Series of Dissertations 8/2014
BI Norwegian Business School

Ide Katrine Birkeland

Fire Walk with Me: Exploring the Role of Harmonious and Obsessive Passion in Well-being and Performance at Work

The papers of this dissertation are not available in BI Brage, due to copyright matters:

Paper 1:
The Dualistic Model of Passion for Work: Discriminant and Predictive Validity with Work Engagement and Workaholism
Birkeland, I.K. & Buch, R.
Submitted and under review. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the APA: Work, Stress, and Health Conference, Los Angeles, CA,2013

Paper 2:
A Longitudinal Study of Passion for Work: How to Kindle the Flame without Burning Out
Birkeland, I.K., Richardsen, A.M., & Dysvik, A.
Submitted and under review. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Annual Meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Houston, TX, 2013

Paper 3:
Incivility Is (Not) the Very Essence of Love: Passion for Work and Incivility Instigation
Birkeland, I.K. & Nerstad, C.G.L.
Submitted and under review.

A complete version of the dissertation (print copy) may be ordered from BI's website:
http://www.bi.edu/research/Research-Publications

Fire Walk with Me

Exploring the Role of Harmonious and Obsessive Passion in Well-being and Performance at Work

by

Ide Katrine Birkeland

A dissertation submitted to BI Norwegian Business School
for the degree of PhD

PhD specialization: Leadership and Organizational Behaviour

Ide Katrine Birkeland

Fire Walk with Me: Exploring the Role of Harmonious and Obsessive Passion in Well-being and Performance at Work

Acknowledgements

List of papers

Paper 1   **The Dualistic Model of Passion for Work: Discriminant and Predictive Validity with Work Engagement and Workaholism**
Birkeland, I.K. & Buch, R.
Submitted and under review. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the APA: Work, Stress, and Health Conference, Los Angeles, CA,2013

Paper 2   **A Longitudinal Study of Passion for Work: How to Kindle the Flame without Burning Out**
Birkeland, I.K., Richardsen, A.M., & Dysvik, A.
Submitted and under review. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Annual Meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Houston, TX, 2013

Paper 3   **Incivility Is (Not) the Very Essence of Love: Passion for Work and Incivility Instigation**
Birkeland, I.K. & Nerstad, C.G.L.
Submitted and under review.

Contents

Summary

This dissertation discusses the construct of passion for work. Built on motivational theories that separate the quantity and the quality of work motivation and integration, the dualistic model of passion intends to better describe individual differences in strong work involvement and how it relates to employee well-being and performance. There are, however, certain questions that need to be addressed in order to fully comprehend the passion for work construct.

First and foremost is the question of whether passion for work is just "old wine in new bottles" or whether the construct brings any new insights to the field of organizational psychology. Secondly, if passion for work does matter, for which parts of employees' emotional, cognitive, and behavioral experiences is it particularly relevant? Through three papers, this dissertation contributes to theory and research on passion by identifying and tightening three gaps in the current literature: (a) Passion for work's ability to explain variance in well-being and performance over and beyond similar constructs, (b) passion's role in explaining change in outcomes over time, and (c) the extent to which the context is able to reduce some of the negative outcomes of particularly obsessive passion for work.

The first paper shows that passion for work does seem to bring some new insights to the field of organizational psychology, although there are some important limitations to its explanatory powers. When empirically compared to conceptually similar constructs such as work engagement and workaholism, passion seems to be more relevant in explaining individual variances in well-being than in performance.

The second paper contributes to the passion literature by examining the stability of the relationships between passion for work and burnout. It shows that the positive relationship between obsessive passion and burnout seems to remain relatively stable throughout the course of one year, but that harmonious passion can be a source of change in burnout. Harmonious passion might enable employees to become more resilient toward work strain over time, and thus counteract the gradual erosion of strong work involvement. In contrast, employees with strong levels of obsessive passion may perhaps spend their resources on worrying about their self-worth and their high work load, but obsessive passion does not seem to worsen the burnout symptoms over time. Paper 2 also shows that the longitudinal relationship between obsessive passion and cynicism (although not with exhaustion) is weaker when individuals feel that their co-workers are caring and supportive.

The third paper contributes to the passion literature by showing that obsessive passion represents a dysfunctional motivation that may lead individuals to act more disrespectfully and arrogantly and to humiliate others. Loving work due to the external gains attached to it (such as social status or contingent self-esteem) can thus make employees emotionally fragile as they depend on rewards such as awe or approval rather than having fun or learning new things. As a means to regain confidence if they are out of balance, these individuals seem to respond to this fragility with incivility toward coworkers. Furthermore, individuals who score high on obsessive passion *and* experience a strong mastery climate seem to instigate more incivility than individuals in a weaker mastery climate. This indicates that such individuals

9

actually respond with more degradation and condescension toward their coworkers when the climate sees cooperation and personal mastery as keys to success.

Although passion for work might bring new insights to the well-being literature, its contribution might be somewhat limited with respect to performance. While theoretically meaningful, the dualistic model of passion for work seems to have certain practical challenges in setting itself apart from established constructs like work engagement and workaholism.

However, when leaving the discriminant validity discussion behind, the results found in extant research are fairly unanimous in pointing to the fact that having an obsessive and addictive relationship with work is unfavorable for employees' emotional, cognitive, and behavioral experiences. The indications that a synergy between having an obsessive relationship with work and experiencing a mastery climate might increase the chances of incivility are cause for concern that should be taken seriously, no matter how we label the obsession. It thus seems that, in order to "walk with fire," the fire should be fueled by harmony and not obsession.

Background

In our everyday life, passion (from Latin passio: suffering) is an expression often used about the amount of time and interest we invest in an activity. We hear about people being passionate about their job, or having a passion for sports, but it might as well be online gaming, or a favorite football team that gets people to spend all of their time thinking of or participating in this activity. Being passionate about work is defined as a strong inclination toward work that is loved, considered highly important, is a significant part of one's self-concept, and in which one invests significant amounts of time and energy (Forest et al., 2012; Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003).

Having a passion for work is a "highly sought-after, yet poorly understood (and cultivated) worker attribute" (Perrewé, Hochwarter, Ferris, McAllister, & Harris, 2013, p. 1) Practitioners and supervisors claim that employee passion is particularly important to organizational performance (e.g. Allegretti, 2000). One example is editor-in-chief of the trade journal *Electrical Wholesaling*, Jim Lucy, who describes different types of employees who are passionate about their work and how they contribute to the company (2013). Another example is Boyatzis, McKee, and Goleman (2002), who, in an issue of the *Harvard Business Review*, describe methods of reawakening the passion for work because, according to the authors, passion is key to employee well-being and hence performance.

Because of this assumed practical significance, passion for work has recently received increased attention from researchers in organizational psychology (e.g. Ho, Wong, & Lee, 2011; Liu, Chen, & Yao, 2011; Marsh et al., 2013; Robertson & Barling, 2013; Thorgren & Wincent, 2013; Vallerand, Paquet, Philippe, & Charest, 2010). However, despite the increasing number of studies on passion for work, the organizational sciences still have a long way to go in order to fully understand the construct (Perrewé et al., 2013).

The purpose of this dissertation is to contribute to an increased understanding of passion for work by filling some of the gaps in the current literature. In the following, I present the overall research questions: Is passion for work just "old wine in new bottles" or does the construct brings any new insights to the field of organizational psychology. Secondly, if passion for work does matter, for which parts of employees' emotional, cognitive, and behavioral experiences is it particularly relevant? Based on these questions I start this dissertation by briefly introducing the background of the passion construct before I identify three gaps in the passion for work literature.

On the Background of the Passion Construct

The construct of passion for work has its theoretical and philosophical roots in the motivation literature. Frijda, Mesquita, Sonnemans, and Van Goozen (1991) postulated that passion is prioritized goals where the outcomes of these goals are emotionally important, and Baum and Locke (2004), as well as Cardon and colleagues (2005), believed passion to be a key component of achievement in business ventures and innovations. These assumptions of passion for work as a motivational force that is important for achievement are rooted in several philosophers' understanding of the concept. For instance Descartes (1596 –1650)

believed passion to be a strong emotion with inherent behavioral tendencies while Hegel (1770 –1831) stated that nothing great in this world can be accomplished without passion.

Motivation is defined as factors or events that energize, channel, and sustain human behavior over time (Atkinson, 1964; Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004; Vroom, 1964). Since Maslow formulated the hierarchy of basic needs, psychologists have been working under the assumption that "man is a perpetually wanting animal" (Maslow, 1943, p. 371). According to Maslow, all individuals have innate needs that they strive to satisfy and while some of these needs are physiological, like food and shelter, we also have psychological needs, like self-actualization and mastery, which motivate us to action. Deci and Ryan (2000) refined Maslow's hierarchy of needs in their Self-Determination Theory (SDT). This theory posits that all humans have innate psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and that motivation for behavior stems from our goal to satisfy these needs. SDT further postulates that in search of autonomy, individuals tend to internalize values and regulations that concern non-interesting activities that they regularly partake in, such as work. Such internalization "refers to 'taking in' a behavioral regulation and the value that underlies it" (Gagne & Deci, 2005, p. 333). That way, employees may subconsciously feel more self-determined in their motivation to participate in work and to act upon values or regulations that pertain to their work.

Building upon these ideas, the passion literature proposes that the same process follows activities that we initially value and see as important to us (Vallerand et al., 2003). A person might integrate an activity into his or her identity to the extent that it defines the person (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992). In a work context, this suggests that work may be so important to some people that they not only internalize related values, but fully integrate work so it becomes their social identity (Ho et al., 2011). To sum up, this means that if the work is valuable and important to the individual, it can become part of the individual's identity and the individual might subsequently develop a passion for work (Vallerand et al., 2003). This implies for example that a passionate individual who teaches at a school does not merely teach; he or she *is* a teacher.

Despite the assumptions of passion for work being all important for performance and well-being, empirical studies have provided diverging results. In line with other theories of motivation, such as the Achievement Goal Theory (mastery vs. performance; Nicholls, 1989), Regulatory Focus Theory (promotion vs. prevention; Higgins, 1997), and Self-Determination Theory (intrinsic vs. extrinsic; Deci & Ryan, 2000), the passion model thus adopts a qualitative point of view on motivation. This means that instead of considering only the amount of motivation a person holds, most of the passion literature also differentiates between types of motivation. This has led scholars to propose a dualistic model of passion for work (Philippe, Vallerand, Houlfort, Lavigne, & Donahue, 2010; Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). Harmonious passion for work (HP), refers to a willed, controllable job integration in which work is seen as something important and fun and yet not all-consuming (Forest et al., 2012; Ho et al., 2011; Vallerand et al., 2003). HP has been associated with a range of beneficial outcomes, including in-role performance (Ho et al., 2011), well-being (Trépanier, Fernet, Austin, Forest, & Vallerand, 2013), creativity (Liu et al., 2011), flow, organizational commitment, and positive affect (Forest, Mageau, Sarrazin, & Morin, 2011). In contrast,

obsessive passion for work (OP) represents a disproportionate importance given to work in the context of one's identity and uncontrollable drive to partake in work (Caudroit, Boiché, Stephan, Le Scanff, & Trouilloud, 2011; Forest et al., 2011; Lavigne, Forest, & Crevier-Braud, 2012). OP develops when employees love work because of contingencies that come to control them (e.g. the need for social status or self-esteem; Vallerand et al., 2003). OP has been associated with a range of negative outcomes such as burnout (Trépanier et al., 2013), excessive work rumination (Donahue et al., 2012), role conflict (Thorgren & Wincent, 2013), and work/family conflict (Caudroit et al., 2011).

Because the passion model is built on the SDT framework it is particularly important to theoretically and empirically show the additional contribution of the passion model with respect to work motivation in general and to SDT in particular. In SDT, work motivation is often separated into two forms: intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Intrinsic motivation is described as the motivation to perform an activity for its own sake, in order to experience the pleasure and satisfaction inherent in the activity (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Vallerand, 1997). Extrinsic motivation, in contrast, is the motivation to perform an activity because of certain consequences such as tangible or verbal rewards. The satisfaction comes not from the activity itself but rather from the extrinsic consequences to which the activity leads (Gagne & Deci, 2005).

These two forms of motivation correspond with the descriptions of harmonious and obsessive passion. In the conceptualizations of both intrinsic motivation and HP, for example, employees engage in an activity because it is interesting and because they derive spontaneous satisfaction from the activity itself (Gagne & Deci, 2005). However, intrinsic motivation "promotes a short-term focus" and is not internalized into the identity (Koestner & Losier, 2002, p. 115), whereas passion for work is a result of an internalization of work because of its perceived long-term importance (Liu et al., 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vallerand et al., 2003). Thus, experiencing moments of intrinsic motivation might be a consequence of having strong levels of HP in general (Przybylski, Weinstein, Ryan, & Rigby, 2009).

The definition of OP seems to correspond with the definition of extrinsic motivation, as they are both concerned with being motivated to partake in activity because of external rewards. However, a fundamental difference between the two is the degree to which the worker enjoys the activity. Although OP is internalized because of extrinsic means (for example, loving the activity because of the gains in self-esteem when one feels better than others), the individual also highly values and likes the activity itself, whereas extrinsic motivation means engaging in the activity only to obtain an external goal (Vallerand et al., 2003). Moreover, similarly to the difference between HP and intrinsic motivation, employees who experience high levels of OP have also internalized work into their identity, which is not the case with employees who are extrinsically motivated to do their work. Some of the differences in intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can be summed up in the following example: Occasionally enjoying certain aspects of work or doing a job because the outcome is beneficial refers to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, respectively, but would not be considered a passion. To be considered a passion, individuals would also need to greatly enjoy the work on a regular basis, discuss it with friends, find it meaningful, and to identify themselves with what they do (Vallerand, 2012).

Thus, even though the passion model shares some important features with SDT, passion has built further on its ancestor looking to more complex ideas of identity. These theoretical differences have also been empirically supported. Liu et al. (2011) demonstrated that HP for work has discriminant and predictive validity over extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. This was done with confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) and by controlling for extrinsic and intrinsic motivation in the regression analyses. Similarly, Vallerand et al. (2003) found in their original studies that both HP and OP had predictive validity over extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. The passion for work model also shares similarities with other work-related attitudes, that are not motivational sources, and has been empirically distinguished from them with similar analyses as those described above. Ho et al. (2011), for example, showed that HP and OP had discriminant and predictive validity over job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job identification.

With this background in mind, I now present three gaps that, if tightened, might contribute to increased understanding of the concept of passion for work.

Gap One

The discussion above contributes to displaying passion for work's construct validity over various variables, yet it does not empirically address the two constructs with which passion for work may share the greatest conceptual overlap. Strong conceptual parallels exist between HP and OP for work with work engagement and workaholism, and the links between the constructs are still in the early stages of theory development (Ho et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2011; Trépanier et al., 2013; Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). Workaholism is defined as working excessively and obsessively (Ng, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2007; Taris, Schaufeli, & Verhoeven, 2005) and thus resembles OP as it refers to an internal pressure that forces the individual into working (Vallerand et al., 2003). Workaholism has also been linked to some of the same outcomes as OP, such as burnout (Schaufeli, Bakker, van der Heijden, & Prins, 2009a) and role conflict (Schaufeli, Bakker, Van der Heijden, & Prins, 2009b). Although OP can be related to negative experiences, employees with strong OP will still love their work and believe it to be fulfilling and important (Forest et al., 2011; Vallerand et al., 2006). Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind in which employees bring all of their emotional, cognitive, and physical energies into work (Kahn, 1990; Trépanier et al., 2013). This conceptualization resembles HP and OP, as they both represent a strong inclination toward work that is loved (emotional), considered highly important (cognitive), and takes up large amounts of time and energy (physical). Work engagement has also been linked to some of the same outcomes as HP, such as well-being (Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012) and performance (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010). In addition, passion is sometimes referred to as activity engagement in papers written on the subject (e.g. Bélanger, Lafrenière, Vallerand, & Kruglanski, 2013b; Forest et al., 2011; Stenseng & Dalskau, 2010). These theoretical similarities underline the need for more scrutiny and have, to the best of my knowledge, yet to be addressed in the extant literature. A few studies have investigated the relationships between them (Ho et al., 2011; Trépanier et al., 2013), but have not considered the fact that they might practically be the same. Thus, the first area that warrants more knowledge is on the discriminant and predictive validity of passion over work engagement

and workaholism. This is an important contribution to the work motivation literature as the conceptual similarities between the four constructs seem relatively strong. Very few studies have conducted thorough, empirical investigations of passion for work and how it contributes to its nomological network, particularly with respect to workaholism and work engagement.

Gap Two

A second area in which more theoretical and empirical knowledge is required is on the role of passion for work in explaining change in outcomes over time. Studies that have investigated HP and OP for work are predominantly cross-sectional or prospective, which provides little information on the stability of passion for work relationships over time (Carbonneau, Vallerand, Fernet, & Guay, 2008; Forest et al., 2012; Lavigne et al., 2012; Robertson & Barling, 2013; Thorgren & Wincent, 2013; Vallerand et al., 2010). Accordingly, whether passion for work is a stable predictor of outcomes is still unclear as cross-sectional and cross-lagged data does not yield any information on the nature of the relationships. Do the relationships increase or decrease over time? Are changes curvilinear, linear, or stable? These questions mark the need for a longitudinal approach to the study of passion for work; to investigate the degree to which its relations are indeed stable or changing. Finally, several authors have called for more longitudinal research in organizational psychology as such studies may indicate the data's consistency with a causal model of the relation between the variables as well as provide insight on the stability of the hypothesized relationships (cf. Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007; Orth, Robins, & Meier, 2009; Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010; Ployhart & Ward, 2011).

Gap Three

A third area in which more knowledge is needed is what the work environments may add to the relationship between passion for work and employee outcomes. At any given point in time, several contextual stimuli impact the direct relationships we are investigating (Johns, 2006). While we cannot account for every stimulus that may be interfering with the hypotheses, it is wise to theoretically and empirically address stimuli that may be of particular importance in constraining or encouraging the strength of the direct links.

The perceived social support and the motivational climate are two contextual factors that seem particularly relevant for impacting the relationships between passion for work and outcomes. Perceived social support, or the degree to which employees feel that their organization, supervisors, or colleagues are supportive and caring, may for example increase the employee's resilience towards work strain and thus hamper or prevent ill-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Hobfoll, 1988). As studies suggest that OP for work is related to ill-being, such as burnout and negative affect (Forest et al., 2011; Philippe et al., 2010; Trépanier et al., 2013), researchers could investigate the perceived support in the organization and whether it might be able to alleviate some of these relationships.

Similarly, the motivational climate; that is, which goals are considered important, how employees are evaluated, and how employees are expected to relate to each other, may impact employee's motives for behavior (Ames & Ames, 1984b; Miller, Roberts, & Ommundsen,

2005). Two basic types of the motivational climate have been conceptualized: a mastery climate and a performance climate (Ames, 1992, 1995). In a mastery climate, rewards tend to rely more on progress, skill development, and cooperation, rather than on social comparison (Ames, 1984; Ames & Ames, 1984a, 1984b). In contrast, a performance climate promotes an egoistic motivation (Nicholls, 1979) in which social comparison information and interpersonal competition is highly salient. A mastery climate is typically associated with morally acceptable behavior, positive ethical norms, and persistence in the face of difficulty (Černe, Nerstad, Dysvik, & Škerlavaj, in press; Lau & Nie, 2008; Nerstad, Roberts, & Richardsen, 2013; Ntoumanis & Biddle, 1999; Ommundsen, Roberts, Lemyre, & Treasure, 2003; Roberts, Kavussanu, & Sprague, 2001; Valentini & Rudisill, 2006). Particularly with respect to the negative behavioral outcomes of OP, such as cheating and aggression (Bureau, Vallerand, Ntoumanis, & Lafrenière, 2013; Donahue, Rip, & Vallerand, 2009), a mastery climate that values personal learning, self-development, and cooperation might be relevant to consider as an alleviator of such behavior. Because these contextual factors more often than not are constants in employees' work lives, they might help "contextualize" employee passion for work and its outcomes (Johns, 2006).

On the Purpose of the Dissertation

The intended contribution of this dissertation is to answer two important questions pertaining to passion for work: Does the passion for work construct actually bring any new insights to the field of organizational psychology? If so, what are these insights? In three different papers I specifically address three gaps in the literature relating to these questions. The first paper entails two studies that investigate the discriminant and predictive validity of passion for work with respect to work engagement and workaholism. The next two papers apply a longitudinal design to account for potential change in the proposed relationships as well as investigating the role of the perceived context.

The dissertation consists of four parts. Part One introduced the topic and the intended contribution of the dissertation as a whole. Next, Part Two reviews the current literature on passion for work as well as the literature on passion in other fields (i.e., sport and education). This part provides the theoretical background that guides the research questions as well as briefly introducing the three papers and their unique contributions. Further, Part Three presents the three independent empirical papers. Finally, Part Four includes an overall discussion of the dissertation's results, contributions, limitations, and future research opportunities. It also suggests practical implications based on the results and provides an overall conclusion to the dissertation.

Theoretical Framework

The Dualistic Model of Passion for Work

As briefly explained in the introduction, Vallerand and colleagues (2003) posit that activities that we value and participate in on a regular basis may eventually become part of our identity. Because of this need to internalize activities that are important, Vallerand and colleagues (2006) argue that when an activity is deemed interesting two processes will affect the development of passion: (a) The degree to which the activity is considered valuable and (b) what this valuable activity represents to the individual. The degree of activity value refers to the subjective amount of value placed on the activity. One might think of this evaluation as the *quantitative* dimension that is the basis for internalizing the activity. When a person values an activity highly, he or she will be passionate about it. The higher the activity is valued, the more passionate he or she will be.

When an interesting activity is highly valued, the way it is internalized into the individual's identity determines what type of passion will develop. One might think of the internalizing process as the *qualitative* dimension in the development. A self-determined internalization occurs when employees integrate their work because it is fun or developmental. A controlled internalization occurs when employees integrate their work, due to secondary gains (e.g., when they believe it will foster the admiration of co-workers or when their self-esteem is contingent upon performance) (Amiot, Vallerand, & Blanchard, 2006; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Ho et al., 2011; Mageau, Carpentier, & Vallerand, 2011). The passion for work model further develops this assumption and proposes that work, for example, can become internalized to the extent that it is part of the employee's self-concept and thus, is self-defining (Vallerand et al., 2003). HP for work follows the self-determined internalization and allows the work to be part of the person's self-concept. This self-concept is stable and strong, as its foundations are based within the individual's control ("I learn something new" or "I think my work is fun"). OP for work follows the controlled internalization and leaves work to be identity-consuming, as it renders little room for other identities. This self-concept is fragile, as its foundations are contingent upon assets that are outside the individual's control ("My colleagues need to recognize me as important" or "I need to be the best at my job to feel competent") (Amiot et al., 2006; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Ho et al., 2011; Mageau et al., 2011).

If work is sufficiently internalized and valued, then it seems to be a relatively important part of individuals' lives. However, are employees either harmoniously or obsessively passionate about work, or can they be both simultaneously? Although passion has been conceptualized as two separate dimensions, harmonious and obsessive, both seem to be associated with similar commitment to the activity (Marsh et al., 2013). Additionally, the two forms are differentially related to various outcomes. This raises the question of whether the two are independent of each other (orthogonal) or on each side of a continuum (bipolar). Conceptually, the two forms of passion can be distinguished by how work is internalized into the employee's identity. That is, what was the process when the employee assimilated the values and regulations of work and accepted them as his or her own? HP is the result of a self-determined internalization, in which the employee willingly accepted his or her work as important and did not feel pressured, either internally or externally, to do so. In contrast, OP is

the result of a controlled internalization, in which the employee is pressured, either internally or externally, to accept his or her work as important (Vallerand et al., 2003). This suggests that the source of the passion involvement or HP and OP is separate but not necessarily mutually exclusive. Research on work motivation indicates that a person can display autonomous and controlled motivation simultaneously; this suggests that employees take part in work both because it is fun and rewarding in itself *and* because they achieve external gains from it (Van den Broeck, Lens, De Witte, & Van Coillie, 2013). Such a perspective can be adopted by the passion literature as well; employees integrate work into their identities because is it both fun and meaningful and because they gain social status or feel good about themselves when they outperform others.

This perspective finds empirical support in the research about passion. In most studies, HP and OP were found to be relatively independent of each other with a weak or no correlation between them (Marsh et al., 2013). This suggests that the two are indeed independent, separate constructs, which means that at any given time, both HP and OP can be high or low, or one can be high and the other low. One study investigated the behavioral, cognitive, and emotional outcomes of different passion profiles in digital gaming (Wang, Khoo, Liu, & Divaharan, 2008). They found three different passion profiles in their data; high HP/OP, low HP/OP, and medium HP/OP and that these profiles related differently to the proposed outcomes. Nevertheless, according to Bélanger et al. (2013b), different situations give rise to a predominance of either HP or OP. They found that it was possible to induce an obsessive or harmonious mindset by asking participants to write a short essay about a personal experience, in which they acted in a prototypical obsessive or harmonious way. Furthermore, this manipulation had consequences for the goal the participants set for themselves. Individuals in an OP mindset suppressed goals that were not directly linked to their favorite activities to a greater extent than individuals in a HP mindset.

The dualistic model of passion thus views passion as two-dimensional and orthogonal. However, there are other conceptualizations of passion that overlook the dysfunctional outcomes of passion and consequently, view passion as a positive intense affect (Baum & Locke, 2004; Burke & Fiksenbaum, 2009; Cardon, 2008) or a purely positive motivational construct (Perttula, 2009; Zigarmi, Nimon, Houson, Witt, & Diehl, 2009). When considering the etymological background of passion as a source of pain and suffering, it also seems relevant to include dysfunction as part of the passion construct. Furthermore, the number of studies that find strong work involvement, engagement, or passion to have negative individual consequences (Halbesleben, Harvey, & Bolino, 2009; Kenny, 2010; Marsh et al., 2013), can be argued as a case for a two-dimensional perspective. Finally, Meyer and Gagné (2008) advocate the Self-Determination Theory as a strong unifying theory to guide research and practice with respect to work engagement and passion. As the dualistic model of passion for work (unlike the others) has such strong ties to SDT, this conceptualization of passion seems to be the most theoretically sound, as well as true to its philosophical underpinnings.

Previous Research on Passion: What We Know and What We Don't Know

Previous studies about passion conceptualized it as a fairly stable construct (Vallerand et al., 2003), which built upon the assumptions that the type and degree of passion stemmed from both a personal disposition (Vallerand et al., 2006) *and* a situational factor (Bonneville-Roussy, Vallerand, & Bouffard, 2013; Mageau et al., 2009). The personality disposition indicated that individuals who have the tendency to experience situations as controlling were likely to have strong levels of OP for their favorite activities. To the contrary, individuals who tended to experience situations as autonomous were likely to have strong levels of HP (Vallerand et al., 2006). The situational factor stemmed from research that suggests that children and teenagers with parents who supported their autonomies were more likely to develop stronger levels of HP than OP. Conversely, children and teenagers with parents who highly valued the activities of their children were more likely to develop an OP (Mageau et al., 2009). The results of this cross-lagged study were supported by three cross-sectional studies with adult respondents. Liu et al. (2011) found organizational autonomy support to be positively related to HP. Moreover, Bonneville-Roussy et al. (2013) found educational autonomy support to be associated with HP. Furthermore, Trépanier et al. (2013) found that the roles of job characteristics (if they were demands or resources) also related to HP and OP for work. For instance, the characteristics defined as demanding were positively linked to OP, whereas characteristics defined as resources were positively linked to HP. Unfortunately, none of these studies have been able to sufficiently establish a causal link between passion and its assumed sources.

Recent studies have been able to manipulate the levels of passion through relatively brief experiments and interventions (Bélanger, Lafrenière, Vallerand, & Kruglanski, 2013a; Bélanger et al., 2013b; Forest et al., 2012). In an intervention study, Forest et al. (2012) found that employees who increased their knowledge and use of signature strengths also increased their levels of HP for work. Additionally, while not pertaining to work in particular, Bélanger et al. (2013b) primed the predominance of the one or the other form of passion with the previously described essay manipulation. Bélanger et al. (2013b, p. 128) explain whether passion could be considered a stable or a changeable construct:

> "…Vallerand (2010) posited that harmonious and obsessive passion could also be seen as a mindset that can be instigated situationally. Indeed, theorists have proposed and adduced evidence that the concept of personality is simply "one source of variability in the functioning of psychological principles that also varies across momentary situations" (Higgins, 2008, p. 612); thus, psychological constructs are dynamic and can be operationalized both in terms of individual differences and short-lived situation."

This indicates that passion may consist of both a stable and a changeable component, where the stability is derived from personality characteristics (Lafrenière, Bélanger, Sedikides, & Vallerand, 2011; Vallerand et al., 2006) and the change is derived from situational influences (Bélanger et al., 2013b; Forest et al., 2012; Mageau et al., 2009). This type of conceptualization is quite common in psychological research. Studies on achievement goals, for example, showed that consistent patterns of both stability and change were evident in each achievement goal (performance-approach and -avoidance, mastery-approach and -aviodance;

Fryer & Elliot, 2007; Senko & Harackiewicz, 2005). Passion for work thus seems to be a relatively stable construct, unless it is particularly targeted for change through interventions. However, this stability does not describe how passion can change the level of suggested outcomes. For example, HP may facilitate the increase of an individuals' well-being over time and research about passion has yet to address this aspect.

Despite Descartes' and Hegel's philosophical ideas of passion being all-important for performance, the number of studies on this relationship is low. Most studies that included performance as a variable have found that the relationship between passion and performance is mediated by strong persistence, engagement, or deliberate practice (Ho et al., 2011; Vallerand et al., 2008; Vallerand et al., 2007). The basic notion in this research is that, although the underlying reasons for the activity engagement differs, both HP and OP provide the motivation for an employee to commit to an activity, stay focused and engaged, until performance is achieved (Vallerand et al., 2008; Vallerand et al., 2007). For example, Ho et al. (2011) found that employees with high levels of HP performed better at work and that this relationship was mediated by cognitive absorption, which is a component of work engagement. Moreover, Vallerand et al. (2007) showed that both HP and OP were positively related to deliberate practice in the participants' fields of expertise. In turn, the deliberate practice was positively related to performance attainment.

Other studies have similarly illustrated that the relationship between passion and performance is attained through the goals the passionate individuals set for themselves, such as mastery or achievement goals (Bonneville-Roussy, Lavigne, & Vallerand, 2011; Li, 2010). For example, Bonneville-Roussy et al. (2011) found that high levels of HP in musicians were positively related to the use of mastery goals, which in turn related to high levels of performance in music. On the other hand, high levels of OP in musicians were positively related to approach and avoidance goals, and both have a direct negative link to performance attainment. Finally, Li (2010) showed that both HP and OP were positively linked to mastery goals, which in turn, was linked to high performance in sport. One of the most recent studies showed that the link between passion and performance is dependent on a situational factor, such as fear of failure in the specific context (Bélanger et al., 2013a). The study found that the relationship between OP for an activity and performance was stronger when the individual was afraid of failing and that such failure would have consequences for the activity. All of the studies on passion and performance are conducted outside of the work context (one exception being Ho et al., 2011). Whether or not the same relationships are expected in a work setting is yet to be discussed.

In terms of work, job performance is often viewed as three separate components: task performance, citizenship behaviors, and counterproductive behavior (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000). Performance has long been considered one of the most important outcome variables in the organizational sciences. After all, most organizations' main purpose - whether it is for profit in business, cost recovery and mortality in hospitals, or faculty prestige or productivity in universities - is dependent on individuals to perform at their best (March & Sutton, 1997). As a result, many studies have investigated individual-level antecedents of work performance. Nonetheless, many of these studies have presented the assumption that as long as you are passionate, engaged, and/or highly motivated, then there is

also a higher likelihood that you partake in citizenship behaviors, perform well, and refrain from negative behaviors (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004; Baum & Locke, 2004; Burke & Fiksenbaum, 2009; Rich et al., 2010; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen, 2009). Given the fact that there seem to be different reasons why individuals are passionate about work (because it is important and fun, fosters the admiration of co-workers, or increases self-esteem); it seems likely that the relationship between being passionate and performing may well be more complex. HP might, for instance, relate differently to performance than OP. Therefore, in the first paper, I included two facets of work performance (task and citizenship), in addition to well-being, when investigating the discriminant and predictive validity of the passion model. The third facet of performance, counterproductive work behavior, is included in the final paper.

Most of the outcome variables of passion for an activity are on well- or ill-being, irrespective of the context of the research. Furthermore, all of the results point in the same direction; OP seems negative for well-being and positive for stress and conflict, whereas HP seems positive for well-being and negative for stress and conflict (for an overview, see Marsh et al., 2013). From the perspective of OP, this may be explained through the internal or external pressure of partaking in the activity. Individuals with high OP "must" engage in their activities to feel successful, accepted, or important. Consequently, as the passion itself is such a significant part of their identities, it overwhelms other aspects of the individuals' lives (Vallerand et al., 2003). Therefore, the individuals also tend to be more sensitive to what is occurring in the activities (Hodgins & Knee, 2002). That is, instead of just partaking in the passionate activity, individuals with strong levels of OP are constantly evaluating whether or not their goals are achieved. "Am I doing well? What do the others think of me?"

When a passion represents a dominant role in one's identity, it is hard to disregard. Such an individual often experiences an uncontrollable urge to engage in his or her passion and becomes dependent on it. Furthermore, the constant evaluation during participation is exhausting, as it uses cognitive and emotional resources (Hodgins et al., 2010). As a result, the individual runs the risk of experiencing conflict with other life domains and negative consequences (e.g., negative affect, rumination) during and after engagement in the passion. Eventually, the individual experiences lower levels of psychological adjustment, as well as higher levels of burnout (Carpentier, Mageau, & Vallerand, 2012; Donahue et al., 2012; Trépanier et al., 2013).

In contrast, HP is related to higher levels of psychological adjustment. As individuals with high levels of HP view their passionate activity as important but have never felt pressured by themselves or others, they partake in the activity simply because it is enjoyable. Consequently, the passion itself is a significant part of their identities but does not overwhelm other aspects of the individuals' lives (Vallerand et al., 2003). As a result, the individuals are able to engage in the activity without ruminating and evaluating the current situation; the only aspect that matters is whether or not they are enjoying themselves (Carpentier et al., 2012). Thus, they more open and flexible towards what happens in the present situation (Hodgins & Knee, 2002), as well as self-determined, to the extent that they are able to quit the activity, if the negative consequences seems overwhelming (Vallerand, 2012). Individuals with high

levels of HP thus experience positive outcomes and little burnout during and after engaging in their favorite activities (Forest et al., 2012; Trépanier et al., 2013).

While the relationship between HP, OP and well-being is the most studied relationship within the passion for work literature, there are still gaps in the knowledge of the nature of this association. For example, none of the previous studies have applied a longitudinal perspective to investigate the stability of these relationships. Some of the studies have applied cross-lagged designs, with a time lag between the independent and the dependent variable (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Forest et al., 2012; Lavigne et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2011; Vallerand et al., 2010). Some of these studies have also measured HP and/or OP twice (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Forest et al., 2012; Lavigne et al., 2012). The longest time span that has subjected the passion variables to a repeated measure is six months (Lavigne et al., 2012), and they showed relatively stable levels of passion. However, the inclusion of only two waves of data makes it difficult to distinguish true change or stability from measurement error; this also makes it impossible to model nonlinear forms of change, if one is so inclined (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010; Singer & Willett, 2003).

The understanding of time as a potential influence on this relationship is important for several reasons. For example, if there is exponential growth in the relationship between OP and burnout, then it becomes increasingly important to help the obsessive individual early on in the burnout process. In contrast, if the relationship between the variables is stable, it provides the organizations with time to a) find ways of alleviating the relationship or b) find ways of changing the OP. Therefore, in Paper 2, we use a longitudinal perspective and investigate the stability of the relationships between passion for work and burnout.

Despite some of the methodological and theoretical shortcomings of the previous research, it still seems that the relationships the employees have with their work is important to their well-being (Carbonneau et al., 2008; Lavigne et al., 2012; Thorgren & Wincent, 2013; Trépanier et al., 2013; Vallerand et al., 2010). Interestingly, with the few exceptions of in-role performance, few studies have investigated whether passion also has behavioral consequences. The studies that have observed this relationship suggest that the roles of self-esteem and identity contingencies seem to be of importance. Mageau et al. (2011) found that individuals with low self-esteem experienced higher levels of OP in their activities than individuals with high self-esteem. This aligns well with the fact that OP is related to a fragile ego and a defensive attitude, when the ego is threatened (Lafrenière et al., 2011). Moreover, Donahue et al. (2009) found that basketball players with strong OP were more aggressive when they perceived that their identities as basketball players were threatened. Furthermore, Lafrenière, St-Louis, Vallerand, and Donahue (2012) found that the overall satisfaction of life, following success, was dependent on whether or not the individual was obsessively or harmoniously involved in the successful activity. Only OP was associated with feeling better about life after success or worse after failure, whereas HP was unrelated such contingencies. Finally, Bureau et al. (2013) focused on immoral behavior and cheating in paintball games and other competitive sports. They found OP to be positively related to these behaviors, and HP was either unrelated or negatively related to the same type of behaviors.

The only two studies that investigated the behavioral outcomes of the passion for work are Forest et al. (2011) and Robertson and Barling (2013). Forest et al. found that HP was

positively related and OP was negatively related to detachment behaviors, such as not taking work home. Robertson and Barling found that high levels of HP for the environment were related to energy efficient behaviors, such as the conscious use of light and recycling at work.

Although it is important to investigate antecedents of positive and sustainable work behaviors, like detachment and recycling, every organization has individuals who violate organizational norms and harm the well-being of its members (Atwater & Elkins, 2009). Because OP seems to be related to feeling easily threatened and a fragile sense of self-esteem (Lafrenière et al., 2011; Mageau et al., 2011; Rip, Vallerand, & Lafrenière, 2012), it may be particularly relevant to the reasons why certain employees harm their co-workers. Studies related to sports suggest that OP is positively associated with negative behaviors like cheating and aggression (Bureau et al., 2013; Donahue et al., 2009). Moreover, OP for work is linked to a low quality of interpersonal relationships and a sense of well-being that seems to be contingent on their own performances (Mageau et al., 2011; Philippe et al., 2010). Such a relationship with work thus seems relevant to understanding negative behaviors, such as aggression, incivility, and cheating in the workplace. An employee who experiences work as an important part of his or her identity, due to secondary gains (Amiot et al., 2006; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Ho et al., 2011; Mageau et al., 2011), may feel threatened if these gains seem to be uncertain (Porath, Overbeck, & Pearson, 2008). Such experiences are likely to be important in the investigation of why individuals may be demeaning, degrading, or insulting towards others (Porath et al., 2008).

As the potential ramifications of such negative behaviors at work are extensive (cf. Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Reio & Ghosh, 2009), the extent to which OP is associated with negative behaviors in work settings might be of importance. In Paper 3, therefore, my co-author and I investigate incivility instigations (acting with disrespect, condescension, and degradation with ambiguous intent to harm the target, Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Burnfield, Clark, Devendorf, & Jex, 2004) as a potential outcome of OP.

Given the relatively consistent findings of OP being related to ill-being and -acting, there seems to be a need to investigate the extent to which such relationships may be weakened by organizational factors. It seems that OP may be subject to change through the manipulation of the mindset one has for the particular activity (Bélanger et al., 2013a). However, many organizations may lack the means or resources to conduct interventions to increase HP or to manipulate the mindset of the employee to be more harmonious (Bélanger et al., 2013a; Forest et al., 2012). Accordingly, we should look for alternatives to dampen the consequences of OP. Furthermore, recent research has underlined the importance of investigating the individual in his or her work context, as opposed to considering the individual or the social environment separately (cf. Hirst, Van Knippenberg, & Zhou, 2009; Johns, 2006; Sakurai & Jex, 2012; Taylor & Kluemper, 2012). As a result, there is a need to learn more about the role of the organizational context in buffering or perhaps even intensifying the relationship between OP and ill-being or -acting.

In the second paper, I introduce perceived social support from supervisors and co-workers as a potential buffer between OP and burnout. I suggest that having supervisors and co-workers who care for and support individuals (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988) may contribute so that employees with strong OP feel

less exhausted and less cynical. By referring to the Conservation of Resources theory (COR; Hobfoll, 1989), I suggest that supervisors may, for example, increase the employees' resources, such as time (e.g. the supervisor alleviates the workload). I also suggest that co-workers may contribute to the increase of employees' self-worth (e.g. the co-worker shows that he/she values the employee and sees him/her as important to the work group). In such a situation, the level of employee burnout may be reduced. Supervisor and co-worker support has previously been associated with lower burnout levels (e.g. Halbesleben, 2006; Huynh, Xanthopoulou, & Winefield, 2013; Nixon, Yang, Spector, & Zhang, 2011; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007).

In the third paper, I introduce a different aspect of the organizational context that may interact with the relationship between OP and incivility. Previous research suggests that the organizational context is of importance in moderating uncivil behaviors and may constrain the assumed positive relationship between OP and incivility (Liu, Chi, Friedman, & Tsai, 2009). Furthermore, recent research has emphasized the need to improve the quality of social relationships in order to reduce uncivil interactions in the workplace (Leiter, Laschinger, Day, & Oore, 2011). However, incivility is not only a function of the social environment at work, but it is also a result of individual differences (Blau & Andersson, 2005; Liu et al., 2009; Reio & Ghosh, 2009; Taylor & Kluemper, 2012); the interaction between the two can yield more information on the background of incivility instigation.

The motivational climate at work is one way of evaluating the quality of the context and its impact on relationships. The motivational climate defines what is communicated to the employees for a number of achievement-related factors, as well as how employees are expected to relate to one another (Ames, 1984; Ames & Ames, 1984a, 1984b). Such a climate has been found to shape an individual's moral actions towards opponents and/or teammates in achievement settings (e.g. Ommundsen et al., 2003). A mastery climate focuses on the work process in terms of fostering mastery, learning, and co-operation, while a performance climate focus on delivered end-results, competition, and social comparison (Nerstad et al., 2013). Therefore, I suggest that a mastery climate may impact the relationship between OP for work and incivility instigation. This is likely, as a mastery climate has been shown to facilitate a high consideration of others' welfare (Ommundsen et al., 2003). This means that although an employee with strong OP would normally respond with incivility when his/her normative status is challenged (Porath et al., 2008), the criteria of success in a mastery climate may reduce such a motive because being considerate and helpful is also part of being successful.

On the unique contribution of each paper

The first paper is based on two individual studies. In study 1, the respondents were drawn from a cross-sectional sample from two different organizations located in Norway - one hospital and service employees in four municipalities. In study 2, the respondents were drawn from a cross-lagged sample in a Norwegian sports organization with a large base of administrative employees. For the second and third papers, the respondents were drawn from the same dataset, which collected data from 1263 respondents three times over the course of 10 months, in March, June, and December. Even though the respondents were included for more than one study, each study has unique datasets as follows.

Paper 1. The validity of the passion for work construct: Two separate studies; study 1 with 385 respondents, and study 2 with 175 matched employee-supervisor dyads. The paper asks the question of whether the passion for work constructs is indeed different from similar, more established constructs, such as work engagement and workaholism. The paper attempts to answer this question by providing a thorough, empirical examination of the passion for work, in relation to the other two constructs. In addition to applying multiple factor analyses to determine the discriminant and convergent validity, it also investigates the predictive validity by testing whether passion explain variance in well-being and performance above and beyond work engagement and workaholism.

Paper 2. Passion for work and burnout; the role of perceived social support: The three-wave longitudinal data set contains 1,263 respondents and includes the following variables: passion for work, burnout, perceived supervisor support, perceived co-worker support, as well as control variables. The paper revisits the literature on the passion for work and burnout and asks whether passion for work is associated with stability or change in burnout symptoms. It also questions whether perceived supervisor support or co-worker support is an effective means of buffering burnout for individuals with strong OP.

Paper 3. Passion for work and incivility; the role of perceived mastery climate: The three-wave longitudinal data set contains 1,263 respondents and includes the following variables; OP for work, incivility instigation, perceived mastery climate, as well as control variables. The paper asks whether OP can be a relevant antecedent for uncivil behaviors at work and whether this relationship is stable or changing over time. Furthermore, it questions the role of the perceived mastery climate as a potential prevention of uncivil behaviors for employees with strong OP.

With respect to the use of data from the second study, Papers 2 and 3 only share one overlapping variable, which is an obsessive passion for work. For the theories employed, Paper 2 is based within the work involvement and conservation of resources literature, while Paper 3 is based within the incivility literature. Both of the papers address distinct research questions. With unique research questions, theories, constructs, and theoretical and practical implications, the use of this large data collection for the two individual papers is considered to be appropriate (Kirkman & Chen, 2011).

The papers of this dissertation (page 27-124) are not available in BI Brage, due to copyright matters:

Paper 1:
The Dualistic Model of Passion for Work: Discriminant and Predictive Validity with Work Engagement and Workaholism
Birkeland, I.K. & Buch, R.
Submitted and under review. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the APA: Work, Stress, and Health Conference, Los Angeles, CA,2013

Paper 2:
A Longitudinal Study of Passion for Work: How to Kindle the Flame without Burning Out
Birkeland, I.K., Richardsen, A.M., & Dysvik, A.
Submitted and under review. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Annual Meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Houston, TX, 2013

Paper 3:
Incivility Is (Not) the Very Essence of Love: Passion for Work and Incivility Instigation
Birkeland, I.K. & Nerstad, C.G.L.
Submitted and under review.

A complete version of the dissertation (print copy) may be ordered from BI's website:
http://www.bi.edu/research/Research-Publications

Discussion

Drawing upon motivational theories that separate the quantity and quality of work motivation and integration, the dualistic model of passion intends to better describe the individual differences in strong work involvement and how it relates to employee well-being and performance (Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). Because passion is assumed to be beneficial for employee well-being and performance, it has received increased attention from researchers in organizational psychology. Still, it seems as though the organizational sciences should conduct further research in order to fully understand the construct. In the introduction, I highlighted two important questions for which the field has yet to provide convincing answers. 1) Does the passion for work construct bring any new insights to the field of organizational psychology? 2) If passion for work does matter, for which parts of employees' emotional, cognitive, and behavioral experiences is it particularly relevant? Based on these questions, I identified three gaps in the passion for work literature. Thus, the purpose of this dissertation is to extend the current knowledge about the passion for work in three ways: a) by examining passion for work's construct and predictive validity, particularly with respect to two conceptually similar constructs: work engagement and workaholism, b) by investigating the role of harmonious and obsessive passion for work in predicting the change in well-being and incivility, and c) by exploring the extent to which there are contextual factors that may reduce the negative outcomes of obsessive passion. With three studies that include a total of 1823 respondents, I explore the research questions in three different papers.

In the following section, first, I discuss the overall theoretical contribution of this dissertation in light of these three gaps. Second, I reconsider the overall research questions of whether the passion for work construct brings any new insights and what these insights might be. Third, I look at the limitations of the dissertation and propose venues of future research, as well as discuss the practical implications in the results of my studies. Finally, I provide a brief summary and conclusion of this dissertation and its implications for passion for work.

Gap One: Passion for Work's Construct and Predictive Validity

The first paper shows that passion for work does seem to bring some new insights to the field of organizational psychology, although there are important limitations to its explanatory powers; it seems to be more relevant in explaining variance in well-being than in performance. The paper entails two studies, and included a total of 560 respondents, investigating the discriminant and predictive validity of passion for work (Birkeland & Buch, under review). This paper contributes to the passion literature in two ways. First, it shows that harmonious passion (HP) and obsessive passion (OP) for work can be measured distinctly from work engagement and workaholism, despite their theoretical and empirical overlaps. Second, by exploring the potential construct proliferation and redundancy in organizational psychology research (Le, Schmidt, Harter, & Lauver, 2010; Rousseau, 2007), this paper finds that HP and OP for work explain variance in employee well-being beyond work engagement and workaholism. Specifically, HP and OP account for an additional 22% of the individual variance related to burnout and an additional 29% of the individual variance related to life

satisfaction. However, the proportion of variance does not always demonstrate the importance of an effect adequately (O'Grady, 1982).

Although HP and OP's contribution to the explanation of variance of well-being is statistically significant, how much of this variance is practically meaningful? Based on the conceptual differences, passion encompasses other aspects of the work relationship that can be examined to explain differences in well-being. It might, for example, be identity that allows us to explain more of the variation of individual experience. When added to a model in which work engagement and workaholism already illuminate parts of the individual's experience, the passion constructs tell us more about what makes individuals feel burned out or satisfied with their lives, making it a relevant addition to the field of organizational science. It is, however, still difficult to disentangle exactly what the increased variance consists of. To truly accentuate the differences between passion for work, engagement, and workaholism, a study should be able to demonstrate that they predict different outcomes in a theoretically meaningful way. For example, if HP activates self-concept while engagement does not, then also examining self-concept empirically would help to state HP's case. Similarly, it should also be demonstrated how passion for work, engagement, and workaholism are predicted by different variables. The results in this paper show that more empirical data is needed in order to truly establish a practical distinction between HP, OP, work engagement, and workaholism.

A theoretical implication of the results in Paper 1 is that passion for work seems better suited in research on well-being than on performance, at least when considering its direct relationships. Trépanier et al. (2013) underscore that passion might be particularly important for well-being by examining how passionate employees draw differently upon the inherent health impairment and motivational processes of the job. Job demands such as cognitive or emotional strain seem to fuel a motivational drive in employees through OP, which compels them to carry out their tasks in a rigid and maladaptive manner in order to cope with demands and maintain job performance. This is, in turn, directly associated with burnout. Therefore, employees with high levels of OP might work hard no matter what, and while this is a fast way to burn out, it does not suggest anything concerning performance. In contrast, job resources such as cognitive and emotional support seem to be conditions that facilitate HP and, subsequently, less burnout. These job resources also fuel a motivational drive, only this drive is self-determined and "enable[s] employees to deploy their energy at work harmoniously" (Trépanier et al., 2013, p. 10). Therefore, employees with high levels of HP deploy their energy and work efforts based on what personal resources are available. Although this way of working is conducive to well-being, it is not necessarily conducive to performance (Fritz, Yankelevich, Zarubin, & Barger, 2010). Similarly to what we discuss in the paper, Trépanier et al. (2013) point to the fact that it seems to be not the amount of investments that employees put into their work that predicts their well-being, but rather the quality of their investments.

Another way of understanding passion's predictive validity of well-being, but not of performance, is by its conceptualization. By default, the dualistic model of passion for work is concerned not only with experiences at work but also with how employees feel and think about work when they are not actually working, i.e., the relationship employees have with their work. Although work engagement and workaholism also include items that pertain to absence, they are both mostly concerned with behaviors, feelings, and thoughts that occur

while working. Since passion for work measures the overall relationship between employees and work, it is not surprising that it also seems more relevant in predicting overall well- and ill-being. The passion construct thus seem to entail aspects that are not covered in work engagement or workaholism; that is, examining passion is a more universal approach to understanding the relationship an individual has with his or her work. This universality may subsequently make it better at predicting outcomes that pertain to the individual's general experiences, while being less relevant for predicting precise work performance. In this perspective, it might be particularly important to consider employees' passions for work when attempting to understand how a person's relationship with work affects his/her everyday life.

Whereas passion for work can predict well- and ill-being, it seems unfit to predict supervisor-rated performance. In 2007, Vallerand et al. suggested that passion may not have a direct influence on performance, but that passion sets individuals in motion by providing them with energy and direction. Their theory is more in line with later studies on passion and performance from the fields of work, sports, and art (Bonneville-Roussy et al., 2011; Ho et al., 2011; Li, 2010). As previously mentioned, these studies show that the relationship between passion and performance is mediated by the goals or the engagement of the individual. However, in Paper 1, neither work passion nor engagement and workaholism were related to performance (except workaholism to OCB). Hence, it is hard to conclude on any of the proposed relationships.

One way of conceptualizing the relationship between passion, engagement, and workaholism is related to Vallerand et al.'s (2007) idea of passion as a motivational force. In this perspective, work engagement and workaholism can be suggested as mechanisms that explain the relationships between passion for work and outcomes. That is, passion for work provides the impetus needed to be engaged at work or obsessed at work, which again relates to various outcomes. This relationship was also illustrated by Trépanier et al. (2013) and Ho et al. (2011) who found HP to be an antecedent of work engagement. So, instead of competing with each other, the three variables may create a more complete explanation of variance in work performance. Future research should take these results into account when investigating passion for work's relationship with work performance.

Gap Two: The Role of Passion for Work in Explaining Change in Outcomes

The next two papers take closer looks at how passion works and for which constructs it might be particularly relevant. They contribute empirically to the passion for work literature by applying a three wave, longitudinal design to account for potential change in the proposed relationships. When investigating potential change in relationships between two variables, one needs to collect information on the same variables from the same individuals in at least three points in time (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010; Ployhart & Ward, 2011; Singer & Willett, 2003). As research with three or more waves is scarce in the field of organizational psychology (Casper et al., 2007; Ployhart & Ward, 2011), the design of the study that served as the source of these papers helps bring such research forward and increase knowledge on the role of passion in predicting outcomes. Although from the same pool of data, the two papers have separate contributions. Yet, they suggest some common denominators of the passion for

work to the literature. The papers' combined theoretical contribution is discussed after a presentation of their separate merits.

Paper 2 contributes to the passion for work literature by examining the stability of the relationships between HP, OP, and burnout. It shows that the relationship between OP and burnout seem to remain relatively stable throughout the course of one year, but that HP can be a source of change in burnout (Birkeland, Richardsen, & Dysvik, under review). HP is related to a small decrease in burnout symptoms over time, and OP is positively related to stable levels of burnout symptoms and does not predict any change in said symptoms. The study thus shows that, depending on the form of passion that is considered, there is a difference in whether or not the relationships are stable. As we discuss in Paper 2, HP might enable employees to become more resilient towards work strain, and thus HP counteracts the gradual erosion of work involvement suggested by Cherniss (1980). OP does not have the same impact of change, but research suggests that OP is indeed related to burnout through the gradual erosion of strong work involvement (e.g. work/family conflict, rumination, or poor coping skills; Carpentier et al., 2012; Caudroit et al., 2011; Donahue et al., 2012). Moreover, although employees with strong levels of OP perhaps worry about their self-worth and their high workloads (Blom, 2012; Lafrenière et al., 2011; Thorgren & Wincent, 2013), it does not seem to worsen the burnout symptoms over the course of 10 months. This particular detail is discussed together with the results from Paper 3. These results are in line with previous cross-lagged and cross-sectional studies on passion for work and burnout, but provide a deeper insight into how these relationships work and change over a longer period of time.

Paper 3 (Birkeland & Nerstad, under review) contributes to the passion for work literature by showing that OP represents a dysfunctional motivation that may lead individuals to act more disrespectful, arrogant, and likely to humiliate others. I thus suggest that OP, or loving work due to the external gains attached to it, can make employees emotionally fragile as they depend on rewards such as awe or appraisal rather than having fun or learning new things. As a means to regain confidence if out of balance, these individuals seem to respond with immoral behaviors, aggression, and incivility (Bureau et al., 2013; Donahue et al., 2009; Porath et al., 2008).

Similar to how it predicts burnout symptoms, OP is positively related to stable levels of incivility, but does not predict any change in such behavior. This suggests that, although OP requires efforts of incivility to feel good, increased efforts to regain confidence do not seem necessary to the employee high in OP. This is contrary to the expectation that incivility instigation escalates if it is ignored (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

The two papers combined contribute to the passion for work literature by exploring the nature of the relationships between passion and outcomes. Taken together, OP thus seems to be stably related to burnout and incivility. HP, however, seems to enable a decrease in burnout and thus might indicate that different mechanisms than those which are in OP. One speculation could concern the source of passion. Since HP is linked to accessible psychological structures that are open, authentic, and less defensive (Donahue et al., 2009; Hodgins & Knee, 2002), individuals who score high in HP should be better at continuously evaluating and recognizing their experiences and behaviors. Subsequently, they should be capable of employing and changing to adaptive cognitive, emotional, and behavioral

strategies in their relationships with work. In contrast, OP seems to be tied up in deeper psychological structures such as ego-invested self-concepts (Hodgins & Knee, 2002; Vallerand et al., 2003). The individual is thus less aware of his or her deep-seated motives and so spends little time evaluating his or her feelings or their consequences. The OP relationship with work is characterized by a passive understanding that "this is just who I am." When work becomes a passion that is predominantly obsessive, the individuals establish what work means to them, how they deal with adversities and maintain these experiences as truths that will not change. With this somewhat depressing conclusion, I now turn to a discussion of whether there are situational contingencies that may be able to moderate this relationship.

Gap Three: Organizational Factors that May Reduce the Negative Outcomes of Obsessive Passion

OP seems to be a precursor of both burnout symptoms and incivility instigation. It is not, however, a source of change for these outcomes but a stable factor that relates to negative experiences and behavior at work over time. Both Paper 2 and 3 contribute to the literature on passion for work by suggesting a situational contingency that may reduce negative outcomes of OP (Forest et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2011; Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). Particularly Paper 3 shows that the relationship might be rather complex. In Paper 2, we find that the longitudinal relationship between OP and cynicism (although not with exhaustion) is weaker when individuals feel that their co-workers are caring and supportive. Such moderation might be the result of co-workers that make the obsessive employees feel appreciated and valued as their own selves and not because of their performances. Feeling appreciated and valued should also render the employees able to have their self-worth be less contingent on performance. In that case, co-workers increase the employee's pool of available resources, such as self-worth, and help him or her relax and detach from work, which subsequently may prevent the employee from becoming exhausted and cynical (Sonnentag, Binnewies, & Mojza, 2010). This is an important finding that may work as a guideline for organizations and practitioners that see how employees' involvements with work may be hampering their well-being. Organizations should look for ways to increase and maintain strong levels of support between co-workers.

In the same paper, there were several other hypotheses on the buffering role of the supervisor and the coworker that were unsupported. Unfortunately, it seems that caring and supportive supervisors are not enough to help employees with strong OP to feel less exhausted or cynical about work. Further, it seems that the role of the co-worker only protects against feeling cynical about the job, not with feeling emotionally exhausted. These results could also be discussed in light of the results from Paper 3 because they might relate to the strength of the OP and the ability of individuals with strong OP to change their behaviors or emotions.

In Paper 3, I suggest that perceptions of a mastery climate that focuses on fostering mastery, learning, and development and has been shown to facilitate a high consideration of others' welfares could render employees with strong OP to instigate less uncivil behaviors. The result is particularly interesting as it shows that a mastery climate does attenuate the relationship; employees with low levels of OP engage in less incivility when there is a strong mastery climate present in the organization. However, individuals who score high on OP *and*

experience a strong mastery climate seem to instigate more incivility than individuals in a weaker mastery climate. This indicates that individuals seem less able to absorb a mastery climate and diminish their behaviors when a high level of OP is present. Furthermore, they actually respond with more degradation of and condescension toward their coworkers when the climate sees cooperation and personal mastery as success. In the paper, I discuss whether this might be a result of a lack of person-environment fit. A person-environment fit is achieved when there is a match between the individual characteristics of a person and the characteristics of the environment (Caplan, 1987). A motivational climate that underscores personal mastery and cooperation can be experienced as less competitive (Nerstad et al., 2013) and might thus represent a poor person-environment fit for a person with strong OP. Such employees are concerned with proving their competences and social statuses to others, and if the climate does not support these notions, they are not able to show off their virtues and are less happy and content at work. Sakurai and Jex (2012) found that negative emotions may be a precursor to counter-productive work behaviors. Although speculative, it might seem that negative emotions derived from a lack of person – environment fit bring about incivility from the unhappy person. This notion is supported by a study from the field of sports. Amiot et al. (2006) found that athletes with high OP scores, who played in highly competitive leagues, reported higher psychological adjustments than did athletes with high HP scores in the same leagues. In contrast, harmonious athletes playing in less competitive leagues reported higher psychological adjustments than did obsessive athletes in the same league.

Given the results from Paper 2 and 3, the extent to which contextual factors may reduce the negative outcomes of OP it is still unclear. What we seem to have gained knowledge of is that there are certain factors that have the potential to reduce the strength of the OP–cynicism relationship (perceived co-worker support) and the strength of the OP–incivility relationship (perceived mastery climate). We also know more about how certain levels of OP may hamper the proposed interaction, that employees might be less able to integrate or understand external cues that subsequently lead them to change their behaviors or attitudes towards work. These results are important as they mark the need for distinguishing between high and low levels of passion, as they seem to bring about very different responses under different circumstances. The findings also strengthen speculations about the individuals with strong OPs capabilities to change. Even when considering the employee in his or her context, traditionally effective remedies like perceived supervisor support or a mastery climate will not suffice in helping the individual overcome some of the adversities of OP. However, research should continue to investigate conditions under which a negative outcome of OP might be alleviated. Both the strength of the situation and the time frame of the study might be of importance, and the present results demonstrate that there are a lot of questions that remain unanswered.

A Discussion of the Overall Research Questions

In the introduction, I stated that the field of organizational psychology has yet to clearly define and understand passion for work. The two research questions following this recognition were (1) does the passion for work construct bring any new insights to the field of organizational psychology, and (2) does passion for work matter, and if so, for which parts of

employees' emotional, cognitive, and behavioral experiences is it particularly relevant? Based on my studies, there are a few answers and a lot more questions that draw the field closer to a fuller comprehension of the passion for work construct.

First of all, when comparing passion to the more established constructs of work engagement and workaholism, it seems as though passion for work has certain limitations to its scope, being more relevant in explaining individual differences in attitudes than in performances. Furthermore, the extant instruments used to measure the different constructs of passion, engagement, and workaholism seem to tap into many of the same mechanisms. It might, in fact, be that the current items in the passion for work scale do not adequately measure the true passion experience. For example, although passion implies a strong and intense relationship with work, some of the items do not exactly vibrate with intensity (e.g., "The new things that I discover with this job allow me to appreciate it even more"). To get the items to truly reflect the etymological background ("suffering") as well as the theoretical foundations (tied to self-concept and meaningfulness), they might be in need of touchups, particularly when seen in the light of the findings of Paper 1.

When considering the practical contribution of the passion for work model, my results are somewhat inconclusive. The increased explained variance suggests that HP and OP seem to explain more about the wellbeing experience which is beyond what work engagement and workaholism are able to. As of yet, studies (including mine) have not been able to empirically address exactly what more it explains and whether this is practically relevant. The implications of this awareness should guide future research on passion, as there might be a need to control for engagement and workaholism, at least until it can be empirically shown that the concepts have meaningful practical differences. Unfortunately, this was not the case in the follow-up study that is reported in Papers 2 and 3. Therefore, I can only speculate as to whether the results in these two papers would be similar or different if I had added work engagement and workaholism scales to the design of the study. Paper 2 pertains to the relationship between HP/OP and burnout and Paper 1 shows that adding HP and OP increases the explained variance in burnout even when controlling for engagement and workaholism. Based on this, I can at least not rule out that the results would stay the same in Paper 2. It is more difficult to tell if the same would be the case in Paper 3. Incivility is a behavior, and by some it is a facet of counterproductive work performance (e.g. Atwater & Elkins, 2009). The results from Paper 1 are inconclusive as to whether passion adds any new insights to explain differences in work performance, as few of the included variables were related to performance (except workaholism to extra-role performance). If incivility is part of work performance, any result pertaining to the role of OP might have been cancelled out by the shared variance of engagement and workaholism had I included them. However, if incivility is seen as a separate behavior, one that that might stem from a fragile sense of self or a way to assert power over someone (Porath et al., 2008), OP might be able to explain more of incivility than workaholism or engagement would. This is because of OP's connection to a delicate self-concept and ego-invested structure (Amiot et al., 2006; Bureau et al., 2013).

To sum up the first research question, passion for work might bring new insights to the well-being literature, but its contribution might be somewhat limited with respect to performance, at least when considering the direct linear link between the two. Although

theoretically meaningful, the dualistic model of passion for work seems to have certain practical challenges in setting itself apart from established constructs like work engagement and workaholism.

The second research question pertained to which parts of employees' emotional, cognitive, and behavioral experiences passion is particularly relevant. As discussed, the present results indicate that passion for work seems more relevant to explain individual differences in attitudes than in performances. However, leaving the discriminant validity discussion behind for a moment, the results found in extant research are fairly unanimous that having an obsessive and addictive relationship with work is unfavorable for employees' emotional, cognitive, and behavioral experiences. Particularly considering overall life satisfaction, Paper 1 indicates that OP seems to be a stronger negative predictor than, for example, workaholism. Life satisfaction is advocated by some to be the most important measurement of well-being ("the oft-publicized global studies of happiness levels around the world utilize life satisfaction as the measure of happiness"; Erdogan, Bauer, Truxillo, & Mansfield, 2012, p. 1039). In this sense, at least OP for work could be considered a valuable addition to the well-being literature. Furthermore, Paper 3 suggests that OP might also be of importance with respect to negative behavior. Perhaps most importantly, Paper 3 also shows that individuals who score high in OP actually respond negatively to a traditionally positive aspect of the work culture, namely to mastery climate. That having an obsessive relationship with work and mastery climate might increase the chances of incivility is a cause for concern that should be taken seriously, no matter how one labels the obsession.

With these observations in mind, I now turn to a more detailed discussion of the limitations of my dissertations and how future research might improve our current knowledge of passion for work.

Limitations and Research Directions

As McGrath (1982, p. 101) puts it, "There is no such thing as too much research! There is no such thing as flawless research!" In the following paragraphs, I identify overall limitations in this dissertation as well as suggest avenues of research that may help in overcoming some of the flaws.

First of all, this dissertation is mostly based on longitudinal data, a type of design that may indicate whether the data are consistent with a causal model of the relations between the variables (Orth et al., 2009). This is an important step forward compared to the majority of research done in organizational psychology, which are mostly cross-sectional or cross-lagged (Casper et al., 2007). However, longitudinal research designs are not able to actually conclude on causality. In order to do that, experimental designs are needed to establish causal relationships (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). Also, to combine experiments with longitudinal follow ups would be an interesting avenue for research. If experiments like those of Bélanger et al. (2013a) that show us that manipulations may be able to change the passion mindset are correct, how long does this change last? As of now, we only have information on the stability of the relationships between passion for work and outcomes over 10 months, when a change in passion is not specifically targeted. Some of the questions that remain are in

what happens to passion over a longer period of time. For example, do employees stay the same for an entire career or do their passions or its outcomes change over time?

A second limitation to this dissertation is the extensive use of self-report measures. Although most of the studies had a cross-lagged or longitudinal design, minimizing the possibility of a mono-method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), social desirability bias may cloud the respondents' answers. This is particularly troublesome when assessing behaviors or experiences that are obviously less desirable, such as incivility instigations or cynicism. Ones and colleagues' (1993) meta-analysis of integrity measures suggests, however, that self-report criteria tend to result in higher estimates of validity than do external measures of deviance. They pointed out that (a) many deviant behaviors go undetected, limiting the validity of external measures, and (b) there is much evidence that the correlation between admissions and actual behavior is substantial. Similarly, a meta-analysis by Berry, Carpenter, and Barratt (2012) suggests that other-reported assessments of counterproductive work behavior are no better at assessing such behavior than self-report measures. Consequently, self-report can be a valid way of assessing less socially desirable behaviors and experiences given that respondents are provided anonymity (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

There are, however, other self-reported constructs that would benefit from adding an observer's point of view. OP, for example, seems to be so complex that more sources of information would help us understand the phenomenon better. A large part of the OP seems to be subconscious or at least largely contradictory. In that sense, there may be elements to OP that the individuals themselves are not able to see, but that are clear to others. The concept of other-reports on obsession is more common in the field of behavioral addiction where, for example, gaming addiction is diagnosed by criteria reported by others (Petry & O'Brien, 2013). An interesting venue of research would therefore be to gather information on an individual's passion from partners and colleagues. Although purely speculative, more people might be obsessively passionate about their jobs, but, because they are not able to see for themselves the impact the job has on the way they live their lives, they do not provide the correct information when asked. Perhaps OP might be better captured by asking people close to the individual, who would be reliable to assess his or her behaviors and even speech patterns, in order to fully understand the work related attitude and lifestyle that is OP.

The fact that two of the papers stem from the same dataset could be a further limitation if they do not make unique contributions to the passion for work literature. However, the papers have only the independent variable in common and investigate totally different outcome variables as well as moderating variables. Subsequently, they have different theoretical and practical implications and should be considered unique in this respect (Kirkman & Chen, 2011).

A fifth limitation is the time frame of the longitudinal study. The study was originally designed with equal time lags between the waves over the course of one year, as I had no prior expectations about rate of change (Singer & Willett, 2003). However, due to practical reasons, the union where the survey took place preferred these months as there were less internal surveys in these time periods. Whether these minor differences in the time frame of the study or the time frame between the data collections had any impact on the data is difficult

to say. Future research should definitively experiment with the time frames of overall design as well as between waves, as seasonal changes might play a role.

In Paper 3, we find that there is a difference between low and high levels of OP in how individuals respond to a strong perceived mastery climate. Whether the difference between high and low OP also pertains to the results from Paper 2 is still unclear. The statistical model we report from in Paper 2 was a three-way interaction model where one of the variables was at the within-individual level (time) and the two other variables were at the between-individual level (obsessive passion and perceived supervisor support/perceived co-worker support). At this point, there is no known way of statistically testing the slope of such three-way interaction when the variables are at different levels (Dawson, 2012). Therefore, we were not able to test and plot the significant interaction the same way we were able to in Paper 3. This means that we do not know whether the longitudinal buffering role that perceived co-worker support has in the relationship between obsessive passion and cynicism is representative for all levels of obsessive passion.

The results in this dissertation come with somewhat low effect sizes. As we argue in the papers, in psychological, cross-level moderation, and longitudinal research, low effect sizes are not uncommon, and it is important to account for them if they are theoretically or practically meaningful (Aguinis, Beaty, Boik, & Pierce, 2005; Kath, Swody, Magley, Bunk, & Gallus, 2009; Kwok et al., 2008). The results with the weakest levels of explained variance suggest that co-workers could help individuals with obsessive passions feel less cynical, but that the same individuals also have a tendency to be rude towards their co-workers. If true, these results are practically important because they (a) may offer certain individuals better workdays, and (b) can help uncover the reasons for incivility instigation in the workplace. In this case, the results merit presentation and discussion, however cautiously, and future studies that should attempt to replicate them to verify whether the lack of explanatory power is due to statistical difficulties or lack of practical significance.

A final limitation is the generalizability of the findings in this dissertation. Although the longitudinal study (Paper 2 and 3) was conducted with data from a variety of professions, I cannot generalize outside of contexts such as country and industry. This is also a valid concern with respect to Paper 1, where, although we replicate most results with data from three different professions, we are still unable to generalize outside of country or industry. Replications of these studies would therefore be necessary in order to fully understand these relationships.

In addition to the already suggested avenues for future research, there are other perspectives on the passion for work literature that might be worth following up. First of all, because the two forms of passion seem to be independent of each other; future research could investigate whether there are certain passion profiles that are more suitable for work. A first step into the realm of passion profiles was taken by Wang et al. (2008). They showed that digital gamers' specific passion profiles (high HP/OP, low HP/OP, or medium HP/OP) related differently to behavioral, cognitive, and emotional outcomes. For example, high HP/OP profiles had significantly higher flow dispositions, behavioral regulations, positive affect, and spent more time gaming than the other two profiles. The question is whether similar profiles could be found in a work setting, and for what outcomes such profiles could be relevant. For

example, is it better to have a high score on both HP and OP, or is high HP and low OP better? Are the same profiles suitable for explaining variance in all kinds of outcomes? Is one profile more apt to explain variance in well-being, where another one is better for explaining behavioral outcomes? We would be able to see clearer connections to performance if we statistically allowed for the two forms of passion to co-exist, possibly with canonical correlations, cluster analyses, or interactions between the two.

Another venue for research is the role of personality in passion for work. The results in this dissertation suggests that particularly OP seems to be a fairly inflexible way of relating to work, which could be because it is linked to the individuals' dispositional traits. A previous study linked the role of autonomous and controlled personality orientations to HP and OP, respectively (Vallerand et al., 2006), but there are other aspects of personality that also may be interesting. The close connection of OP to fragile self-concept indicates, for example, that OP might also be associated with neuroticism. Although at least two papers address obsessive passion and neuroticism in the same report (Stephan, Deroche, Brewer, Caudroit, & Le Scanff, 2009; Tosun & Lajunen, 2009), no one have, to the best of my knowledge, explicitly investigated the connection between the two.

This dissertation is based solely on quantitative data. Although this type of design was the most appropriate for answering the research questions where the mechanisms are rather unambiguous, (Fiske, 1982; Shadish et al., 2002), some of the results suggest that the dualistic model of passion might also benefit from another angle of research.

The vast majority (if not all) of published papers on the dualistic model of passion for an activity are in the quantitative tradition as opposed to the qualitative tradition. Where quantitative data could be considered thin and less informative, qualitative data provide additional contextual meanings (Geertz, 1975; Miles & Huberman, 1994). This approach to information could be particularly beneficial when investigating obsessive passion for work. For an outsider, it seems hard to create meaning from the contradictory behavior of a person who loves his or her job, and yet who feels exhausted, is cynical, and may be rude to his/her coworkers. As the results from this dissertation suggest that employees are only able to change their behaviors based on signals from their surroundings up to a certain level of obsessive passion, qualitative interviews could, for example, add more knowledge of what it feels like when an obsessive passion for work is so strong that one does not perceive external cues. More importantly, one might learn more about the mechanisms of a lack of a person–environment fit. By gaining knowledge on employee experiences of different levels of obsessive passion, research on passion could be even better at predicting behavior and particularly change in behavior.

A final research opportunity is on the role of the environment in influencing the development of passion for work. Although the knowledge on passion for work is increasing, there are large limitations as to what, if anything, may cultivate the most desirable form of passion (Perrewé et al., 2013). Studies have already suggested that parents' values and beliefs about certain activities may influence the development of passion in children (Mageau et al., 2009), yet we do not know whether these processes are similar to when adults form their perceptions and relationships with work. Although previous studies have investigated the role of autonomy support, job demands, and resources as antecedents of passion for work

(Bonneville-Roussy et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2011; Trépanier et al., 2013), these studies were neither longitudinal nor experimental, and the causality of the results is therefore still unclear. Research using social learning theory suggest that leaders influence their followers through their behaviors (Latham & Saari, 1979). Can supervisor behaviors, beliefs, or values play a role in the development of passion for work? Studies on similar work attitudes such as engagement, motivation, and goal pursuits suggest that these attitudes may be affected by others such as partners, coworker, or supervisors (Bakker, Shimazu, Demerouti, Shimada, & Kawakami, 2011; Bakker, Westman, & van Emmerik, 2009; Dik & Aarts, 2007). Similarly, it could be interesting to see if passion for work follows such a pattern. If OP, with all its potential down-sides, is contagious, scholars should know more about the process.

All in all, there are a number of research opportunities within the field of passion for work. I agree with Perrewé et al. (2013, p. 5) when they conclude that "theory development, as well as thoughtful considerations regarding the boundary conditions under which passion results in favorable or unfavorable outcome, is needed."

Practical Implications

Although this dissertation has its limitations, there are certain parts of the results that might be of interest from a practical perspective. First of all, it seems like passion for work is more than an enduring, positive state of contentment (Zigarmi, Nimon, Houson, Witt, & Dichl, 2011); it is best understood as a two-dimensional relationship that can be delightful or dangerous depending on which type of passion has the highest levels, harmonious or obsessive (Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). This mirrors the increasing amount of research that find a darker side to passion, a side that is associated with stress, aggression, uncontrolled rumination, and inflexibility (for an overview, see Marsh et al., 2013; Perrewé et al., 2013). These results are particularly important outside of university campuses, as many supervisors and practitioners believe in employee passion as a key to organizational performance (Allegretti, 2000; Boyatzis et al., 2002; Lucy, 2013). Organizations should thus be conscious of the different forms of passion when calling for more passion in the workplace. More importantly, they should look for ways to simultaneously enable autonomy, mastery, and a strong sense of personal qualifications and security. The little we know about what gives rise to a predominance of harmony over obsession indicates that these added focus areas would be helpful (Bélanger et al., 2013a; Forest et al., 2012; Mageau et al., 2009).

Unfortunately, it may seem like OP entails certain aspects that resemble a behavioral addiction. If this is the case, organizations may find themselves in a situation where they need to learn more about how to provide necessary help to treat that obsessive behavior (Pallesen, Mitsem, Kvale, Johnsen, & Molde, 2005). If strong OP is indeed pathological, its treatment should be based within a clinical framework, which is outside the scope of this dissertation. A practical implication of this speculation is, of course, related to recruitment. Although potentially unethical, one of the implications of the results of this dissertation could be that organizations should look for ways to avoid individuals with a strong OP to enter the organizations in the first place.

Because of this potential pathological streak, the results on whether or not situational factors may help buffer between OP and a negative outcome are somewhat differing. Whereas

co-worker support seems to be fairly important in buffering cynicism, a mastery climate is not sufficient in decreasing the level of incivility instigations for employees above a certain level of OP, and may actually spark more incivility for certain employees. However, the time frame of our study may also be of importance. We do not know whether a perceived mastery climate would play a different role if we allowed for a longer time period in our study. In our data, we have few possibilities of controlling for how long the individual has been in the specific climate (except for tenure). Perhaps employees with strong OPs need more time than 10 months to adjust their behaviors according to the extant definitions of success and mastery, from which point they would become more civil. The results are promising, still, as both Papers 2 and 3 suggest that the context *may* help employees with lower levels of OP in overcoming their problems. Further, as a perceived supportive environment and mastery climate have several other positive consequences, organizations should definitely look for ways to enhance the support and the mastery climate.

This can be done by focusing on recruiting genuinely caring and considerate employees who also have relevant job skills and abilities (Purcell, Kinnie, Swart, Rayton, & Hutchinson, 2009). Additionally, organizations might benefit from enhancing relations between co-workers, perhaps through mentoring and increasing possibilities of cooperation and interaction (Zagenczyk, Scott, Gibney, Murrell, & Thatcher, 2010). Moreover, focusing on employee autonomy and decision making as well as avoiding rewards and recognition that are perceived as bribes or methods of control could be parts of creating a climate that is perceived as mastery oriented (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Nerstad et al., 2013). However, supervisors, organizations, and practitioners should also be aware of the possibility of the unintended consequences of a mastery climate. For certain employees, creating an arena where they are not allowed to shine in what way they need to may result in their increased incivility and dissatisfaction.

From a practitioner's perspective, implementing a HRM system that actually has an impact is crucial. One way to ensure this is to have a system with a good horizontal fit. Horizontal fit refers to the internal consistency of the practices, where the different practices complement each other in achieving the organizational goals (in this case a supportive and mastery focused climate, Delery, 1998). Due to its close relationship with self-determination theory, the dualistic model of passion for work has the potential of explaining emotional, cognitive, and behavioral elements related to work involvement, its antecedents and outcomes. Having such an overall theoretical framework will help practitioners employ theory driven strategies with a horizontal fit that covers recruiting through retirement policies (Gagne & Deci, 2005; Gagné & Forest, 2008; Philippe, Vallerand, & Lavigne, 2009). This potential is yet to be reached; more research is needed in order to fully understand the complex work attribute that is passion for work.

Overall Conclusion

Whereas passion for work is considered to be an important worker attribute (Allegretti, 2000; Boyatzis et al., 2002; Moses, 2001; Perrewé et al., 2013), there are several gaps of knowledge that have yet to be filled. This dissertation addresses three of these gaps and investigates passion for work's ability to explain variance in well-being and performance over and beyond similar constructs, its role in explaining change in outcomes over time, and the extent to which the context is able to buffer some of the negative outcomes of, particularly, obsessive passion for work. Overall, the three papers included in this dissertation suggest that passion for work does seem to bring some new insights to the field of organizational psychology, specifically in understanding individual well-being and uncivil behavior. Harmonious passion relates to a small decrease in burnout. Obsessive passion is positively related to stable levels of burnout and incivility, and for employees with strong levels of obsessive passion, co-workers may buffer cynicism. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, when obsessive passion is strong, individuals might be less able to recognize and change their behaviors at work. In fact, under circumstances that are traditionally celebrated for raising morale, cooperation, and good relationships (i.e., the mastery climate), individuals with strong obsessive passion might react oppositely and become a risk to not only themselves, but their co-workers. It thus seems that, in order to "walk with fire"; the fire should be fueled by harmony and not obsession.

References

Aguinis, H., Beaty, J. C., Boik, R. J., & Pierce, C. A. (2005). Effect Size and Power in Assessing Moderating Effects of Categorical Variables Using Multiple Regression: A 30-Year Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(1), 94-107.

Allegretti, J. G. (2000). *Loving your job, finding your passion: Work and the spiritual life*. Mahwah, NJ US: Paulist Press.

Ames, C. (1984). Achievement Attributions And Self-Instructions Under Competitive And Individualistic Goal Structures. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(3), 478-487.

Ames, C. (1992). Achievement goals and the classroom motivational climate. In D. H. Schunk & J. L. Meece (Eds.), *Student perceptions in the classroom.* (pp. 327-348). Hillsdale, NJ England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Ames, C. (1995). Achievement goals, motivational climate, and motivational processes. In G. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Motivation in sport and exercise.* (pp. 161-176). Champaign, IL US: Human Kinetics Books.

Ames, C., & Ames, R. (1984a). Goal Structures And Motivation. *Elementary School Journal, 85*(1), 39-52.

Ames, C., & Ames, R. (1984b). Systems Of Student And Teacher Motivation - Toward A Qualitative Definition. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 535-556.

Amiot, C. E., Vallerand, R. J., & Blanchard, C. M. (2006). Passion and Psychological Adjustment: A Test of the Person-Environment Fit Hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(2), 220-229.

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for Tat? The Spiraling Effect of Incivility in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452-471.

Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(4), 596-612.

Atkinson, J. W. (1964). *An introduction to motivation*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.

Atwater, L., & Elkins, T. (2009). Diagnosing, understanding, and dealing with counterproductive work behavior. In J. W. Smither & M. London (Eds.), *Performance management: Putting research into action.* (pp. 359-410). San Francisco, CA US: Jossey-Bass.

Bakker, Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the Job Demands-Resources Model To Predict Burnout and Performance. *Human Resource Management, 43*(1), 83-104.

Bakker, A. B., Shimazu, A., Demerouti, E., Shimada, K., & Kawakami, N. (2011). Crossover of work engagement among Japanese couples: Perspective taking by both partners. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(1), 112-125.

Bakker, A. B., Westman, M., & van Emmerik, I. J. H. (2009). Advancements in crossover theory. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*(3), 206-219.

Baum, J. R., & Locke, E. A. (2004). The Relationship of Entrepreneurial Traits, Skill, and Motivation to Subsequent Venture Growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 587-598.

Bélanger, J. J., Lafrenière, M.-A. K., Vallerand, R. J., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2013a). Driven by fear: The effect of success and failure information on passionate individuals' performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*(1), 180-195.

Bélanger, J. J., Lafrenière, M.-A. K., Vallerand, R. J., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2013b). When passion makes the heart grow colder: The role of passion in alternative goal suppression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*(1), 126-147.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 349-360.

Berry, C. M., Carpenter, N. C., & Barratt, C. L. (2012). Do other-reports of counterproductive work behavior provide an incremental contribution over self-reports? A meta-analytic comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(3), 613-636.

Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 410-424.

Birkeland, I. K., & Buch, R. (under review). The Dualistic Model of Passion for Work: Discriminant and Predictive Validity with Work Engagament and Workaholism.

Birkeland, I. K., & Nerstad, C. G. L. (under review). Incivility Is (Not) the Very Essence of Love.

Birkeland, I. K., Richardsen, A. M., & Dysvik, A. (under review). A Longitudinal Study of Passion for Work: Kindling the Flame without Burning Out.

Blau, G., & Andersson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*(4), 595-614.

Blom, V. (2012). Contingent self-esteem, stressors and burnout in working women and men. *Work: Journal of Prevention, Assessment & Rehabilitation, 43*(2), 123-131.

Bonneville-Roussy, A., Lavigne, G. L., & Vallerand, R. J. (2011). When passion leads to excellence: the case of musicians. *Psychology of Music, 39*(1), 123-138.

Bonneville-Roussy, A., Vallerand, R. J., & Bouffard, T. (2013). The roles of autonomy support and harmonious and obsessive passions in educational persistence. *Learning and Individual Differences, 24*(0), 22-31.

Boyatzis, R., McKee, A., & Goleman, D. (2002). Reawakening Your Passion for Work. *Harvard Business Review, 80*(4), 86-94.

Bureau, J. S., Vallerand, R. J., Ntoumanis, N., & Lafrenière, M.-A. K. (2013). On passion and moral behavior in achievement settings: The mediating role of pride. *Motivation and Emotion, 37*(1), 121-133.

Burke, & Fiksenbaum, L. (2009). Work motivations, work outcomes, and health: Passion versus addiction. *Journal of Business Ethics, 84*, 257-263.

Burnfield, J. L., Clark, O. L., Devendorf, S. A., & Jex, S. M. (2004). *Understanding workplace incivility: Scale development and validation*. Paper presented at the 19th Annual Conference of theh Society for Industrial and Organzational Psychology, Chicago.

Caplan, R. D. (1987). Person-environment fit theory and organizations: Commensurate dimensions, time perspectives, and mechanisms. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31*(3), 248-267.

Carbonneau, N., Vallerand, R. J., Fernet, C., & Guay, F. (2008). The role of passion for teaching in intrapersonal and interpersonal outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(4), 977-987.

Cardon, M. S. (2008). Is passion contagious? The transference of entrepreneurial passion to employees. *Human Resource Management Review, 18*(2), 77-86.

Cardon, M. S., Zietsma, C., Saparito, P., Matherne, B. P., & Davis, C. (2005). A tale of passion: New insights into entrepreneurship from a parenthood metaphor. *Journal of Business Venturing, 20*(1), 23-45.

Carpentier, J., Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2012). Ruminations and flow: Why do people with a more harmonious passion experience higher well-being? *Journal of Happiness Studies, 13*(3), 501-518.

Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work-family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 28-43.

Caudroit, J., Boiché, J., Stephan, Y., Le Scanff, C., & Trouilloud, D. (2011). Predictors of work/family interference and leisure-time physical activity among teachers: The role of passion towards work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20*(3), 326-344.

Černe, M., Nerstad, C. G. L., Dysvik, A., & Škerlavaj, M. (in press). What goes around comes around: Knowledge hiding, perceived motivational climate, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Cherniss, C. (1980). *Professional burnout in human service organizations*. New York: Praeger.

Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1082-1103.

Dawson, J. F. (2012). [Probing three-way interactions when time is W2].

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268.

Delery, J. E. (1998). Issues of fit in strategic human resource management: Implications for research. *Human Resource Management Review, 8*(3), 289-309.

Dik, G., & Aarts, H. (2007). Behavioral cues to others' motivation and goal pursuits: The perception of effort facilitates goal inference and contagion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43*(5), 727-737.

Donahue, E. G., Forest, J., Vallerand, R. J., Lemyre, P. N., Crevier-Braud, L., & Bergeron, É. (2012). Passion for work and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of rumination and recovery. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 4*(3), 341-368.

Donahue, E. G., Rip, B., & Vallerand, R. J. (2009). When winning is everything: On passion, identity, and aggression in sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 10*(5), 526-534.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 500-507.

Erdogan, B., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., & Mansfield, L. R. (2012). Whistle while you work: A review of the life satisfaction literature. *Journal of Management, 38*(4), 1038-1083.

Fiske, D. W. (1982). Convergent-discriminant validation in measurements and research strategies. *New Directions for Methodology of Social & Behavioral Science, 12*, 77-92.

Forest, J., Mageau, G. A., Crevier-Braud, L., Bergeron, É., Dubreuil, P., & Lavigne, G. L. (2012). Harmonious passion as an explanation of the relation between signature strengths' use and well-being at work: Test of an intervention program. *Human Relations, 65*(9), 1233-1252.

Forest, J., Mageau, G. A., Sarrazin, C., & Morin, E. M. (2011). 'Work is my passion': The different affective, behavioural, and cognitive consequences of harmonious and obsessive passion toward work. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.), 28*(1), 17-30.

Frijda, N. H., Mesquita, B., Sonnemans, J., & Van Goozen, S. (1991). The duration of affective phenomena or: emotions, sentiments and passions. *International review of studies on emotion, 1*, 187-225.

Fritz, C., Yankelevich, M., Zarubin, A., & Barger, P. (2010). Happy, healthy, and productive: The role of detachment from work during nonwork time. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(5), 977-983.

Fryer, J. W., & Elliot, A. J. (2007). Stability and change in achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(4), 700-714.

Gagne, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 331-362.

Gagné, M., & Forest, J. (2008). The study of compensation systems through the lens of self-determination theory: Reconciling 35 years of debate. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne, 49*(3), 225-232.

Geertz, C. (1975). *The interpretation of cultures: selected essays*. London: Hutchinson.

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

Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1134-1145.

Halbesleben, J. R. B., Harvey, J., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1452-1465.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52*(12), 1280-1300.

Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., & Zhou, J. (2009). A cross-level perspective on employee creativity: Goal orientation, team learning behavior, and individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(2), 280-293.

Ho, V. T., Wong, S.-S., & Lee, C. H. (2011). A Tale of Passion: Linking Job Passion and Cognitive Engagement to Employee Work Performance. *Journal of Management Studies, 48*(1), 26-47.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1988). *The ecology of stress*. Washington, DC US: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513-524.

Hodgins, H. S., & Knee, C. R. (2002). The integrating self and conscious experience. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research.* (pp. 87-100). Rochester, NY US: University of Rochester Press.

Hodgins, H. S., Weibust, K. S., Weinstein, N., Shiffman, S., Miller, A., Coombs, G., & Adair, K. C. (2010). The cost of self-protection: Threat response and performance as a function of autonomous and controlled motivations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*(8), 1101-1114.

Huynh, J. Y., Xanthopoulou, D., & Winefield, A. H. (2013). Social support moderates the impact of demands on burnout and organizational connectedness: A two-wave study of volunteer firefighters. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18*(1), 9-15.

Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *The Academy of Management Review, 31*(2), 386-408.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 692-724.

Kath, L. M., Swody, C. A., Magley, V. J., Bunk, J. A., & Gallus, J. A. (2009). Cross-level, three-way interactions among work-group climate, gender, and frequency of harassment on morale and withdrawal outcomes of sexual harassment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82*(1), 159-182.

Kenny, K. M. (2010). Beyond ourselves: Passion and the dark side of identification in an ethical organization. *Human Relations, 63*(6), 857-873.

Kirkman, B. L., & Chen, G. (2011). Maximizing Your Data or Data Slicing? Recommendations for Managing Multiple Submissions from the Same Dataset. *Management & Organization Review, 7*(3), 433-446.

Koestner, R., & Losier, G. F. (2002). Distinguishing three ways of being highly motivated: A closer look at introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 101-121). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (1988). Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48*(4), 1075-1079.

Kwok, O.-M., Underhill, A. T., Berry, J. W., Luo, W., Elliott, T. R., & Yoon, M. (2008). Analyzing longitudinal data with multilevel models: An example with individuals living with lower extremity intra-articular fractures. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 53*(3), 370-386.

Lafrenière, M.-A. K., Bélanger, J. J., Sedikides, C., & Vallerand, R. J. (2011). Self-esteem and passion for activities. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*(4), 541-544.

Lafrenière, M.-A. K., St-Louis, A. C., Vallerand, R. J., & Donahue, E. G. (2012). On the relation between performance and life satisfaction: The moderating role of passion. *Self and Identity, 11*(4), 516-530.

Latham, G. P., & Saari, L. M. (1979). Application of social-learning theory to training supervisors through behavioral modeling. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*(3), 239-246.

Lau, S., & Nie, Y. (2008). Interplay between personal goals and classroom goal structures in predicting student outcomes: A multilevel analysis of person-context interactions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(1), 15-29.

Lavigne, G. L., Forest, J., & Crevier-Braud, L. (2012). Passion at work and burnout: A two-study test of the mediating role of flow experiences. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology, 21*(4), 518-546.

Le, H., Schmidt, F. L., Harter, J. K., & Lauver, K. J. (2010). The problem of empirical redundancy of constructs in organizational research: An empirical investigation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 112*(2), 112-125.

Leiter, M. P., Laschinger, H. K. S., Day, A., & Oore, D. G. (2011). The impact of civility interventions on employee social behavior, distress, and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(6), 1258-1274.

Li, C.-H. (2010). Predicting subjective vitality and performance in sports: The role of passion and achievement goals. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 110*(3, Pt 2), 1029-1047.

Liu, D., Chen, X.-P., & Yao, X. (2011). From autonomy to creativity: A multilevel investigation of the mediating role of harmonious passion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 294-309.

Liu, W., Chi, S.-C. S., Friedman, R., & Tsai, M.-H. (2009). Explaining incivility in the workplace: The effects of personality and culture. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 2*(2), 164-184.

Lucy, J. (2013). A Passion for Work. *Electrical Wholesaling, 94*(7), 4-4.

Mageau, G. A., Carpentier, J., & Vallerand, R. J. (2011). The role of self-esteem contingencies in the distinction between obsessive and harmonious passion. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*(6), 720-729.

Mageau, G. A., Vallerand, R. J., Charest, J., Salvy, S.-J., Lacaille, N., Bouffard, T., & Koestner, R. (2009). On the development of harmonious and obsessive passion: The

role of autonomy support, activity specialization, and identification with the activity. *Journal of Personality, 77*(3), 601-646.

March, J. G., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). Organizational Performance as a Dependent Variable. *Organization Science, 8*(6), 698-706.

Marsh, H. W., Vallerand, R. J., Lafrenière, M.-A. K., Parker, P., Morin, A. J. S., Carbonneau, N., . . . Paquet, Y. (2013). Passion: Does One Scale Fit All? Construct Validity of Two-Factor Passion Scale and Psychometric Invariance Over Different Activities and Languages. *Psychological Assessment*.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*, 370-396.

McGrath, J. E. (1982). *Judgment calls in research* (Vol. 2). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Meyer, J. P., & Gagné, M. (2008). Employee engagement from a self-determination theory perspective. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 1*(1), 60-62.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Miller, B. W., Roberts, G. C., & Ommundsen, Y. (2005). Effect of perceived motivational climate on moral functioning, team moral atmosphere perceptions, and the legitimacy of intentionally injurious acts among competitive youth football players. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 6*(4), 461-477.

Moses, B. (2001). It's All About Passion. *Across the Board, 38*(3), 55.

Nerstad, C., Roberts, G. C., & Richardsen, A. M. (2013). Person–Situation Dynamics and Well-Being at Work: An Achievement Goal Theory Perspective. In C. L. Cooper & R. J. Burke (Eds.), *The Fulfilling Workplace: The Organization's Role in Achieving Individual and Organizational Health* (pp. 121–138): Gower Publishing.

Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2007). Dimensions, Antecedents, and Consequences of Workaholism: A Conceptual Integration and Extension. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(1), 111-136.

Nicholls, J. G. (1979). Quality and equality in intellectual development: The role of motivation in education. *American Psychologist, 34*, 1071-1084.

Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Nixon, A. E., Yang, L.-Q., Spector, P. E., & Zhang, X. (2011). Emotional labor in China: Do perceived organizational support and gender moderate the process? *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress, 27*(4), 289-305.

Ntoumanis, N., & Biddle, S. J. H. (1999). A review of motivational climate in physical activity. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 17*, 643 - 665.

O'Grady, K. E. (1982). Measures of explained variance: Cautions and limitations. *Psychological Bulletin, 92*(3), 766-777.

Ommundsen, Y., Roberts, G. C., Lemyre, P. N., & Treasure, D. C. (2003). Perceived motivational climate in male youth soccer: relations to social-moral functioning, sportspersonship and team norm perceptions. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 4*(4), 397-413.

Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (1993). Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(4), 679-703.

Orth, U., Robins, R. W., & Meier, L. L. (2009). Disentangling the effects of low self-esteem and stressful events on depression: Findings from three longitudinal studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(2), 307-321.

Pallesen, S., Mitsem, M., Kvale, G., Johnsen, B.-H., & Molde, H. (2005). Outcome of psychological treatments of pathological gambling: A review and meta-analysis. *Addiction, 100*(10), 1412-1422.

Perrewé, P. L., Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., McAllister, C. P., & Harris, J. N. (2013). Developing a passion for work passion: Future directions on an emerging construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, n/a-n/a.

Perttula, K. (2009). *Passion for Work: Initial Measurement and Empirical Validation*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Chaicago, Illinois.

Petry, N. M., & O'Brien, C. P. (2013). Internet gaming disorder and the DSM-5. *Addiction, 108*(7), 1186-1187.

Philippe, F. L., Vallerand, R. J., Houlfort, N., Lavigne, G. L., & Donahue, E. G. (2010). Passion for an activity and quality of interpersonal relationships: The mediating role of emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(6), 917-932.

Philippe, F. L., Vallerand, R. J., & Lavigne, G. L. (2009). Passion Does Make a Difference in People's Lives: A Look at Well - Being in Passionate and Non - Passionate Individuals. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well - Being, 1*(1), 3 - 22.

Ployhart, R. E., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2010). Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change. *Journal of Management, 36*(1), 94-120.

Ployhart, R. E., & Ward, A.-K. (2011). The "quick start guide" for conducting and publishing longitudinal research. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(4), 413-422.

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. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903.

Porath, C. L., Overbeck, J. R., & Pearson, C. M. (2008). Picking up the gauntlet: How individuals respond to status challenges. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(7), 1945-1980.

Przybylski, A. K., Weinstein, N., Ryan, R. M., & Rigby, C. S. (2009). Having to versus wanting to play: Background and consequences of harmonious versus obsessive engagement in video games. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*(5), 485-492.

Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Swart, J., Rayton, B., & Hutchinson, S. (2009). *People Management and Performance*. London: Routledge.

Reio, T. G., Jr., & Ghosh, R. (2009). Antecedents and outcomes of workplace incivility: Implications for human resource development research and practice. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 20*(3), 237-264.

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(3), 617-635.

Rip, B., Vallerand, R. J., & Lafrenière, M. A. K. (2012). Passion for a cause, passion for a creed: On ideological passion, identity threat, and extremism. *Journal of Personality, 80*(3), 573-602.

Roberts, G. C., Kavussanu, M., & Sprague, R. L. (2001). Mentoring and the impact of the research climate. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 7*, 525-537.

Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2013). Greening organizations through leaders' influence on employees' pro-environmental behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(2), 176-194.

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 66-80.

Rousseau, D. M. (2007). A sticky, leveraging, and scalable strategy for high-quality connections between organizational practice and science. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1037-1042.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.

Sakurai, K., & Jex, S. M. (2012). Coworker incivility and incivility targets' work effort and counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating role of supervisor social support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*(2), 150-161.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., van der Heijden, F. M. M. A., & Prins, J. T. (2009a). Workaholism among medical residents: It is the combination of working excessively and compulsively that counts. *International Journal of Stress Management, 16*(4), 249-272.

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

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*, 893-917.

Senko, C., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2005). Regulation of Achievement Goals: The Role of Competence Feedback. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*(3), 320-336.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: modeling change and event occurrence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. (2010). Staying well and engaged when demands are high: The role of psychological detachment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(5), 965-976.

Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Shapiro, D. L. (2004). The Future Of Work Motivation Theory. *Academy of Management Review, 29*(3), 379-387.

Stenseng, F., & Dalskau, L. H. (2010). Passion, self-esteem, and the role of comparative performance evaluation. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 32*(6), 881-894.

Stephan, Y., Deroche, T., Brewer, B. W., Caudroit, J., & Le Scanff, C. (2009). Predictors of perceived susceptibility to sport-related injury among competitive runners: The role of previous experience, neuroticism, and passion for running. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 58*(4), 672-687.

Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Verhoeven, L. C. (2005). Workaholism in the Netherlands: Measurement and Implications for Job Strain and Work-Nonwork Conflict. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 54*(1), 37-60.

Taylor, S. G., & Kluemper, D. H. (2012). Linking perceptions of role stress and incivility to workplace aggression: The moderating role of personality. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*(3), 316-329.

Thorgren, S., & Wincent, J. (2013). Passion and Role Opportunity Search: Interfering Effects of Conflicts and Overloads. *International Journal of Stress Management*.

Tosun, L. P., & Lajunen, T. (2009). Why Do Young Adults Develop a Passion for Internet Activities? The Associations among Personality, Revealing "True Self" on the Internet, and Passion for the Internet. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*(4), 401-406.

Trépanier, S.-G., Fernet, C., Austin, S., Forest, J., & Vallerand, R. J. (2013). Linking job demands and resources to burnout and work engagement: Does passion underlie these differential relationships? *Motivation and Emotion*.

Valentini, N. C., & Rudisill, M. E. (2006). Goal orientation and mastery climate: A review of contemporary research and insights to intervention. *Estudos de Psicologia, 23*, 159-171.

Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 29.* (pp. 271-360). San Diego, CA US: Academic Press.

Vallerand, R. J. (2012). From motivation to passion: In search of the motivational processes involved in a meaningful life. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne, 53*(1), 42-52.

Vallerand, R. J., & Houlfort, N. (2003). Passion at Work: Toward a New Conceptualization. In S. W. S. Gilliland, Dirk D. E.; Skarlicki, Daniel P. (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on values in organizations* (pp. 175 - 204). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Vallerand, R. J., Mageau, G. A., Elliot, A. J., Dumais, A., Demers, M.-A., & Rousseau, F. (2008). Passion and performance attainment in sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 9*(3), 373-392.

Vallerand, R. J., Mageau, G. A., Ratelle, C., Léonard, M., Blanchard, C., Koestner, R., . . . Marsolais, J. (2003). Les Passions de l'Ãme: On Obsessive and Harmonious Passion. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 85*, 756-767.

Vallerand, R. J., Paquet, Y., Philippe, F. L., & Charest, J. (2010). On the role of passion for work in burnout: A process model. *Journal of Personality, 78*(1), 289-312.

Vallerand, R. J., Rousseau, F. L., Grouzet, F. M. E., Dumais, A., Grenier, S., & Blanchard, C. M. (2006). Passion in Sport: A Look at Determinants and Affective Experiences. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 28*(4), 454-478.

Vallerand, R. J., Salvy, S.-J., Mageau, G. A., Elliot, A. J., Denis, P. L., Grouzet, F. M. E., & Blanchard, C. (2007). On the role of passion in performance. *Journal of Personality, 75*(3), 505-534.

Van den Broeck, A., Lens, W., De Witte, H., & Van Coillie, H. (2013). Unraveling the importance of the quantity and the quality of workers' motivation for well-being: A person-centered perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 82*(1), 69-78.

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*(4), 216-226.

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

Wang, C. K. J., Khoo, A., Liu, W. C., & Divaharan, S. (2008). Passion and intrinsic motivation in digital gaming. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11*(1), 39-45.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Dollard, M. F., Demerouti, E., Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Schreurs, P. J. G. (2007). When do job demands particularly predict burnout?: The moderating role of job resources. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(8), 766-786.

Zagenczyk, T. J., Scott, K. D., Gibney, R., Murrell, A. J., & Thatcher, J. B. (2010). Social influence and perceived organizational support: A social networks analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 111*(2), 127-138.

Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Dichl, J. (2011). A preliminary field test of an employee work passion model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 22*(2), 195-221.

Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Diehl, J. B. (2009). *Toward a Framework and Operational Definition for Employee Work Passion*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management.

Series of Dissertations

The Dissertations may be ordered from our website www.bi.no
(Research – Research Publications – Series of Dissertations)

2014
8/2014   *Ide Katrine Birkeland*
Fire Walk with Me: Exploring the Role of Harmonious and Obsessive Passion in Well-being and Performance at Work

7/2014   *Sinem Acar-Burkay*
Essays on relational outcomes in mixed-motive situations

6/2014   *Susanne H. G. Poulsson*
On Experiences as Economic Offerings

5/2014   *Eric Lawrence Wiik*
Functional Method as a Heuristic and Research Perspective: A Study in Systems Theory

4/2014   *Christian Enger Gimsø*
Narcissus and Leadership Potential - The measurement and implications of narcissism in leadership selection processes

3/2014   *Mehrad Moeini-Jazani*
When Power Has Its Pants Down: Social Power Increases Sensitivity to Internal Desires

2/2014   *Yuriy Zhovtobryukh* The role of technology, ownership and origin in M&A performance

1/2014   *Siv Staubo*
Regulation and Corporate Board Composition

2013
9/2013   *Bjørn Tallak Bakken*
Intuition and analysis in decision making: On the relationships between cognitive style, cognitive processing, decision behaviour, and task performance in a simulated crisis management context

8/2013   *Karl Joachim Breunig*
Realizing Reticulation: A Comparative Study of Capability Dynamics in two International Professional Service Firms over 10 years

7/2013   *Junhua Zhong*
Three Essays on Empirical Asset Pricing

6/2013   *Ren Lu*
Cluster Networks and Cluster Innovations: An Empirical Study of Norwegian Centres of Expertise

5/2013   *Therese Dille*
Inter-institutional projects in time: a conceptual framework and empirical investigation

4/2013   *Thai Binh Phan*
Network Service Innovations: Users' Benefits from Improving Network Structure

3/2013   *Terje Gaustad*
Creating the Image: A Transaction Cost Analysis of Joint Value Creation in the Motion Picture Industry

2/2013   *Anna Swärd*
Trust processes in fixed-duration alliances: A multi-level, multi-dimensional, and temporal view on trust

1/2013   *Sut I Wong Humborstad*
Congruence in empowerment expectations: On subordinates' responses to disconfirmed experiences and to leaders' unawareness of their empowerment expectations

2012

9/2012   *Robert Buch*
Interdependent Social Exchange Relationships: Exploring the socially embedded nature of social exchange relationships in organizations

8/2012   *Ali Faraji-Rad*
When the message feels right: Investigating how source similarity enhances message persuasiveness

7/2012   *Marit Anti*
Commercial friendship from a customer perspective: Exploring social norm of altruism in consumer relationships and self-interest-seeking behavior
Birgit Helene Jevnaker

6/2012   Vestiges of Design-Creation: An inquiry into the advent of designer and enterprise relations

5/2012   *Erik Aadland*
Status decoupling and signaling boundaries: Rival market category emergence in the Norwegian advertising field, 2000-2010

4/2012   *Ulaş Burkay*
The Rise of Mediating Firms: The Adoption of Digital Mediating Technologies and the Consequent Re-organization of Industries

3/2012   *Tale Skjølsvik*
Beyond the 'trusted advisor': The impact of client-professional relationships on the client's selection of professional service firms

2/2012   *Karoline Hofslett Kopperud*
Well-Being at Work: On concepts, measurement, and leadership influence

1/2012   *Christina G. L. Nerstad*
In Pursuit of Success at Work: An Empirical Examination of the Perceived Motivational Climate, Its Outcomes and Antecedents

2011

12/2011 *Kjell Jørgensen*
Three Articles on Market Microstructure at the Oslo Stock Exchange (OSE)

11/2011 *Siri Valseth*
Essays on the information content in bond market order flow

10/2011 *Elisabet Sørfjorddal Hauge*
How do metal musicians become entrepreneurial? A phenomenological
investigation on opportunity recognition

9/2011 *Sturla Lyngnes Fjesme*
Initial Public Offering Allocations

8/2011 *Gard Paulsen*
Betwixt and between: Software in telecommunications and the programming
language Chill, 1974-1999

7/2011 *Morten G. Josefsen*
Three essays on corporate control

6/2011 *Christopher Wales*
Demands, designs and decisions about evaluation: On the evaluation of post-
graduate programmes for school leadership development in Norway and England

5/2011 *Limei Che*
Investors' performance and trading behavior on the Norwegian stock market

4/2011 *Caroline D Ditlev-Simonsen*
Five Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): Aan empirical
analysis

3/2011 *Atle Raa*
Fra instrumentell rasjonalitet til tvetydighet: En analyse av utviklingen av
Statskonsults tilnærming til standarden Mål- og resultatstyring (MRS) 1987-2004

2/2011 *Anne Louise Koefoed*
Hydrogen in the making - how an energy company organises under uncertainty

1/2011 *Lars Erling Olsen*
Broad vs. Narrow Brand Strategies: The Effects of Association Accessibility on
Brand Performance

2010
8/2010 *Anne Berit Swanberg*
Learning with Style: The relationships among approaches to learning, personality,
group climate and academic performance

7/2010 *Asle Fagerstrøm*
Implications of motivating operations for understanding the point-of-online-
purchase: Using functional analysis to predict and control consumer purchasing
behavior

6/2010 *Carl J. Hatteland*
Ports as Actors in Industrial Networks

5/2010 *Radu-Mihai Dimitriu*
Extending where? How consumers' perception of the extension category affects brand extension evaluation

4/2010 *Svanhild E. Haugnes*
Consumers in Industrial Networks: a study of the Norwegian-Portuguese bacalhau network

3/2010 *Stine Ludvigsen*
State Ownership and Corporate Governance: Empirical Evidence from Norway and Sweden

2/2010 *Anders Dysvik*
An inside story – is self-determination the key? Intrinsic motivation as mediator and moderator between work and individual motivational sources and employee outcomes. Four essays

1/2010 *Etty Ragnhild Nilsen*
Opportunities for learning and knowledge creation in practice

2009
8/2009 *Erna Senkina Engebrethsen*
Transportation Mode Selection in Supply Chain Planning

7/2009 *Stein Bjørnstad*
Shipshaped: Kongsberg industry and innovations in deepwater technology, 1975-2007

6/2009 *Thomas Hoholm*
The Contrary Forces of Innovation*: An Ethnography of Innovation Processes *in the Food Industry.*

5/2009 *Christian Heyerdahl-Larsen*
Asset Pricing with Multiple Assets and Goods

4/2009 *Leif-Magnus Jensen*
The Role of Intermediaries in Evolving Distribution Contexts: A Study of Car Distribution

3/2009 *Andreas Brekke*
A Bumper!? An Empirical Investigation of the Relationship between the Economy and the Environment

2/2009 *Monica Skjøld Johansen*
Mellom profesjon og reform: Om fremveksten og implementeringen av enhetlig ledelse i norsk sykehusvesen

1/2009 *Mona Kristin Solvoll*
Televised sport: Exploring the structuration of producing change and stability in a public service institution

2008

7/2008 *Helene Loe Colman*
Organizational Identity and Value Creation in Post-Acquisition Integration: The Spiralling Interaction of the Target's Contributive and the Acquirer's Absorptive Capacities

6/2008 *Fahad Awaleh*
Interacting Strategically within Dyadic Business Relationships: A case study from the Norwegian Electronics Industry

5/2008 *Dijana Tiplic*
Managing Organizational Change during Institutional Upheaval: Bosnia-Herzegovina's Higher Education in Transition

4/2008 *Jan Merok Paulsen*
Managing Adaptive Learning from the Middle

3/2008 *Pingying Zhang Wenstøp*
Effective Board Task Performance. Searching for Understanding into Board Failure and Success

2/2008 *Gunhild J. Ecklund*
Creating a new role for an old central bank: The Bank of Norway 1945-1954

1/2008 *Øystein Strøm*
Three essays on corporate boards

2007

6/2007 *Martha Kold Bakkevig*
The Capability to Commercialize Network Products in Telecommunication

5/2007 *Siw Marita Fosstenløkken*
Enhancing Intangible Resources in Professional Service Firms. A Comparative Study of How Competence Development Takes Place in Four Firms

4/2007 *Gro Alteren*
Does Cultural Sensitivity Matter to the Maintaining of Business Relationships in the Export Markets? An empirical investigation in the Norwegian seafood industry

3/2007 *Lars C. Monkerud*
Organizing Local Democracy: The Norwegian Experience

2/2007 *Siv Marina Flø Karlsen*
The Born Global – Redefined. On the Determinants of SMEs Pace of Internationalization

1/2007 *Per Engelseth*
The Role of the Package as an Information Resource in the Supply Chain. A case study of distributing fresh foods to retailers in Norway

2006

10/2006 *Anne Live Vaagaasar*
From Tool to Actor - How a project came to orchestrate its own life and that of others

9/2006 *Kjell Brynjulf Hjertø*
The Relationship Between Intragroup Conflict, Group Size and Work Effectiveness

8/2006 *Taran Thune*
Formation of research collaborations between universities and firms: Towards an integrated framework of tie formation motives, processes and experiences

7/2006 *Lena E. Bygballe*
Learning Across Firm Boundaries. The Role of Organisational Routines

6/2006 *Hans Solli-Sæther*
Transplants' role stress and work performance in IT outsourcing relationships

5/2006 *Bjørn Hansen*
Facility based competition in telecommunications – Three essays on two-way access and one essay on three-way access

4/2006 *Knut Boge*
Votes Count but the Number of Seats Decides: A comparative historical case study of 20th century Danish, Swedish and Norwegian road policy

3/2006 *Birgitte Grøgaard*
Strategy, structure and the environment. Essays on international strategies and subsidiary roles

2/2006 *Sverre A. Christensen*
Switching Relations - The rise and fall of the Norwegian telecom industry

1/2006 *Nina Veflen Olsen*
Incremental Product Development. Four essays on activities, resources, and actors

2005
6/2005 *Jon Erland Bonde Lervik*
Managing Matters:Transferring Organizational Practices within Multinational Companies

5/2005 *Tore Mysen*
Balancing Controls When Governing Agents in Established Relationships: The Influence of Performance Ambiguity

4/2005 *Anne Flagstad*
How Reforms Influence Organisational Practices: The Cases of Public Roads and Electricity Supply Organisations in Norway

3/2005 *Erlend Kvaal*
Topics in accounting for impairment of fixed asset

2/2005 *Amir Sasson*
On Mediation and Affiliation. A Study of Information Mediated Network Effects in The Banking Industry

1/2005 *Elin Kubberød*
Not just a Matter of Taste – Disgust in the Food Domain

2004

10/2004   *Sverre Tomassen*
The Effects of Transaction Costs on the Performance of Foreign Direct Investments - An empirical investigation.

9/2004   *Catherine Børve Monsen:*
Regulation, Ownership and Company Strategies. The Case of European Incumbent Telecommunications Operators

8/2004   *Johannes A. Skjeltorp*
Trading in Equity Markets: A study of Individual, Institutional and Corporate Trading Decision.

7/2004   *Frank Elter*
Strategizing in Complex Contexts

6/2004   *Qinglei Dai*
Essays on International Banking and Tax-Motivated Trading

5/2004   *Arne Morten Ulvnes*
Communication Strategies and the Costs of Adapting to Opportunism in an Interfirm Marketing System

4/2004   *Gisle Henden*
Intuition and its Role in Strategic Thinking

3/2004   *Haakon O. Aa. Solheim*
Essays on volatility in the foreign exchange market

2/2004   *Xiaoling Yao*
From Village Election to National Democratisation. An Economic-Political Microcosm Approach to Chinese Transformation

1/2004   *Ragnhild Silkoset*
Collective Market Orientation in Co-producing Networks

2003
2/2003   *Egil Marstein*
The influence of stakeholder groups on organizational decision-making in public hospitals

1/2003   *Joyce Hartog McHenry*
Management of Knowledge in Practice. Learning to visualise competence

2002
6/2002   *Gay Bjercke*
Business Landscapes and Mindscapes in People's Republic of China. A Study of a Sino-Scandinavian Joint Venture

5/2002   *Thorvald Hærem*
Task Complexity and Expertise as Determinants of Task Perceptions and Performance: Why Technology-Structure Research has been unreliable and inconclusive

4/2002 *Norman T. Sheehan*
Reputation as a Driver in Knowledge-Intensive Service Firms: An exploratory study of the relationship between reputation and value creation in petroleum exploration units

3/2002 *Line Lervik Olsen*
Modeling Equity, Satisfaction and Loyalty in Business-to-Consumer Markets

2/2002 *Fred H. Strønen*
Strategy Formation from a Loosely Coupled System Perspective. The Case of Fjordland

1/2002 *Terje I. Våland*
Emergence of conflicts in complex projects. The role of informal versus formal governance mechanisms in understanding interorganizational conflicts in the oil industry

2001
6/2001 *Kenneth H. Wathne*
Relationship Governance in a Vertical Network Context

5/2001 *Ming Li*
Value-Focused Data Envelopment Analysis

4/2001 *Lin Jiang*
An Integrated Methodology for Environmental Policy Analysis

3/2001 *Geir Høidal Bjønnes*
Four Essays on the Market Microstructure of Financial Markets

2/2001 *Dagfinn Rime*
Trading in Foreign Exchange Markets. Four Essays on the Microstructure of Foreign Exchange

1/2001 *Ragnhild Kvålshaugen*
The Antecedents of Management Competence. The Role of Educational Background and Type of Work Experience

2000
1/2000 *Per Ingvar Olsen*
Transforming Economies. The Case of the Norwegian Electricity Market Reform