' variable, as it is often used as an indicator of employees' well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Czerw, 2017b). Work engagement is defined as a positive state of mind of the employee, which is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption in the performed task, as well as a sense of time flying by quickly (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). Therefore, we assume that engagement will be positively related to MW (H6).

Another measurement carried out as part of the WAMI-PL validity test concerned eudemonic well-being in the workplace. According to Czerw (2017a) Eudemonic Well-being in the Workplace involves: perceiving one's organization as positive, having a sense of fit to the organization and being satisfied with one's role in the organization, having good and friendly relationships in the workplace, as well as having the sense of being important and appreciated for one's contribution to the company. Since the above-mentioned concept encompasses aspects of work regarded as components of its meaning, we expect to observe positive relationships between MW and all facets of eudemonic well-being in the workplace (H7).

In Study 2, a measure of affective commitment of the employee to the organization was applied, as well as the employee's subjective sense of professional effectiveness. Such a choice of variables allowed us to expand the context of the study into the areas related to the functioning of the employee in the workplace. Affective commitment refers to feeling 'psychologically comfortable' at work and regards employees' emotional attachment and their identification with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Following the results obtained by the designers of WAMI (Steger et al., 2012), we hypothesized a positive relationship between MW and affective commitment to the organization (H8).

Williams and Anderson (1991) demonstrated that professional effectiveness can be perceived from the perspective of in-role and extra-role behaviors. The in-role behaviors refer to the behaviors that are necessary for the completion of responsibilities at work (e.g., accomplishing duties on time), while extra-role behaviors are not part of the formal job requirements that enable the organization to function as a social system (e.g., helping coworkers with a job-related problem). Since studies to date have shown that well-being in the workplace is related to job performance (Lin, Yu, & Yi, 2014) as well as to positive behaviors going beyond one's professional role (Bateman & Organ, 1983), we assume that

MW will be positively related to professional effectiveness from the perspective of in-role and extra-role behaviors (H9).

Research demonstrates that employees may craft their jobs to their needs and preferences in order to make it more meaningful. Therefore, the aim of Study 3 was to verify the relationship between MW and job crafting. Job crafting is a proactive behavior on the part of employees aimed at shaping their job to better suit their needs and preferences (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). According to Tims, Bakker, and Derks (2012), employees can craft their job in four different ways: by increasing the job's structural resources (e.g., gaining skills on their own), increasing social resources (e.g., asking coworkers for advice), increasing challenges (e.g., engaging in new projects), and reducing demands (e.g., avoiding emotionally straining relations). The first three methods of job crafting are often distinguished in studies as proactive strategies, whereas the reduction of demands is considered passive (Roczniewska & Puchalska-Kamińska, 2017; Mäkikangas, 2018), since, in contrast to increasing resources and challenges, it does not lead to an increase in the effectiveness and satisfaction of the employee (Rudolph, Katz, Lavigne, & Zacher, 2017). Therefore, we assume that MW will be positively related to job crafting through increasing job resources and challenging demands (H10).

To sum up, we predict that MW in the self and world perspective will be positively correlated with a presence (but not search) of meaning in life as a life well-being indicator. Additionally, we hypothesize positive relations with work well-being components, like work engagement, affective commitment, and eudemonic well-being indicators, e.g., positive relations with others. We also predict that MW will be positively linked to job-as-a-calling orientation and negatively to just-a-job and job-as-a-carrier orientation. Moreover, we expect positive correlations between WM and positive work behaviors, i.e., in-role and extra-role performance, as well as job crafting.

Scale Development and Translation

Our first step was to translate the original WAMI questionnaire into Polish. The translation was performed in collaboration with three independent translators; in the end, we decided on one final version, which in our opinion best rendered the sense of the original questions. Next, the text was sent to a bilingual psychologist for back translation from Polish into English. The results of the comparison of the two versions were highly satisfying and allowed us to decide on the final version of the translation.

Methods

Procedure

All data was collected via online forms. Respondents were Polish employees from different occupational sectors recruited using network sampling by 10 research assistants (see

Demerouti & Rispens, 2014). The tools used for the purpose of psychometric validation of the WAMI-PL scale were divided into three sub-studies (described as Study 1, 2, and 3) to test multiple relationships without depleting participants. An average study took 12 minutes to complete. An assistant received a link to only one set of scales.

Participants

A hundred and three employees participated in Study 1 (70 women). On average, participants were 33.15 years old (*SD* = 6.81) and had worked for their current organization for 10 years. Study 2 involved 120 participants (106 women) with an average age of 31.98 years (*SD* = 8.09). Their mean tenure was 6.45 years. Lastly, 180 individuals participated in Study 3 (148 women). On average, they had worked for 6 years in their current company. The sample for Confirmatory Factor Analysis included participants from Studies 1-3 who responded to every item of WAMI-PL (*N* = 393).

Measures

In three studies, validated scales were used to assess the relations between WAMI-PL and other constructs.

Study 1

Meaning in life was measured using the Polish version of the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (Kossakowska & Kwiatek, 2013) originally developed by Steger et al. (2006). The scale consists of ten items, which form two subscales: search for meaning in life (e.g., "I am seeking a purpose or mission for my life", α = .78); and presence of meaning in life (e.g., "I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful", α = .86). Items are rated on a scale from 1 (absolutely untrue) to 7 (absolutely true).

Work orientation was measured using Kasprzak's Occupational Orientation Styles Scale (Kasprzak, 2012), which was built on the basis of the job-career-calling model (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). It distinguishes three main styles of functioning at work: occupation, which refers to job orientation in the job-career-calling model and describes workers who concentrate on financial rewards and treat work as a necessity (e.g., "I treat my work as a necessity in life", α = .85), career referring to career orientation and to workers who focus promotion and advancement, (e.g., "I try to be better than others", α = .65) and mission, which is in line with calling orientation and is typical for people who enjoy the sense of fulfillment at work and have a sense of calling, (e.g., "I feel that my work has some sense", α = .79). The scale consists of fifteen items and participants rate their agreement with each statement using a scale from 1 (totally disagree) to 6 (totally agree).

Work engagement was measured with the seventeen-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) adapted into Polish by Szabowska-Walaszczyk,

Zawadzka, & Wojtaś (2011). The instrument consists of three subscales to assess vigor, which refers to the levels of energy and mental resilience while working (e.g., "At work, I am bursting with energy", α = .87), dedication, which is a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge (e.g., "I am enthusiastic about my job", α = .90), and absorption, characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work (e.g., "I am immersed in my work", α = .89). Participants respond to these items using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (always).

Eudemonic well-being at work was measured using Czerw's Eudemonic Well-Being in the Workplace Questionnaire (EWWQ; Czerw, 2017a), which consists of forty three statements. The subscales of EWWQ measure different aspects of well-being in organizations, such as: viewing the organization as generally positive (Positive Organization, e.g., "The organization that I work for has more pros than cons", α = .94), having a sense of being in the right place and having an opportunity to develop oneself (Fit and Development, e.g., "Thanks to my work I can fulfill my personal goals and realize the values important to me", α = .95), having friendly and supportive relations with coworkers (Positive Relations, e.g., "I have a good relationship with coworkers", α = .95), and assessing one's role in the organization as important (Contribution to Organization, e.g., "Thanks to my work, my company has achieved measurable benefits", α = .95). Participants rate their agreement with each statement on a scale from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree).

Study 2

Affective organizational commitment was assessed with a six-item subscale adapted from Allen and Meyer's Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS; Meyer & Allen, 1991) translated into Polish by Retowski, Bogdanowicz, Dolata, and Kaźmierczak (2003). An example item that measures affective organizational commitment is "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization" (α = .91). All items were assessed using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Job performance was measured using six items developed by Williams and Anderson (1991) translated into Polish by (Roczniewska, 2017) with two types of job performance: in-role and extra-role. An example item that measures in-role performance is "I adequately complete assigned duties" (α = .81). An example of an extra-role performance item is "I help others who have been absent" (α = .64). A 7-point response scale was used, ranging from 0 (not at all characteristic of me) to 6 (very characteristic of me).

Study 3

Job crafting was assessed using three sub-dimensions of the Polish version (Roczniewska & Retowski, 2016; see: Roczniewska & Bakker, 2016) of the job crafting scale originally developed by Tims, Bakker, and Derks (2012). The dimensions are: increasing structural job resources (e.g., "I try to develop my capabilities", α = .67), increasing social job resour-

ces (e.g., "I ask colleagues for advice", α = .74), increasing challenging job demands (e.g., "When there is not much to do at work, I see it as a chance to start new projects", α = .88). Items were rated on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To test whether the proposed two-factor solution fits the data better than the original three-factor solution (Hypothesis 1), we performed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using Mplus 7.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). To assess model fit, we used four indices: the $\chi 2/df$ ratio, the Tucker-Lewis Index, the Comparative FitIndex (CFI; Bentler, 1990), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudeck, 1992). With respect to the $\chi 2/df$ ratio, values below three generally indicate good model fit (Kline, 1999). Values of 0.90 and above for TLI and CFI indicate acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1995). For RMSEA, values of 0.08 and below are considered acceptable, while values of 0.05 and below are considered good fit (Byrne, 2001). Finally, we compared the two-factor model fit with the fit of the alternative models (original three-factor and control one-factor solutions) by testing the change in $\chi 2$ across models.

The analysis was conducted on the combined samples from Studies 1-3 to increase statistical power (N = 393). Missing data were deleted list-wise. In Step 1, we tested for the multivariate normal distribution. Significant coefficients of skewness and kurtosis (*ps* < 0.001) indicate that this assumption cannot be accepted. Consequently, we used the Maximum Likelihood Robust (MLR) estimator instead of Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimator to test the fit. Furthermore, we compared the models using Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square (Bryant & Satorra, 2012; Satorra & Bentler, 2001).

The results of the CFA regarding the goodness-of-fit indices of the tested models are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Confirmatory Factor Analyses of the WAMI-PL Scale (N = 393)

Model	χ2	df	χ2/df	RMSEA	90% CI	CFI	TLI
One-factor (A)	223.08	35	6.37	0.117	[0.103, 0.132]	0.90	0.87
Three-factor (B)	157.17	32	4.91	0.100	[0.085, 0.116]	0.94	0.91
Two-factor (C)	104.23	34	3.07	0.073	[0.057, 0.089]	0.96	0.95
Two-factor: modified (D)	66.37	33	2.01	0.051	[0.033, 0.068]	0.98	0.98

The results revealed that the one-factor model consisting of all ten items fits the data inadequately (Model A); the same holds true for the original three-factor solution (Model

B). The goodness-of-fit indices exceed the acceptable cut-off values for both Models A and B; in line with expectations, they reach acceptable values for the two-factor solution (Model C). The proposed two-factor model fits the data significantly better than Models A ($\Delta\chi2 = 55.93$, $\Delta df = 1$, $p < .001$) and B ($\Delta\chi2 = 84.92$, $\Delta df = 2$, $p < .001$).

Modification indices pointed toward a high covariance between the error terms of items 4 and 5 (see Table 1). Closer inspection of the content reveals a similarity between the items, i.e., they both relate to cognitions ("I know" and "I understand") about how one's work allows for meaning-making. Bowen (2014) points out that if test items use similar vocabulary or phrasing, random ambiguity or systematic misunderstanding could cause correlation of position errors. Here, the similarity may have been amplified by the fact that these items appear one after the other. This is a substantial justification for introducing changes to the proposed model. Including this covariance in the model (Model D) yielded a better and satisfactory model fit: the goodness-of-fit indices of the model were 0.98, while RMSEA was small (0.05), which supports the acceptability of the fit. Furthermore, the χ2/dfratio was also smaller than 3, indicating a good fit. Finally, all items loaded significantly on the latent factors, with coefficients ranging from 0.56 to 0.92 (*p*s < .001). The correlation between the two factors is relatively high, *r* = .88, *p* < .001. Table 3 presents factor loadings and the reliability coefficients of the WAMI-PL scale.

Table 3

Factor Loadings of the WAMI-PL Scale (N = 393)

Factor / Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability
Meaning of work in the self-perspective		.92
WAMI 1	.81	
WAMI 2	.81	
WAMI 4	.79	
WAMI 5	.78	
WAMI 7	.74	
WAMI 8	.91	
Meaning of work in the world perspective		.88
WAMI 3	.56	
WAMI 6	.88	
WAMI 9	.92	
WAMI10	.85	

Criterion-Related and Discriminant Validity

Intercorrelations of variables tested in Study 1, 2 and 3 are presented in Table 4. Fisher's r-to-z transformation was performed to test for potential differences between correlations (Lee & Preacher, 2013).

Table 4

Intercorrelations of the WAMI-PL Subscales

Measure	MW in the self-perspective		MW in the world perspective		Δr	
	r	95% CI	r	95% CI	Z	p
Study 1 (N = 103)						
MW in the self-perspective						
MW in the world perspective	.73**					
Presence of meaning in life	.42**	[.25, .57]	.36**	[.18, .52]	0.90	.369
Search for meaning in life	-.03	[-.22, .16]	-.02	[-.21, .17]	-0.14	.890
Occupational style	-.48**	[-.62, -.32]	-.51**	[-.64, -.35]	0.48	.631
Career style	.03	[-.16, .22]	-.11	[-.30, .09]	1.09	.270
Mission style	.64**	[.51, .74]	.66**	[.53, .76]	-0.38	.706
Vigor	.54**	[.39, .66]	.56**	[.41, .68]	-0.34	.737
Dedication	.65**	[.52, .75]	.70**	[.59, .79]	-0.98	.326
Absorption	.44**	[.27, .58]	.47**	[.30, .61]	-0.47	.641
Positive Organization	.59**	[.45, .70]	.55**	[.40, .67]	0.69	.493
Fit and Development	.84**	[.77, .89]	.72**	[.61, .80]	3.02	.003
Positive Relations	.62**	[.48, .73]	.57**	[.42, .69]	0.88	.378
Contribution to Organization	.54**	[.39, .66]	.41**	[.24, .56]	2.07	.039
Study 2 (N = 120)						
MW in the self-perspective						
MW in the world perspective	.83**					
Affective commitment	.59**	[.46, .70]	.49**	[.34, .62]	2.26	.024
Extra-role performance	.36**	[.19, .51]	.29*	[.12, .45]	1.38	.167
In-role performance	.36**	[.19, .51]	.33**	[.16, .48]	0.60	.551
Study 3 (N = 180)						
MW in the self-perspective						
MW in the world perspective	.78**					
Increasing structural job resources	.55**	[.44, .64]	.44**	[.31, .55]	2.60	.009
Increasing social job resources	.42**	[.29, .53]	.35**	[.21, .47]	1.54	.124
Increasing challenging job demands	.57**	[.46, .66]	.44**	[.31, .55]	3.11	.002

Note. Confidence intervals are given in square brackets. Δr = correlation difference; Z = Fisher's r-to-z transformation.

*p < .01. **p < .001.

As illustrated in Table 4, both dimensions of MW, i.e., the self and the world perspective, correlate similarly with the remaining variables used in all the studies. Both perspectives on MW correlate positively and moderately with the presence of meaning in life, while simultaneously we did not observe a significant relationship between both facets of MW and searching for meaning in life. This pattern supports Hypothesis 2. In line with Hypothesis 3, both MW indicators correlate positively with calling orientation and their relationship is moderate. The predicted direction was also observed for Hypothesis 4, which demonstrates a negative relationship between both MW perspectives and just-a-job orientation (also moderate in this case). Contrary to our predictions in Hypothesis 5,

a negative relationship with career orientation was not observed, and the relationship is insignificant.

In line with Hypothesis 6, both MW perspectives are positively related to work engagement. This relationship is moderate for vigor and absorption. The relationship between both MW facets and dedication, on the other hand, is high. A similar, positive relationship was observed for all the dimensions of eudemonic well-being in the workplace, which is in line with Hypothesis 7. The dimensions of EWWQ, such as Positive Organization, Positive Relations and Contribution to Organization correlate moderately with work meaning, whereas the dimension of Fit and Development is highly related to work meaning in both perspectives. There are significant differences between correlations of MW perspectives and Contribution to Organization ($Z = 2.07$, $p = .039$) as well as Fit and Development ($Z = 3.02$, $p = .003$), indicating that this relation is stronger for MW in the self-perspective dimension.

The results of Study 2 are also in line with our predictions. MW in the self and world perspective is positively related to affective commitment (Hypothesis 8) and the relationship is moderate. Moreover the relation with affective commitment is significantly stronger for MW in the self-perspective ($Z = 2.26$, $p = .024$). The MW in the self and world perspective is also related positively to extra-and in-role behaviors (Hypothesis 9); however, the strength of these relationships is low.

The results of Study 3 are in line with Hypothesis 10 on the positive relationship between MW perspectives and job crafting. These relationships are moderate and MW in the self- perspective is significantly more strongly associated with increasing structural demands ($Z = 2.60$, $p = .009$) and increasing challenging demands ($Z = 3.11$, $p = .002$) than MW in the world perspective. There are no such differences for job crafting through increasing social resources.

Discussion

In this paper, we integrate the big two model (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014) with work meaning literature to 1) introduce an agentic vs. communal perspective on WM, and 2) to present a Polish adaptation of the WAMI scale corresponding to the proposed model. Below, we expand on these contributions.

Theoretical Contributions

In line with previous research (e.g., Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009; Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010), it appears that MW could be achieved in the self and the world perspective. This way, MW has both an agentic and a communal aspect. In our research these two factors, although strongly linked with each other, differ in the degree to which MW is attained by focus on the 'self' vs. 'others'. The agentic dimension subscale of MW

(MW in the self-perspective) along with all the corresponding questions indicates that the perception of one's work is important for personal reasons, allows for the realization of significant and satisfying goals, and influences the sense of development and the degree of attained meaning of life. MW understood in such a way is similar to the mechanisms of creating meaning in life presented in the literature (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), which show that self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) is significant for building a personal sense of meaning. In the field of work, such a conviction could strengthen the sense of agency and the perception of oneself as a person who through their actions has an impact on themselves and their work environment (Grant, 2008). The sense of self-efficacy also manifests itself in responding to challenges and overcoming barriers on the path to one's goal, which results in the sense of learning and developing one's knowledge and skills at work (Spreitzer, Sutcliffe, Dutton, Sonenshein, & Grant, 2005). The sense of development at work and its positive relationship with the sense of meaning was also observed by Lips-Wiersma and Morris (2009) in their long-term qualitative research on employees in organizations. Employees perceiving MW on a personal level could also result from a strong link between the self and work and from the fact that many people deem work to be one of the more significant areas of functioning (Blustein, 2008).

The communal dimension subscale of MW (MW in the world perspective) indicates to what degree a person perceives their work as significant to the world and having a positive impact on others. According to earlier research, apart from self-oriented needs, recognizing the value of one's actions is also positively related to the sense of meaning in life (Reker & Woo, 2011). In turn, this mechanism corresponds to the world perspective, which focuses the employee on noticing the value of their work in the world. According to Frankl (1963) meaning-making can take place through the realization of goals focused beyond the self, and through serving others. This is in line with the results of research on volunteering, which demonstrate that employees could enhance their MW by engaging in voluntary and pro-social activities supported by their organization (Rodell, 2013).

In accordance with our theoretical assumptions, confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that the two-factor solution is a better fit to the collected data compared to the initial one-factor model or the three-factor model postulated by Steger et al. (2012); the three-factor structure is not a good fit to the data, since it creates redundant factors. The appropriate indices for the goodness of fit were obtained by a simpler two-factor model, which – according to the principles of scientific economy – favors this solution. Most factor loading of items are high and above 0.70 in each dimension. Only item 3 has a relatively lower loading than others (i.e., 0.56), probably because it is the only question that is reversed, and this sentence construction may not be noticed by some participants. However, this result is still satisfactory and in line with recommendations from the literature, i.e., for factor loading to be above 0.35 (Osborne & Costello, 2005).

The majority of our hypotheses for the validity of WAMI-PL were confirmed, as the direction and the strength of the relationships obtained in the study are close to those

obtained during the validation of the original WAMI scale (cf. Steger et al., 2012). The relationship between WAMI-PL and the calling orientation indicates the theoretical validity of the adapted tool. According to the Job-Career-Calling model (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), people who perceive their job as a calling report high levels of meaning in work; and according to Steger et al. (2012) these constructs are related to each other. Job orientation, on the other hand, which is associated with obligation and low work satisfaction (Kasprzak, 2012), has shown a negative relationship with MW. However, contrary to Hypothesis 3, career orientation is not negatively related to WAMI-PL, although it should be noted that in the validation studies by the creators of WAMI, the relationship between these constructs was low and it possibly revealed itself only due to the homogeneity of the studied group, i.e., university employees. It seems that amongst people from different professional backgrounds, career orientation does not determine the lack of MW. Moreover, our result is in line with another study conducted among Polish employees, which demonstrated a lack of relationship between career orientation and work satisfaction (Kasprzak, 2012).

A positive relationship between the presence of meaning in life and MW is consistent with the validation studies by Steger et al. (2012), which demonstrated a similar, positive yet moderate relationship between the two constructs. This relationship indicates that the sense of MW is closely related to the subjective sense of well-being of an individual, also in a non-professional context, and that meaningful work provides benefits to employees in their life as a whole (Steger, 2016). On the other hand, the lack of relationship between the search for meaning in life and WAMI-PL indicates the divergent validity of the tool and is in line with previous studies, which reveal that the search for meaning in life is not significantly related to the sense of well-being (Steger et al., 2006; Steger et al., 2012; Kossakowska & Kwiatek, 2013).

The instrument validity results that we obtained are also in line with previous research, according to which meaningful work benefits people and implies positive consequences in the quality of their work life (e.g., Arnold et al., 2007). The results of Studies 1 and 2 have shown that both perspectives of MW are related to work engagement and affective commitment to the organization. Interestingly, amongst the measures of work engagement, MW has the strongest relationship with the dimension of dedication. This dimension pertains to the conviction that work is meaningful and that performing it is important and can engender pride (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). This is close to the definition of MW proposed by Steger et al. (2012), according to which MW is related to assessing one's actions as important and valuable. The similarity of our validation results to the results obtained by the creators of the original WAMI scale also emerges in the case of the affective commitment variable. A study by the authors of WAMI (Steger et al., 2012) demonstrated a similar relationship between all WAMI factors and positive commitment to the organization, which is expressed by one's willingness to identify with the organization and by engagement in organization-related matters and issues. Interestingly, as in

the original Study by Steger et al. (2012), we find that this relation is slightly higher for MW in the self than the world perspective. Affective commitment arises through employees' sense of competence (Allen & Meyer, 1996) and thus may be more related to the agency that refers to such experiences as competence, achievement, and power (Bakan, 1966).

It is also worth emphasizing that moderate and high correlations between WAMI-PL and all the EWWQ indicators are in line with earlier theoretical assumptions (Czerw, 2017a; Steger, 2016), according to which the sense of MW is close to the eudemonic perspective of employees' well-being. According to the theoretical concepts of MW presented earlier (Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009; Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010), positive relations with others is one of the factors that condition the sense of MW. Positive relations could enable the fulfillment of the employees' need for belonging, which is deemed universal and significant for the sense of meaning in life (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Furthermore, the relationship with contribution to the organization indicated that employees who are convinced that their work is important and valued by their organization, also have a sense of MW in a wider context, but stronger for the self than the world perspective. The positive perception of one's impact on the organization can also enhance self-efficacy, which is often mentioned as a factor boosting the sense of meaning in the agency perspective (Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010).

The relationship between Positive Organization and WAMI-PL reveals that there is a link between noticing meaning in one's work and the positive perception of one's workplace. Such a result is consistent with contemporary research on employees' needs (Fletcher & Robinson, 2016), which demonstrates that employees expect their organization to take actions that enhance their sense of meaning. Finally, the 'Fit and Development' subscale indicates a significantly stronger relationship with agentic rather than communal MW. This result is consistent with our assumptions: MW in the self-perspective is a dimension corresponding to the sense of deriving personal benefit from work, and self-development in particular. Fit and development represent individual rather than communal motives, and as such benefit the employee. Indeed, studies demonstrate that a fit between a person and the organization with regard to goal pursuit is linked to positive consequences for the individual, i.e., higher job satisfaction and better mental health (Roczniewska & Retowski, 2014).

The relationships between MW and work behaviors that we obtained in Studies 2 and 3 are in line with research to date and confirm the relationship between employees' well-being, their initiative and behaviors that the organization perceives as desirable (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1998; Wright, Cropanzano, & Bonett, 2007). According to organizational support theory (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) employees who view their organization as supportive of their needs are more favorable with regard to, and more invested in, their organization. In line with this theory, our findings may indicate that meaningful work constitutes a need that, when satisfied, leads

people to do their best at work. The relationship between job crafting and work meaning is also consistent with earlier longitudinal research, which demonstrated that employees who craft their job by increasing resources and challenges experienced a higher level of MW (Tims, Derks, & Bakker, 2016). According to Tims et al. (2016), employees who proactively craft their job experience a better fit at work, which, in turn, leads to a higher sense of MW. Interestingly, our study indicates that job crafting through increasing structural resources and challenging job demands is significantly more strongly related to MW in the self-perspective. A meta-analysis by Rudolph et al. (2017) revealed that, among all crafting behaviors, only those two dimensions positively predict self-related performance and thus are more agentic than increasing social resources. Our results are in line with those findings, indicating that MW in the self-perspective is more related to behaviors aimed at increasing one's own efficacy, whereas crafting through social resources, which is, e.g., asking for advice or support, can be an agency and communal behavior at the same time.

Study Limitations and Future Research

Certain limitations of this research must be recognized. First of all, our studies and factor analysis of the tool are not in agreement with results obtained using the three-factor structure postulated by the authors of the original version of the tool. This difference may result from the method of analysis we adopted. Confirmatory Factor Analysis has strict requirements that may result in a misfit for models with multiple factors when the number of items is high (Marsh, Morin, Parker, & Kaur, 2014). However, it is worth noting that in their publication on the tool, Steger et al. (2012) presented only the three-factor solution, without comparing it to a two-factor solution. For this reason, we cannot know whether the result presented here is typical only of the Polish population that we studied and linked with cultural differences, or whether perhaps it could be reproduced for other nationalities as well. To the best of our knowledge, there are no other WAMI adaptations into other languages. It would be worthwhile to verify the factor structure of the tool in other countries, even though research on MW to date has shown that, despite cultural differences, common elements in the understanding of MW by employees outnumber differences in this area (International Research Team, 1987, as cited by Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010).

One of the limitations of our study is that we did not fully verify the discriminant validity of the MW in the self and other perspective. We do, however, demonstrate that there are organizational well-being indicators and positive work behavior that are better predicted by MW in the self-perspective rather than MW in the world perspective. Future studies might reveal more differences between those two dimensions of WAMI-PL, indicating that there are employees with different levels of MW in the self and world perspective. This could be achieved by carrying out comparative research in organizations characterized by different lines of business, values, and missions. It would be informative,

for instance, to compare the levels of MW in NGO employees against that of people employed in organizations where it might be challenging to identify a positive impact of their work on the world, e.g., tobacco companies. Another idea to examine differences between MW in the self and world perspectives is to study the personal values of employees and their sense of fulfilling them at work. Using the framework of the Schwartz values theory (Schwartz, 1992) we may predict that employees who value self-enhancement will be more interested in developing their MW in the self-perspective, while employees for whom self-transcendence is important will invest their efforts in building MW in the world perspective.

The professional specifics of the studied population could have also led to the abovementioned difference in results. The studies by the authors of WAMI were carried out amongst university employees, whereas our research was carried out online, using snowball sampling, and involved employees from different organizations. Unfortunately, we do not possess more specific data with regards to the education levels or specific professions in our study sample. It must be mentioned that the prevalence of women in our studies is another study limitation. Therefore it would be beneficial to carry out future studies on a more diverse population. We also need to address the fact that we did not verify the time stability of WAMI-PL. Future research with the Polish version of the WAMI scale may examine whether WM is a stable construct or whether it might be subject to changes over time or under organizational or personal interventions.

The above-mentioned online-based procedure constitutes another limitation of our study. Studies carried out in this fashion give less control over the quality of the obtained data and over engagement in the filling in of the questionnaires. Although the issue of participants' carelessness pertains to pen-and-paper research as well (Huang, Liu, & Bowling, 2015), it can be more severe in online studies. Another limitation of our studies is their correlative nature, which does not allow for verification of the prognostic validity of the tool. Therefore, we cannot assume that meaning in work leads to well-being in the organization or to positive work behaviors. Due to a cross-sectional study design, our results could be subject to common method bias (CMB; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). To test the construct validity of our measures, we conducted a series of confirmatory factor analyses, which demonstrated a better fit of a multi-factor model over a one-factor model in both Study 2 and Study 3[1]. We simultaneously administered Harman's single factor test (Bido, Mantovani, & Cohen, 2017) and found that a single factor did not account for the majority of the covariance among the measures in either of the studies. These results reduce the chance that common-method variance affected our results. However, for the sake of measuring the predictive validity, future studies should adopt a longitudinal design, i.e., space the questionnaires over time, or use distinct sources of data to measure outcomes, e.g., supervisor assessment of employee job perform-

---

1) Confirmatory Factor Analysis in Study 1 resulted in an unidentified solution because the number of parameters exceeded the sample size.

ance. Nonetheless, for strictly psychometric purposes, the strength and direction of the obtained relationships allowed us to confirm the theoretical validity of the tool.

In future studies we also propose to change the order of items in WAMI-PL to separate Items 4 and 5 (see Appendix), which are similarly phrased. This solution may prevent the high covariance between the error terms of those items that was found in our studies. It must be noted, however, that this remark refers only to the Polish version of WAMI, since the translation of phrase from item 5 'I have a good sense' refers to the Polish phrase 'I know', which is close to the expression 'I understand' used in Item 4.

Practical Implications

Studies of the field of MW transform the interest in and care for employees' well-being from a sole hedonistic perspective, common in organizations, into the eudemonic dimension, considered to be more permanent and influencing the general sense of life satisfaction more strongly (Czerw, 2017b; Heine, Proulx, & Vohs, 2006; Schueller & Seligman, 2010). The WAMI-PL tool, as an empirically confirmed tool for the study of MW, could enable organizations to monitor the level of MW and to make decisions that facilitate an increase in work meaning. This seems particularly significant from the point of view of organizations that carry out various social missions, e.g., schools and hospitals, since jobs performed in such organizations are linked with fulfilling MW in the macro perspective (e.g., for the good of society). An assessment of MW using the WAMI-PL questionnaire could also be useful in professional consultancy or career coaching. It seems that the perspective of fit to work (rather than to the organization) is best represented in this tool. Therefore, the perspective of industrial and organizational psychology and the support of professional development based on seeking work solutions that bestow a sense of MW will probably constitute a prime application for this tool. This is particularly true since the two factors of MW obtained in our studies, i.e., the self and the world perspectives, demonstrate that from the employee's point of view it is significant to see both personal as well as global benefits of their work. These two perspectives could also be a hint for designing interventions setting out to increase MW, which on the one hand should focus on increasing the sense of influence and self-development at work, while on the other should concentrate on opportunities for carrying out professional goals that serve the greater good.

Data Availability: For all three studies datasets and a codebook are freely available (see the Supplementary Materials section).

Supplementary Materials

The following Supplementary Materials are available via the PsychArchives repository (for access see Index of Supplementary Materials below):

1. Study 1 Dataset
2. Study 2 Dataset
3. Study 3 Dataset
4. Codebook (all studies)

Index of Supplementary Materials

Puchalska-Kamińska, M., Czerw, A., & Roczniewska, M. (2019). *Supplementary materials to "Work meaning in self and world perspective: A new outlook on the WAMI scale".* PsychOpen. https://doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.2425

References

Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2014). Communal and agentic content in social cognition: A dual perspective model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 50*, 195-255. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800284-1.00004-7

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49*(3), 252-276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043

Arnold, K. A., Turner, N., Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & McKee, M. C. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: The mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 193-203. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.193

Ashmos, D., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 9*(2), 134-145. https://doi.org/10.1177/105649260092008

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: Isolation and communion in Western man.* Chicago, IL, USA: Rand McNally.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309-328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

PsychOpen GOLD

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 587-595. https://doi.org/10.2307/255908

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497-529. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354-364. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(2), 238-246. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238

Bido, D. S., Mantovani, D. M. N., & Cohen, E. D. (2017). Destruction of measurement scale through exploratory factor analysis in production and operations research. *Gestão & Produção, 25*(2), 384-397. https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-530x3391-16

Blustein, D. L. (2008). The role of work in psychological health and well-being: A conceptual, historical, and public policy perspective. *American Psychologist, 63*(4), 228-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.4.228

Bowen, N. K. (2014). *Requesting and using modification indices in Mplus.* Retrieved from http://ssw.unc.edu/sswsig/sites/default/files/Modification%20Indices%20in%20Mplus%20(NK%20Bowen).pdf

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods & Research, 21*(2), 230-258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124192021002005

Bryant, F. B., & Satorra, A. (2012). Principles and practice of scaled difference chi-square testing. *Structural Equation Modeling, 19*(3), 372-398. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2012.687671

Byrne, B. M. (2001). Structural equation modeling with AMOS, EQS, and LISREL: Comparative approaches to testing for the factorial validity of a measuring instrument. *International Journal of Testing, 1*, 55-86. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327574IJT0101_4

Connor, L. E. O., Rangan, R. K., Berry, J. W., Stiver, D. J., Hanson, R., Ark, W., & Li, T. (2015). Empathy, compassionate altruism and psychological well-being in contemplative practitioners across five traditions. *Psychology, 6*(8), 989-1000. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2015.68096

Czerw, A. (2015). Well-being at work–the essence, causes and consequences of the phenomenon. *International Journal of Contemporary Management, 13*(2), 97-110.

Czerw, A. (2017a). Diagnosing well-being in work context – Eudemonic Well-Being in the Workplace Questionnaire. *Current Psychology.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9614-8

Czerw, A. (2017b). *Psychologiczny model dobrostanu w pracy. Wartość i sens pracy.* Warszawa, Poland: PWN.

Demerouti, E., & Rispens, S. (2014). Improving the image of student-recruited samples: A commentary. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 87*(1), 34-41. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12048

Dik, B. J., Sargent, A. M., & Steger, M. F. (2008). Career development strivings: Assessing goals and motivation in career decision-making and planning. *Journal of Career Development, 35*(1), 23-41. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845308317934

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 500-507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

Emmons, R. A. (2005). Striving for the sacred: Personal goals, life meaning, and religion. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*(4), 731-745. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00429.x

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 11*(2), 77-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005

Fletcher, L., & Robinson, D. (2016). What's the point? The importance of meaningful work. In Institute for Employment Studies (Ed.), *Thoughts for the day: IES Perspectives on HR 2016* (Report 508). Retrieved from Institute for Employment Studies website: https://www.employment-studies.co.uk/resource/whats-point-importance-meaningful-work

Frankl, V. E. (1963). *Man's search for meaning: An introduction to logotherapy.* New York, NY, USA: Washington Square Press.

Gallup Inc. (2017). *State of the workplace.* Retrieved from https://www.gallup.com/workplace/238085/state-american-workplace-report-2017.aspx

Grant, A. M. (2008). Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 48-58. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.48

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(2), 159-170. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076546

Heine, S. J., Proulx, T., & Vohs, K. D. (2006). The meaning maintenance model: On the coherence of social motivations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(2), 88-110. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_1

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 76–99). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.

Huang, J. L., Liu, M., & Bowling, N. A. (2015). Insufficient effort responding: Examining an insidious confound in survey data. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(3), 828-845. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038510

Kamdron, T. (2015). Work motivation: Relationships with job satisfaction, locus of control and motivation orientation. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science, 3*(6), 125-148.

Kasprzak, E. (2012). Style orientacji zawodowej – postawy teoretyczne i narzędzie pomiaru. *Czasopismo Psychologiczne, 18*(1), 95-105.

Kline, P. (1999). *The new psychometrics: Science, psychology and measurement.* https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315787817

Kossakowska, M., & Kwiatek, P. (2013). Sens w życiu. Polska wersja kwestionariusza MLQ (Meaning in Life Questionnaire). *Psychologia Jakości Życia, 12*(2), 111-131. https://doi.org/10.5604/16441796.1090786

Kuhn, T., Golden, A. G., Jorgenson, J., Berkelaar, B. L., & Kisselburgh, L. G. (2008). Cultural discourses and discursive resources for meaning/ful work. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*(1), 162-171. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318908318262

Lee, I. A., & Preacher, K. J. (2013). Calculation for the test of the difference between two dependent correlations with one variable in common [Computer software]. Retrieved from http://quantpsy.org/corrtest/corrtest2.htm

Lin, Y., Yu, C., & Yi, C. (2014). The effects of positive affect, person-job fit, and well-being on job performance. *Social Behavior and Personality, 42*(9), 1537-1547. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.9.1537

Lips-Wiersma, M., & Morris, L. (2009). Discriminating between "meaningful work" and the "management of meaning." *Journal of Business Ethics, 88*(3), 491-511. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0118-9

Lips-Wiersma, M., & Wright, S. (2012). Measuring the meaning of meaningful work: Development and validation of the Comprehensive Meaningful Work Scale (CMWS). *Group & Organization Management, 37*(5), 655-685. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601112461578

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing, 62*(3), 87-98. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299806200306

Mäkikangas, A. (2018). Job crafting profiles and work engagement: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 106*, 101-111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.01.001

Marsh, H. W., Morin, A. J. S., Parker, P. D., & Kaur, G. (2014). Exploratory structural equation modeling: An integration of the best features of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 10*(1), 85-110. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153700

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*(1), 11-37. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892

McGregor, I., & Little, B. R. (1998). Personal projects, happiness, and meaning: On doing well and being yourself. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(2), 494-512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.494

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

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2017). *Mplus 8 User's Guide.* Los Angeles, CA, USA: Muthén & Muthén.

Osborne, J. W., & Costello, A. B. (2005). Best practises in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10*(7), Article 7. Retrieved from https://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Reker, G. T., & Woo, L. C. (2011). Personal meaning orientations and psychosocial adaptation in older adults. *SAGE Open, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244011405217

Retowski, S., Bogdanowicz, A., Dolata, J., & Kaźmierczak, M. (2003). Przywiązanie organizacyjne i percepcja sprawiedliwości organizacyjnej jako predyktory zachowań etosowych w organizacji. In S. Witkowski (Ed.), *Psychologiczne wyznaczniki sukcesu w zarządzaniu. Tom IV* (pp. 187–198). Wrocław, Poland: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Roczniewska, M. (2017). *In-role and extra-role performance scales by Williams and Anderson: Polish adaptation.* Unpublished manuscript.

Roczniewska, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). Who seeks job resources, and who avoids job demands? The link between dark personality traits and job crafting. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 150*(8), 1026-1045. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2016.1235537

Roczniewska, M., & Kolańczyk, A. (2014). Competence over communion: Implicit evaluations of personality traits during goal pursuit. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 45*(4), 418-425.

Roczniewska, M., & Puchalska-Kamińska, M. (2017). Are managers also "crafting leaders"? The link between organizational rank, autonomy, and job crafting. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 48*(2), 198-211. https://doi.org/10.1515/ppb-2017-0023

Roczniewska, M., & Retowski, S. (2014). The role of job satisfaction in the person-organization fit relationship in terms of goal pursuit strategies, and mental health. *Medycyna Pracy, 65*(5), 621-631.

Roczniewska, M., & Retowski, S. (2016). *Polska adaptacja Skali Przekształcania Pracy* [Polish adaptation of the Job Crafting Scale]. Unpublished manuscript.

Rodell, J. B. (2013). Finding meaning through volunteering: Why do employees volunteer and what does it mean for their jobs? *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(5), 1274-1294. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0611

Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 30*, 91-127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2010.09.001

Rudolph, C. W., Katz, I. M., Lavigne, K. N., & Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 102*, 112-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.008

Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. (2001). A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. *Psychometrika, 66*(4), 507-514. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02296192

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *Test manual for the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale.* Retrieved from Utrecht University website: http://www.schaufeli.com

Schnell, T., & Becker, P. (2006). Personality and meaning in life. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*(1), 117-129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.030

Schueller, S. M., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2010). Pursuit of pleasure, engagement, and meaning: Relationships to subjective and objective measures of well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 5*(4), 253-263. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439761003794130

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*, 1-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(5), 878-891. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.5.878

Shamir, B. (1991). Meaning, self and motivation in organizations. *Organization Studies, 12*(3), 405-424. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069101200304

Spreitzer, G., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J., Sonenshein, S., & Grant, A. M. (2005). A socially embedded model of thriving at work. *Organization Science, 16*(5), 537-549. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0153

Steger, M. F. (2016). Creating meaning and purpose at work. In L. Oades, M. Steger, A. Delle Fave, & J. Passmore (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology of positivity and strengths-based approaches at work* (pp. 60-81). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118977620.ch5

Steger, M. F., & Dik, B. J. (2009). If one is looking for meaning in life, does it help to find meaning in work? *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 1*(3), 303-320. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01018.x

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment, 20*(3), 322-337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711436160

Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The Meaning in Life Questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(1), 80-93. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.80

Szabowska-Walaszczyk, A., Zawadzka, A. M., & Wojtaś, M. (2011). Zaangażowanie w pracę i jego korelaty: adaptacja skali UWES autorstwa Schaufeliego i Bakkera. *Psychologia Jakości Życia, 10*(1), 57-74.

Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 36*(2), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v36i2.841

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). The development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(1), 173-186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009

Tims, M., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). Job crafting and its relationships with person-job fit and meaningfulness: A three-wave study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 92*, 44-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.11.007

Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: Exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*(14), 2657-2669. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.798921

PsychOpen GOLD

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

Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(4), 678-691. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.4.678

Westerhof, G. J., Bohlmeijer, E., & Valenkamp, M. W. (2004). In search of meaning: A reminiscence program for older persons. *Educational Gerontology, 30*(9), 751-766. https://doi.org/10.1080/03601270490498016

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 601-617. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305

Wojciszke, B., Bazinska, R., & Jaworski, M. (1998). On the dominance of moral categories in impression formation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*(12), 1251-1263. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672982412001

Wright, T. A., Cropanzano, R., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). The moderating role of employee positive well-being on the relation between job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(2), 93-104. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.2.93

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 179-201. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*(1), 21-33. https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2162

Xi, J., Lee, M., LeSuer, W., Barr, P., Newton, K., & Poloma, M. (2017). Altruism and existential well-being. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 12*(1), 67-88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-016-9453-z

Yeoman, R. (2014). Conceptualising meaningful work as a fundamental human need. *Journal of Business Ethics, 125*(2), 235-251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1894-9

Appendix

Table A.1

The Work and Meaning Inventory Adapted Into Polish (WAMI-PL)

Praca może mieć bardzo różne znaczenia dla ludzi. Poniżej znajdują się stwierdzenia dotyczące tego, w jaki sposób można myśleć o swojej pracy. Zastanów się nad znaczeniem pracy dla Ciebie. Wskaż w jakim stopniu zgadzasz się z każdym z poniższych stwierdzeń.

	Zdecydowanie nieprawda	Raczej nieprawda	Nie mam zdania	Raczej prawda	Zdecydowanie prawda
1. Obrałem/am drogę zawodową, która ma znaczenie (SPO)	1	2	3	4	5
2. Uważam, że moja praca przyczynia się do mojego rozwoju osobistego (SPO)	1	2	3	4	5
3. Moja praca nie ma żadnego znaczenia dla świata (R) (SPG)	1	2	3	4	5
4. Znalazłem/am pracę, która ma satysfakcjonujący cel (SPO)	1	2	3	4	5
5. Wiem dobrze co sprawia, że moja praca ma sens (SPO)	1	2	3	4	5
6. Wiem, że moja praca zmienia świat na lepsze (SPG)	1	2	3	4	5
7. Moja praca pozwala mi lepiej zrozumieć siebie (SPO)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Rozumiem, w jaki sposób moja praca przyczynia się do nadania sensu mojemu życiu (SPO)	1	2	3	4	5
9. Moja praca pozwala mi nadawać sens światu, który mnie otacza (SPG)	1	2	3	4	5
10. Praca, którą wykonuję, służy wyższemu celowi (SPG)	1	2	3	4	5

Note. (R) = punktacja odwrócona / An (R) notes that this item is reverse-scored; SPO = Sens pracy w perpektywie osobistej / Work meaning in the self-perspective; SPG = Sens pracy w perpektywie globalnej / Work meaning in the world perspective. The order of items 4 and 8 was changed compared to the original version used in the described studies (after the final analysis of the structure) due to the high covariance between the error terms of Items 4 and 5.