**2018 ASM Abstract Submission form**

**All Raine Study researchers** are invited to submit an abstract to present their research findings at the Raine Study Annual Scientific Meeting [8 minute oral presentation followed by 2 mins of questions from the floor].

**Early career researchers and PhD students** are encouraged to present on behalf of their Special Interest Groups. The Raine Medical Research Foundation have kindly donated **two prizes of $750 each** **for the best presentations** by students and early career researchers.

Please complete this form and return to the Raine Study, attention: Aggie Bouckley

At raineadmin-SPH@uwa.edu.au **by Friday 19th October 2018**.
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| **Researcher Bio (2-3 sentences – will be included on the final program)** |
| **Caroline Knight** is a Research Fellow in the Centre for Transformative Work Design, within the Future of Work Institute, Curtin University, Perth. Her interests include work design, job crafting, well-being and performance, with a particular focus on intervention research. She works with industry partners to design and implement interventions and explores the mechanisms underlying these. She has also conducted rigorous systematic reviews and meta-analyses in the area of interventions.  |
| **Title:** *Title of presentation* |
| Work design profiles of Raine Study Gen2 participants: The importance of meaning at work |
| **Speaker:** *Title, name, position, institution, address, telephone, email* |
| Dr. Caroline Knight Research Fellow Centre for Transformative Work Design (CTWD)Future of Work InstituteCurtin University78 Murray StreetPerth 6000Caroline.knight@curtin.edu.au0892664994 |
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| **Education & Work SIG** |
| **Co-investigators:**  |
| Prof Sharon Parker (CTWD, Curtin University)Assist Prof Matthew McLarnon (Oakland University, Michigan, US)Dr Pat Dunlop (School of Psychological Science, University of Western Australia) |
| **Abstract:** *Approximately 600 words* |
|  **Introduction:** Work designs which are high in job characteristics such as autonomy, social support, and job feedback, with moderate job demands, are motivating and lead to positive outcomes such as job satisfaction, well-being, and performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Work design refers to “the content and organization of one’s work tasks, activities, relationships, and responsibilities” (Parker, 2014, p. 662). Recently, relational perspectives have received attention. These argue that work motivation increases when positive relational work characteristics are abundant (e.g. work interactions, interdependencies, relationships) and individuals regularly interact with the beneficiaries of their work and so understand the signficance and benefit of their work on others (Grant, 2008; Grant & Parker, 2009). Relational perspectives are particularly pertinent in contemporary organisations where individuals work interdependently, with teams, departments and external people (e.g. clients, customers). In these contexts, positive outcomes occur when employees are prosocially motivated, that is, recognise and appreciate the benefit their work has on others. This increases commitment towards beneficiaries, encouraging helping behaviour (Grant & Parker, 2009; Grant, 2008). Most job design research is variable centered, focusing on analysing the relationships between each characteristic and predictors / outcomes independently. This is surprising given the theoretical and empirical evidence which suggests that motivational work characteristics tend to occur together and have a differential impact depending on the presence of other characteristics such as job demands (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Karasek, 1979; Parker, 2014). This suggests that work characteristics are, in fact, *interdependent*, and therefore should be statistically modelled together. Work design profiles are therefore likely to exist in which certain job characteristics co-occur in constellations representing different types of jobs. Some previous research has investigated the work design profiles of employees mostly from the perspective of stress. This research found support for high and low strain profiles but limited support for other profiles (Keller, Igic, Meier, Semmer, & Schaubroeck, 2016; Makikangas Tolvanen, Aunola, Feldt, Mauno, & Kinnunen, 2018; Mauno, Mäkikangas, & Kinnunen 2016; Igic ,Keller, Elfering, Tschan, Kälin, & Semmer 2017). We suggest this work has omitted the importance of task significance on work design. Task significance refers to how much impact the job has on others (e.g. in terms of well-being), reflecting how meaningful the job is to individuals (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). Research has demonstrated that jobs where workers understand the positive impact their work has on beneficiaries is associated with higher task significance, sense of social impact and social worth (sense that work contributions impact and are valued by others), and performance. Drawing on previous research (Grant & Hofman, 2011; Grant, 2008) and theories of work design (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Grant & Parker, 2009) we propose that task significance in addition to social support can buffer the negative effects of low autonomy and high demands on outcomes such as well-being and performance. We use a person-centered approach to investigate what types of profiles emerge which reflect different employees’ work experiences, and how these relate to outcomes. This study offers important theoretical implications for work design theory as well as practical implications for interventions to improve work design. **Method:** Latent profile analysis (LPA) explored the work design profiles of employees in The Raine Study dataset 2016 (N=389). Established measures of autonomy, social support, job demands and task significance were used. Following Morin, Meyer, Creusier, & Biétry’s (2016) approach, increasing numbers of profiles were tested using a range of recommended fit indices combined with theory.**Results:** Four distinct profiles were revealed (Figure 1)**:** 1) ‘High strain’, very low autonomy and task significance, low support, high demands; 2) ‘Low significance’, low job significance, average other characteristics (19%); 3) ‘High significance’, high job significance, above average other characteristics (35%); and 4) ‘Average’, average in all characteristics (43%). Those in profile 3 experienced the best outcomes, in terms of work engagement, mood, and increased job crafting. This suggests that job significance may be particularly important for individual and organisational outcomes. **Conclusion:** Managers and practitioners can use these results to target work design interventions towards those who need them most (i.e. those in high strain or low task significance profiles).   |
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