

## Chapter 12 – Public sector employee well-being: Examining its determinants using the JD–R and P–E fit models

*Bram Steijn and David Giauque*

*This is a draft of a chapter that has been accepted for publication by Oxford University Press in the forthcoming book entitled « Managing for public service performance : How people and values make a difference », edited by Peter Leisink, Lotte B. Andersen, Gene A. Brewer, Christian B. Jacobsen, Eva Knies, and Wouter Vandenabeele, due for publication in 2021.*

### 12.1 Introduction

Within the organizational sciences, employee well-being is arguably one of the most frequently studied subjects (Boxall et al. 2016; Judge and Klinger 2007). Studying employee well-being is not only considered worthwhile from an employee perspective, it is also believed to be an important determinant of organizational performance (Alfes et al. 2012; Van de Voorde et al. 2012). In this respect, the happy–productive worker hypothesis, which states “happy employees exhibit higher levels of job-related performance behaviors than do unhappy employees” (Cropanzano and Wright 2001, 182), is widely acknowledged (Zelenski et al. 2008). One can thus argue that managing for public performance also implies managing public sector employee well-being.

Apart from being an important topic in the academic HRM literature, well-being is increasingly a concern for organizations. Public and private organizations are confronted with huge “well-being issues” with respect to their employees as since the 1980s, organizations have implemented new management practices and tools to improve their external adaptation and their internal functioning. Furthermore, “doing more with less” has become the new managerial mantra, leading organizations to develop and implement detailed performance targets in order to achieve results in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. These managerial

practices and tools shape the work environment and result in positive but also negative effects on employees. Numerous empirical studies demonstrate that stress, burnout, and hardship at work are clearly increasing (Demerouti et al. 2001; Hsieh 2012). Managing these “well-being issues and challenges” is of great importance, and this requires knowledge of how to deal with this issue, which is one of the objectives of this chapter.

In this chapter, we focus on employee well-being within the public sector, and especially on its main determinants, using two theoretical models: the job demands–resources (JD–R) model and the person–environment (P–E) fit model. These are not the only models that have been deployed in empirical studies but are often seen in the literature as the main theoretical frameworks for studying well-being issues in organizations. Further, these models are relevant here as they clarify how individual, job, and organizational characteristics have a (positive or negative) effect on employee well-being. Although these models are general and have not been specifically developed for the public sector, we will show that they can easily be applied in a public sector context. In this respect, as Chapter 1 argued, one has to give attention to public sector characteristics and deal with the question: “How does a public sector context affect employee well-being?” In the same vein, we will also shed light on the current discussion regarding well-being and public service motivation (PSM). As is also explained in Chapter 14 of this volume, PSM is an important topic in the public administration (PA) literature. In terms of well-being, some studies argue that PSM can be an individual resource that helps in fighting stress and other negative outcomes, while others have identified negative consequences of PSM.

Before continuing, we should make clear that this chapter has its limitations. First, the literature on employee well-being—even when only considering public administration literature—is vast, and we are not able to deal with every single study or even every aspect. It is also not our aim to produce a full systematic review. Our objective is more modest, namely

to show the relevance of the JD–R and P–E fit frameworks when studying public sector employee well-being. Second, we will not discuss the relationship between well-being and performance. In this respect, we just note that the happy–productive worker hypothesis is contested (Cropanzano and Wright 2001) and that not all studies have found a relationship between well-being and performance (Taylor 2018). Moreover, as we will discuss in the next section, employee well-being is a multidimensional concept (Grant et al. 2007). Noting two competing perspectives on the relationship between well-being and organizational performance, Van de Voorde et al. (2012) showed that for some dimensions of employee wellbeing, a “mutual gains” perspective holds (i.e. well-being is congruent with organizational performance), but for other dimensions, “conflicting outcomes” are visible (i.e. employee well-being is at odds with organizational performance). Although we do not deny the importance of this issue, we do not address it in this chapter (see Chapter 9). The final limitation has to do with possible differences between public and private sector employees with respect to aspects of employee well-being. Some studies have suggested that public sector employees score lower on several dimensions of well-being than private sector employees do (Goulet and Frank 2002; Lyons et al. 2006) and that this might be related to specific characteristics of public sector organizations (Rainey 2009). Although this is a relevant observation, we limit ourselves to investigating determinants of well-being *within* the public sector and do not make comparisons with other sectors.

The outline of this chapter is as follows. The next section sets the stage and outlines the three main ingredients that will be discussed: the concept of employee well-being plus the two theoretical frameworks (the JD–R and P–E fit models). This is followed by a section that discusses studies using the JD–R model in a public sector context, followed by a similar discussion of studies using a P–E fit framework. Finally, in the last section, we draw conclusions and propose some possible directions for future research.

## **12.2 Employee well-being, JD–R, and P–E fit**

### **12.2.1 Employee well-being**

Drawing on the work of Warr (1987), Grant et al. (2007, 52) define well-being as “the overall quality of an employee’s experience and functioning at work.” Various concepts are included within this overarching concept such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, engagement, burnout, absence due to sickness, and organizational support. As such, the concept is multidimensional (Grant et al. 2007; Van de Voorde et al. 2012), and several authors have tried to identify distinct dimensions. Some have made a distinction between hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (Ryan and Deci 2001). Hedonic well-being equates well-being to the attainment of pleasure or the avoidance of pain (using concepts such as happiness and satisfaction). Eudaimonic well-being focuses on the importance of “living a complete life, or the realization of valued human potentials” (Ryan et al. 2008) using concepts such as mastery and personal growth, as well as engagement. Self-determination theory—which, with respect to well-being, stresses the importance of fulfilment in the areas of relatedness, competence, and autonomy—is one relevant theory in this respect (see also Chapter 4).

This distinction between hedonic and eudaimonic well-being relates to only one aspect of employee well-being, namely psychological well-being. Psychological well-being focuses on the subjective experiences of individuals, while Grant et al. (2007, 53) discern two other dimensions of employee well-being: physical and social well-being. Physical well-being is related to both objective and subjective aspects of bodily health and includes work-related illnesses, stress, and sick leave. Social well-being (or “relations”) focuses on the interactions that occur between employees (Grant et al. 2007), including interaction with their supervisors

or leaders. This dimension includes variables such as social support, leader–membership exchange (LMX), and trust.

In our description of existing public sector research, we will refer to these three psychological, physical, and social dimensions of well-being. The JD–R and P–E fit models look for factors related to employees’ well-being such as engagement and adopt a positive view of work. Further, both models include the three well-being dimensions identified earlier (psychological, physical, and social). As such, these perspectives might, therefore, bring relevant results for practitioners who seek to develop a healthy organizational environment, rather than merely identifying aspects that are detrimental to employees’ well-being. Another important point is whether there are aspects of well-being that are specific to public sector workers. An obvious candidate for such a variable is public service motivation (PSM), especially if one sees it as a eudaimonic concept. Enhancing PSM could contribute to a higher degree of self-realization, and in this way, it could contribute to enhanced employee well-being. We limit ourselves to discussing PSM as a concept that affects employee well-being within the JD–R and P–E fit frameworks. In other words, PSM will be discussed as a possible determinant of well-being and not as an aspect of it.

### **12.2.2 The JD–R model**

The focus in this chapter is on how individual and organizational determinants affect public sector employees’ well-being. A popular model to explain how and why specific job and organizational characteristics affect employee well-being is the JD–R model developed by, among others, Bakker, Schaufeli, and Demerouti (Bakker and Demerouti 2007; Demerouti et al. 2001). This model is a heuristic model that specifies how employee well-being may be affected by two specific sets of working conditions:

A central assumption in the JD-R model is that work characteristics may evoke two psychologically different processes. In the first process, demanding aspects of work (i.e., work overload and complaining customers) lead to constant psychological overtaxing and in the long run to exhaustion. . . . In the second process proposed by the JD-R model, a lack of job resources precludes actual goal accomplishment, which causes failure and frustration. (Bakker et al. 2008, 311)

In other words, job demands are factors that cost energy to deal with, such as high work pressure, complexity, and role ambiguity (Bakker 2015). Job resources are factors that help individuals to deal with these demands, such as support and autonomy (Bakker and Demerouti 2007). The JD–R theory proposes that job demands and job resources interact in shaping the work experiences and well-being of employees. In essence, job resources help in dealing with job demands. In principle, there is an unlimited number of variables that one could include under the headings of “demands” and “resources,” and the choice depends on the specific research question or research context. This makes the model flexible (Bakker et al. 2014). Further, the model also includes personal resources (such as personality characteristics) alongside job resources.

The model describes two distinct pathways linking job demands and resources to employee well-being: a health impairment process and a motivational process (Bakker et al. 2014). Job demands are, if not matched by adequate resources, important predictors of health problems (such as burnout or repetitive strain injuries) because they deplete energy. Job resources, in contrast, are important determinants of motivation and engagement and contribute to the fulfilment of basic psychological, physical, and social needs (Bakker et al. 2014). More recently, the literature has made a further distinction between hindrance and challenging job demands, which can have different effects (Tadić et al. 2015). According to Tadić et al. (2015, 703), “challenge demands can trigger positive emotions and cognitions and increase

work engagement and performance, whereas hindrance demands trigger negative emotions and cognitions and seem to undermine work engagement and performance.”

### **12.2.3 The P–E fit model**

Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) observe that the idea that there should be a “congruence” or “fit” between what individuals want and what they get from their work and/or organization has a long history in management science. The overarching concept that describes this has been called the “person–environment (P–E) fit” and is defined by Kristof-Brown et al. (2005, 281) as “the compatibility between an individual and [their] work environment that occurs when their characteristics are well matched.” Several distinctions can be made within this overarching concept. First, a complementary fit (individuals add something that was missing in the environment) should be discerned from a supplementary fit (individuals and the environment have similar characteristics). Second, a distinction can be made between a demand–abilities fit (individual skills are met by environmental demands) and a needs–supplies fit (environmental supplies meet individual needs) (Edwards and Rothbard 1999). Finally, it is important to distinguish between four critical domains of fit: person–organization (P–O), person–job (P–J), person–group (P–G), and person–supervisor (P–S) (Kristof-Brown et al. 2005). This chapter focuses on the first two fit domains. Nevertheless, one should note that other fit domains, such as the P–G fit, have also been identified as important antecedents of job satisfaction and stress in a public sector context (Giauque et al. 2014). It is also relevant to note that in their study, Edwards and Billsberry (2010) showed that the P–E fit is a multidimensional concept and that different dimensions of the P–E fit separately influence work outcomes (commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to leave).

The P–E fit framework is—like the JD–R model—a well-accepted model within the organizational sciences, especially within organizational psychology. There, the attraction–selection–attrition (ASA) model (Schneider et al. 1995) is often used to explain why people feel attracted to organizations (e.g. because they believe they “fit” within the organization), why they are selected (because the organization believes they fit), and why they stay or leave (maybe because they are disappointed in the degree of fit). Implicitly, this model assumes that P–E fit is related to employee well-being, especially with respect to the attrition component. Put simply, fit leads to well-being. Indeed, when joining an organization, employees expect to find themselves in a healthy work climate, one that fits with their expectations. Thus, they will compare their work environment with their expectations (their values, a specific vision of missions, tasks, and so on), which will result in either a perceived fit or misfit. This perception could be based on different fit domains such as organization fit or job fit. Explicitly, many studies have linked P–E fit and well-being. For instance, Verquer et al. (2003) conducted a meta-review that identified relationships between P–O fit and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Later studies have also related the P–O fit to engagement (Memon et al. 2014) and health (Merecz and Andysz 2012). Similar findings have also been reported concerning P–J fit and employee well-being (Boon et al. 2011; Park et al. 2011).

Perhaps surprisingly, the fit concept was seldom used in PA research until the early 2000s (Steijn 2008). Vigoda and Cohen (2003, 195) considered this unfortunate since “the environment of non-profit organizations is unique and highly distinguished from ordinary for-profit companies.” However, as we will see, much has changed since then, with more recent PA studies having embraced the P–E fit perspective, especially with respect to the relevance of PSM as an important motivational lever within public organizations (Van Loon et al. 2017).



### 12.3 The JD–R model and public sector research

Although the JD–R model is one of the most significant models used in organizational sciences to explain well-being, it is not often referred to in the PA literature. An early 2020 literature search (using the keywords “job demands” and “job resources” plus “public sector” or “public administration”) generated only twenty empirical studies within core PA journals (*JPART*, *Public Administration*, *Public Administration Review*, and *Public Management Review*) that have explicitly used the JD–R model between 2001–2019. Only four of these have been published before 2015. However, many more articles dealing with public sector employees have been published outside the PA field, mostly in journals linked to organizational behavior (including the *Journal of Organizational Behavior* and the *International Journal of Stress Management*). We first give a brief overview of the main findings from the latter studies.

Many studies published outside the PA field have taken place in non-profit or public service organizations such as schools, home care organizations, and hospitals. A typical study is from Bakker et al. (2003) within the Dutch home care sector. This study explicitly tested the JD–R model and included seven job demands (workload, job content, problems with planning, physical demands, emotional demands, sexual harassment, and patient harassment) and six job resources (autonomy, social support, coaching by supervisor, possibilities for professional development, performance feedback, and financial rewards). Burnout was studied with respect to employee well-being. The study provided strong support for the relevance of the JD–R model in this public sector context. More specifically, it provided support for the health impairment pathway (when job demands are high) and the motivational pathway (when job resources are lacking), which results in “cynicism towards the job and reduced feelings of efficacy” (Bakker et al. 2003, 33). A later study by Xanthopoulou et al. (2007) in the same

sector studied the buffering effect of job resources and found that these could indeed buffer the effect of job demands—especially with respect to the relationship between emotional demands/patient harassment and burnout. Another study by Bakker et al. (2005) tested the buffering effect of job resources in an institute for higher education. Again, the essence of the JD–R model was confirmed, and the results gave partial support for the hypothesis that a combination of high demands and low resources generates the highest levels of burnout. Similarly, a study of Spanish teachers by Lorente Prieto et al. (2008) illustrated the applicability of the JD–R model in public organizations. Unlike the previous studies, their study included not only burnout but also work engagement. It showed not only that work overload influenced burnout and engagement, but also that role conflict affected burnout and that role ambiguity had an effect on engagement. These effects of role conflict and role ambiguity are especially relevant from a public administration perspective.

A study by Van den Broeck et al. (2017) is significant because it tested the relevance of the JD–R model with respect to burnout and engagement across four different sectors (industry, healthcare, business services, and the public sector). It is one of the few studies that applied the JD–R model to a core public sector, namely the civil service. The study looked at three job demands (workload, role conflict, and cognitive demands) and three job resources (social support, autonomy, and skill utilization). Interestingly, overall well-being (a combination of low burnout and high engagement) was highest in the healthcare sector. Burnout was highest in the public and the business services sectors. Work engagement was highest in the healthcare sector and at a lower level in the other sectors. An important finding is that their analysis found support for the JD–R model across all the sectors. As the authors stated, “each of the job demands and job resources were equally strongly related to burnout and work engagement across sectors” (Van den Broeck 2017, 373). Notwithstanding the similar effect sizes, there were differences in the levels of job demands and job resources between sectors.

In discussing the public sector, the authors noted that, on average, jobs seemed rather passive with both relatively low job demands and low job resources. The study therefore advised public sector managers to increase employees' challenges and invest in job resources (Van den Broeck 2017, 374).

The studies discussed above did not explicitly study job demands and resources that are specific to public sector workers. For these, we need to turn to authors who have published in PA journals. In this respect, Hsieh (2012) studied emotional labor among public service workers and confirmed its potential effect on burnout. In line with the JD–R model, the study found that job resources (specifically job control, social support, and rewards) are able to mitigate this effect.

Recently, Borst et al. (2017) applied the JD–R framework in a public sector context (the Dutch local and central civil service). Based on their findings, they proposed three important adjustments to the original framework. First, they identified red tape as a potentially important hindrance demand on public sector employees. This fits with other studies that have identified red tape as a public sector-specific job demand (Giauque et al. 2013; Steijn and Van der Voet 2017). Second, building on a conceptual article by Bakker (2015), they identified PSM as an important personal resource that energizes public servants and thus, theoretically, should have a positive effect on engagement. This was confirmed in their study and resonates with other studies that have looked at PSM as a resource. However, Giauque et al. (2013) also studied PSM and found, in contrast to the hypothesis, that higher levels of PSM were related to higher levels of stress. This suggests that PSM does not always function as a resource and could have a “dark side” (see also Van Loon et al. 2015). Giauque et al. (2013, 73) suggested that employees with high PSM are also highly committed and “suffer from stress if they perceive an inability to reach their personal and organizational objectives due to organizational constraints or work environment burdens or pressures.” Indeed, such a

double-edged effect of PSM is also suggested by Borst et al. (2017) who found, alongside the positive effect on work engagement, that employees with higher PSM are also more inclined to turnover. Quratulain and Khan (2015) and Steijn and Van der Voet (2017) reported similar effects. These findings raise the question as to whether PSM also fuels feelings of incongruence between professionals' aspirations and their actual contributions to society (Quratulain and Khan 2015). This is an issue we will return to in the next section on the P–E fit.

Borst et al.'s (2017) third adjustment to the JD–R framework is that they make an explicit distinction between work-related job resources (teamwork, job content, and autonomy) and organization-related job resources (career development opportunities, supervisory support, and performance management). They argue that this distinction is important because “public servants are more motivated by work characteristics than by organization-related characteristics” (Borst et al. 2017, 5). Their findings supported this assertion, and they interpreted it as a sign that civil servants “become . . . most engaged by intrinsic factors including work-related resources” (Borst et al. 2017, 17). Interestingly, in their study, red tape has different relationships with work-related resources and with organizational-related resources. When red tape is high, work-related resources have a stronger effect on work engagement, but the effect of organizational-related resources is lower. Borst et al. (2017, 19) suggest that “it seems to be the case that organization-related resources in the public sector are automatically accompanied with more red tape which de facto lead to the evaporation of the positive effects of these resources on work engagement.”

Overall, it can be concluded that the JD–R model is appropriate for explaining employee well-being in the public sector—although the number of studies that have done so for the core public sector (e.g. the civil service) is limited. In general, the model can be used to study the effects of public sector employees' job demands and job resources. In particular, the

literature suggests that certain public sector demands (red tape) and resources (PSM) should be included in public sector research. That being said, further investigation is needed to assess and better distinguish the mechanisms and conditions that explain the contradictory effects of PSM identified in the literature: When is it a resource with positive effects, and when does it have unexpected negative effects (dark sides)? It should also be noted that JD–R studies have only addressed employees’ psychological and physical well-being and not considered social well-being as an outcome variable. To date, JD–R studies often treat social well-being (e.g. supervisor or social support) as a resource and not as a dimension of well-being (Dunseath et al. 1995; Giauque et al. 2016; Johnson 1986).

#### **12.4 The P–E fit model and public sector research**

Before the early 2000s, few studies had adopted a P–E fit perspective within PA research. A notable exception is a study by Boxx et al. (1991) which showed that value congruence—“the fit between professed organizational values and the values deemed appropriate by employees” (Boxx et al. 1991, 195)—is an important predictor of satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion. As such, this early study showed a relationship between P–O fit (value congruence) and psychological well-being. More recently, many studies have taken a similar perspective and have used a P–O fit perspective to look at how individual needs (the values looked for by employees) are met by the organization.

Several studies have used the P–E fit perspective to study well-being. Indeed, numerous studies have found empirical evidence that this fit is positively associated with job attitudes (job satisfaction, subjective career success, and intention to remain) and job behaviors such as citizenship behavior (Christensen and Wright 2011; Kristof-Brown et al. 2005). Others have explicitly looked at employee well-being, with Vigoda-Gadot and Meiri (2008)

demonstrating a relationship between new public management (NPM) values and employee well-being (e.g. satisfaction and commitment). Employees who were positive about their organization's core NPM values (responsiveness, transparency, innovativeness, and achievement) expressed greater job satisfaction and commitment. Liu et al. (2010), who used a more traditional way of measuring the P–O fit of public sector employees, also reported a positive effect of P–O fit on job satisfaction.

In using NPM values as espoused organizational values, Vigoda-Gadot and Meiri (2008) are among the few who have not used PSM as part of a public sector P–O fit perspective.

Vandenabeele (2007, 552), in his development of an institutional theory of PSM, was one of the first to do so and stated: “In terms of PSM, this means that civil servants will only demonstrate public service behavior to the extent that their organization embraces public service values as a principle.” Bright (2008) showed that P–O fit mediated the relationships between PSM and both job satisfaction and turnover intention. His study not only showed that value congruence (in terms of PSM and organizational values) is important for employee well-being but also that PSM and P–O fit are distinct and have separate effects. Gould-Williams et al. (2015) also looked at P–O fit as a mediator between PSM and several outcome variables including work-related stress. Similar to Bright, they found that P–O fit acted as a mediator: PSM was positively related to P–O fit, and through P–O fit, it was negatively related to work-related stress. Similar findings are also reported by Kim (2012) who studied job satisfaction and commitment.

In a conceptual article, Ryu (2017) warned against equating PSM with the P–E fit framework. One of his arguments was that PSM studies only use a needs–fulfilment fit perspective and were thus unable to “explain why individuals with high PSM prefer working for a specific organization over other organizations” (Ryu 2017, 363). Although a valid observation, not all PSM researchers would probably agree with this assessment. Steijn (2008) introduced the

concept of PSM fit to argue that the effect of PSM on outcome variables depends on employees being able “to use” their PSM. In support, he found a relationship between the degree of PSM fit and job satisfaction. This argument fits within the P–E fit framework and could also partly explain why people prefer one organization to another. Possibly, employees perceive a greater ability to put their PSM values into practice in one public organization than in another.

Accepting the concept of PSM fit also implies that there could be a misfit. Steijn (2008) suggested that the increase of NPM-like values within the public sector could increase this misfit if these values are at odds with the values held by the employees. This suggests that the effect of PSM on employee well-being is not always positive and could be negative under certain conditions. For instance, Van Loon et al. (2015) showed that the relationship between PSM and well-being is dependent on institutional logics. More specifically, the effect of PSM on well-being is related to the societal impact potential (SIP) through the job and organization type. According to their study, PSM is linked to higher burnout and lower job satisfaction in people-changing organizations when SIP is high. However, in people-processing organizations, it is a low SIP that leads to higher burnout and lower job satisfaction. In the first scenario, employees sacrifice themselves too much for society, while in the second, they are dissatisfied because they cannot contribute sufficiently. In other words, PSM can have a “dark side.”

We referred to this “dark side” earlier when we noted that PSM could also fuel feelings of incongruence between professionals’ aspirations and their actual contributions to society as observed by Quratulain and Khan (2015). They (2015, 324) empirically concluded that “. . . PSM exacerbates the adverse effects of red tape on negative employee attitudes and behaviors and that these effects are transmitted through the mechanism of resigned satisfaction.” This view is supported by Steijn and Van der Voet (2017), who came to a

similar conclusion about the relationship between PSM (or in their case, prosocial motivation) and red tape, noting that red tape acts as a hindrance stressor that thwarts the realization of prosocial aspirations. PSM's "dark side" is clearly a work in progress. Schott and Ritz (2018) identified only nine articles dealing with the unexpected negative consequences of PSM during the 1990–2016 period. They reported that PSM had been found to be related to stress, resigned satisfaction, lower physical well-being, involuntary or long-term absenteeism, and even to presentism. They also concluded that the empirical results were mixed and generally inconclusive. Schott and Ritz tried to explain the mechanisms through which such negative consequences occur. They argued that a complementary P–E misfit might lead to negative attitudes, thereby highlighting the importance of the P–E fit perspective when attempting to explain work outcomes. They invoked various theories (identity theory, psychological contract theory, and the ASA model) to explain how a P–E misfit has negative consequences, and "why highly public-service motivated individuals experience negative attitudes if they feel that their jobs do not allow them to contribute to society" (Schott and Ritz 2018, 33).

Overall, it seems fair to conclude that the P–E fit framework has earned its place within public sector research. As in traditional organizational studies, "fit" is able to explain employee well-being. The general view is that higher fit translates into increased employee well-being. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the number of PA studies that have studied employee well-being from this perspective is rather limited. In fact, only certain elements (job satisfaction, commitment, and work-related stress) have been studied in relation to well-being. There are virtually no PA studies addressing eudaimonic well-being (e.g. engagement) or more general aspects of health. Further, there are only a few studies on social well-being. Moreover, most studies have investigated only one dimension of P–E fit and mainly P–O fit.



This is regrettable since some studies have shown that other fit dimensions are worth studying in relation to work outcomes (Edwards and Billsberry 2010; Giauque et al. 2013).

## **12.4 Conclusions and suggestions for future research**

A number of conclusions can be drawn. First, well-being is an important topic for organizations and further research is required to fully understand its antecedents and consequences in a public sector context. In this respect, the two models most commonly deployed to investigate well-being (the JD–R and P–E fit models) give valuable insights, but so far, these models have not been sufficiently exploited in the PA literature. For example, only a limited number of employee well-being outcomes have been studied. Although some concepts (such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction) have been extensively studied, others need further investigation including eudaimonic well-being concepts (such as engagement) and more “negative” concepts such as burnout, resignation, and absenteeism. Referring to the three-way distinction made earlier between psychological, physical, and social well-being, it should also be noted that very few PA studies have addressed social well-being using either the JD–R or the P–E fit perspective.

Second, it would be useful to investigate differences in employees’ well-being between sectors (public, private, and non-profit) and within subsectors of the public sector. The study by Van den Broeck et al. (2017) is an important starting point for this. However, their study included only a limited number of demands and resources, and it is not certain that their conclusion that the JD–R model is equally relevant for the various sectors will hold if other demands or resources are included. Indeed, some occupations, or jobs, could be more susceptible than others to emotional demands or job strains. For instance, the literature on street-level bureaucracies suggests that frontline workers have more difficult working

conditions, which could lead to negative work outcomes (Brodkin 2012; Destler 2017). Further, as we have seen, red tape has already been identified as a significant hindrance demand that may well be specific to a public sector context. Further research is needed, especially with respect to issues whether recent public management reforms have increased red tape, which types of employees are most affected by it, and what resources employees have to deal with it. Further, the observation by Borst et al. (2017) that the positive effects of organizational resources are thwarted by red tape in a public sector context deserves further study. Although red tape appears to be a job demand that is particularly relevant for public administration studies, other potential demands also deserve further study. In this respect, role conflict and role ambiguity are relevant since public sector workers are potentially more prone to these phenomena. Although some studies have addressed emotional labor (Rayner and Espinoza 2015), the effect of emotional labor on well-being and the possible mitigating effect of job resources also warrant further study in a public sector context.

Third, PSM is clearly an important concept when studying well-being in a public sector context. It fits well within both the P–E fit perspective and the JD–R model. In terms of the former, employees with high PSM are attracted to public organizations as the values espoused by public organizations match their needs, and through a P–O fit mechanism, PSM enhances employee well-being. Nevertheless, further investigations are needed because, as Bright (2008) showed, P–O fit values are distinct from PSM values, and it would be valuable to test this “non-congruence” hypothesis. With respect to the JD–R model, PSM has been explicitly identified by Bakker (2015) as an important personal resource for public sector workers. Indeed, the PSM literature has extensively demonstrated that it may lead to positive outcomes. However, there is some empirical evidence that PSM is also related to negative outcomes when employees are confronted by certain organizational constraints (such as red tape). Currently, it is unclear whether this issue is specific to public organizations or also

exists in private and non-profit organizations. In this respect, it is likely that recent public management reforms have influenced employees' well-being. Recent literature has reported that the frequency and impact of change influence employee behaviors, that organizational support and resources may enhance positive attitudes toward change, and that reforms are not always seen as negative by public employees (Akhtar et al. 2016; Giaque 2015; Greasley et al. 2009). These and other studies demonstrate the value of continuing the study on the links between reforms and well-being.

A final important avenue for further research concerns the relationship between the P–E fit perspective and the JD–R model. This topic arose in the discussion on the possible dark side of PSM. On the one hand, employees with high PSM are attracted to public organizations (which fits with the P–O fit perspective), but on the other hand, the JD–R model would suggest that specific demands (red tape) thwart the fulfilment of employees' PSM. Further, some resources (such as leader or social support) could also affect this relationship between demands and needs fulfilment. Additional research into the question of how job demands and resources could affect the various fits seems an interesting subject for further study.

To conclude, this discussion suggests some relevant practical considerations. We have seen that there are many ways in which managers can positively influence employee well-being. The P–E fit perspective illustrates the importance of aligning the employees' and the organization's values (Gould-Williams et al. 2015) as this will have a positive effect on employee well-being. The JD–R model provided additional insight into the importance of balancing job demands and job resources. When it comes to well-being, other research has highlighted the importance of resources such as trust (Alfes et al. 2012), perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al. 1990), social support (Johnson 1986), work–life balance (Worrall and Cooper 2007), and public service values (Andersen et al. 2013). Also relevant is the observation by Van den Broeck et al. (2017) that many public sector jobs

appear to be passive and would benefit from an increase in employees' challenges and an investment in job resources. Borst et al. (2017) concur by showing that increasing work resources (such as autonomy and social support) will be more effective in enhancing well-being than investing in organizational resources, albeit only when red tape is high. Thus investing in organizational resources is worthwhile provided that managers are able to reduce red tape.

Well-being is also influenced by job and organizational characteristics (Van Loon et al. 2015). Consequently, practices and tools aimed at enhancing public employees' well-being need to be adapted to the specifics of the organization's main mission (people-changing or people-processing organizations) or to the specificities of the job (street-level or back-office jobs). Without doubt, practitioners can benefit from the considerable empirical evidence when addressing well-being and occupational health issues in their organization.

## References

- Akhtar, M. N., M. Bal, and L. Long. 2016. "Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect Reactions to Frequency of Change, and Impact of Change: A Sensemaking Perspective through the Lens of Psychological Contract." *Employee Relations* 38 (4): pp. 536–62.
- Alfes, K., A. Shantz, and C. Truss. 2012. "The Link between Perceived HRM Practices, Performance and Well-Being: The Moderating Effect of Trust in the Employer." *Human Resource Management Journal* 22 (4): pp. 409–27.
- Andersen, L. B., T. Beck Jørgensen, A. M. Kjeldsen, L. H. Pedersen, and K. Vrangbæk. 2013. "Public Values and Public Service Motivation: Conceptual and Empirical Relationships." *The American Review of Public Administration* 43 (3): pp. 292–311.
- Bakker, A. B. 2015. "A Job Demands–Resources Approach to Public Service Motivation." *Public Administration Review* 75 (5): pp. 723–32.
- Bakker, A. B., and E. Demerouti. 2007. "The Job Demands–Resources Model: State of the Art." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 22 (3): pp. 309–28.

- Bakker, A. B., E. Demerouti, and A. I. Sanz-Vergel. 2014. "Burnout and Work Engagement: The JD–R Approach." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 1 (1): pp. 389–411.
- Bakker, A. B., E. Demerouti, and M. C. Euwema. 2005. "Job Resources Buffer the Impact of Job Demands on Burnout." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 10 (2): pp. 170–80.
- Bakker, A. B., E. Demerouti, T. W. Taris, W. B. Schaufeli, and P. J. Schreurs. 2003. "A Multigroup Analysis of the Job Demands–Resources Model in Four Home Care Organizations." *International Journal of Stress Management* 10 (1): pp. 16–38.
- Bakker, A. B., H. Van Emmerik, and P. Van Riet. 2008. "How Job Demands, Resources, and Burnout Predict Objective Performance: A Constructive Replication." *Anxiety Stress and Coping* 21 (3): pp. 309–24.
- Boon, C., D. N. Den Hartog, P. Boselie, and J. Paauwe. 2011. "The Relationship between Perceptions of HR Practices and Employee Outcomes: Examining the Role of Person–Organisation and Person–Job Fit." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 22 (1): pp. 138–62.
- Borst, R. T., P. M. Kruyen, and C. J. Lako. 2017. "Exploring the Job Demands–Resources Model of Work Engagement in Government: Bringing in a Psychological Perspective." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 39 (3): pp. 372–97.
- Boxall, P., J. P. Guthrie, and J. Paauwe. 2016. "Editorial Introduction: Progressing our Understanding of the Mediating Variables Linking HRM, Employee Well-Being and Organisational Performance." *Human Resource Management Journal* 26 (2): pp. 103–11.
- Boxx, W. R., R. Y. Odom, and M. G. Dunn. 1991. "Organizational Values and Value Congruency and Their Impact on Satisfaction, Commitment, and Cohesion: An Empirical Examination within the Public Sector." *Public Personnel Management* 20 (2): pp. 195–205.
- Bright, L. 2008. "Does Public Service Motivation Really Make a Difference on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions of Public Employees?" *The American Review of Public Administration* 38 (2): pp. 149–66.

- Brodkin, E. Z. 2012. "Reflections on Street-Level Bureaucracy: Past, Present, and Future." *Public Administration Review* 72 (6): pp. 940–9.
- Christensen, R. K., and B. E. Wright. 2011. "The Effects of Public Service Motivation on Job Choice Decisions: Disentangling the Contributions of Person–Organization Fit and Person–Job Fit." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21 (4): pp. 723–43.
- Cropanzano, R., and T. A. Wright. 2001. "When a 'Happy' Worker Is Really a 'Productive' Worker: A Review and Further Refinement of the Happy–Productive Worker Thesis." *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 53 (3): pp. 182–99.
- Demerouti, E., A. B. Bakker, F. Nachreiner, and W. B. Schaufeli. 2001. "The Job Demands–Resources Model of Burnout." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86 (3): pp. 499–512.
- Destler, K. N. 2017. "A Matter of Trust: Street Level Bureaucrats, Organizational Climate and Performance Management Reform." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 27 (3): pp. 517–34.
- Dunseath, J., T. A. Beehr, and D. W. King. 1995. "Job Stress–Social Support Buffering Effects across Gender, Education and Occupational Groups in a Municipal Workforce." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 15 (1): pp. 60–83.
- Edwards, J. A., and J. Billsberry. 2010. "Testing a Multidimensional Theory of Person–Environment Fit." *Journal of Managerial Issues* 22 (4): pp. 476–93.
- Edwards, J. R., and N. P. Rothbard. 1999. "Work and Family Stress and Well-Being: An Examination of Person–Environment Fit in the Work and Family Domains." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 77 (2): pp. 85–129.
- Eisenberger, R., P. Fasolo, and V. Davis-LaMastro. 1990. "Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Diligence, Commitment, and Innovation." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75 (1): pp. 51–9.
- Giauque, D. 2015. "Attitudes toward Organizational Change among Public Middle Managers." *Public Personnel Management* 44 (1): pp. 70–98.
- Giauque, D., F. Resenterra, and M. Siggen. 2014. "Antecedents of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Stress in a Public Hospital: A P–E Fit Perspective." *Public Organization Review* 14 (2): pp. 201–28.

- Giauque, D., S. Anderfuhren-Biget, and F. Varone. 2013. "Stress Perception in Public Organisations: Expanding the Job Demands–Job Resources Model by Including Public Service Motivation." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 33 (1): pp. 58–83.
- Giauque, D., S. Anderfuhren-Biget, and F. Varone. 2016. "Stress and Turnover Intents in International Organizations: Social Support and Work–Life Balance as Resources." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 30 (5): pp. 879–901.
- Gould-Williams, J. S., A. M. S. Mostafa, and P. Bottomley. 2015. "Public Service Motivation and Employee Outcomes in the Egyptian Public Sector: Testing the Mediating Effect of Person–Organization Fit." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25 (2): pp. 597–622.
- Goulet, L. R., and M. L. Frank. 2002. "Organizational Commitment across Three Sectors: Public, Non-Profit, and For-Profit." *Public Personnel Management* 31 (2): pp. 201–10.
- Grant, A. M., M. K. Christianson, and R. H. Price. 2007. "Happiness, Health, or Relationships? Managerial Practices and Employee Well-Being Tradeoffs." *The Academy of Management Perspectives* 21 (3): pp. 51–63.
- Greasley, K., P. Watson, and S. Patel. 2009. "The Impact of Organisational Change on Public Sector Employees Implementing the UK Government's 'Back to Work' Programme." *Employee Relations* 31 (4): pp. 382–97.
- Hsieh, C.-W. 2012. "Burnout among Public Service Workers: The Role of Emotional Labor Requirements and Job Resources." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 34 (4): pp. 379–402.
- Johnson, J. V. 1986. *The Impact of Workplace Social Support, Job Demands and Work Control upon Cardiovascular Disease in Sweden*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Baltimore, US: Johns Hopkins University.
- Judge, T. A., and R. Klinger. 2007. "Job Satisfaction. Subjective Well-Being at Work." In *The Science of Subjective Well-Being*, edited by M. Eid and R. J. Larsen, pp. 393–413. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Kim, S. 2012. "Does Person–Organization Fit Matter in the Public-Sector? Testing the Mediating Effect of Person-Organization Fit in the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Work Attitudes." *Public Administration Review* 72 (6): pp. 830–40.

- Kristof-Brown, A. L., R. D. Zimmerman, and E. C. Johnson. 2005. "Consequences of Individuals' Fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person–Job, Person–Organization, Person–Group, and Person–Supervisor Fit." *Personnel Psychology* 58 (2): pp. 281–342.
- Liu, B., J. Liu, and J. Hu. 2010. "Person–Organization Fit, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention: An Empirical Study in the Chinese Public Sector." *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal* 38 (5): pp. 615–25.
- Lorente Prieto, L., M. Salanova Soria, I. Martínez Martínez, and W. Schaufeli. 2008. "Extension of the Job Demands–Resources Model in the Prediction of Burnout and Engagement among Teachers over Time." *Psicothema* 20 (3): 354–60.
- Lyons, S. T., L. E. Duxbury, and C. A. Higgins. 2006. "A Comparison of the Values and Commitment of Private Sector, Public Sector, and Parapublic Sector Employees." *Public Administration Review* 66 (4): pp. 605–18.
- Memon, M., R. Salleh., M. Baharom, and H. Harun. 2014. "Person–Organization Fit and Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role of Engagement." *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal* 6 (3): pp. 205–9.
- Merecz, D., and A. Andysz. 2012. "Relationship between Person–Organization Fit and Objective and Subjective Health Status (Person–Organization Fit and Health)." *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health* 25 (2): pp. 166–77.
- Park, H. I., M. J. Monnot, A. C. Jacob, and S. H. Wagner. 2011. "Moderators of the Relationship between Person–Job Fit and Subjective Well-Being among Asian Employees." *International Journal of Stress Management* 18 (1): pp. 67–87.
- Quratulain, S., and A. K. Khan. 2015. "Red Tape, Resigned Satisfaction, Public Service Motivation, and Negative Employee Attitudes and Behaviors: Testing a Model of Moderated Mediation." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 35 (4): pp. 307–32.
- Rainey, H. G. 2009. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*. 4th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rayner, J., and D. E. Espinoza. 2015. "Emotional Labour under Public Management Reform: An Exploratory Study of School Teachers in England." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 27 (19): pp. 2254–74.



- Ryan, R. M., and E. L. Deci. 2001. "On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being." *Annual Review of Psychology* 52 (1): pp. 141–66.
- Ryan, R. M., V. Huta, and E. Deci. 2008. "Living Well: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Eudaimonia." *Journal of Happiness Studies* 9 (1): pp. 139–70.
- Ryu, G. 2017. "Rethinking Public Service Motivation from the Perspective of Person–Environment Fit: Complementary or Supplementary Relationship?" *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 37 (3): pp. 351–68.
- Schneider, B., H. W. Goldstein, and D. B. Smith. 1995. "The ASA Framework: An Update." *Personnel Psychology* 48 (4): pp. 747–73.
- Schott, C., and A. Ritz. 2018. "The Dark Sides of Public Service Motivation: A Multi-Level Theoretical Framework." *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* 1 (1): pp. 29–42.
- Steijn, B. 2008. "Person–Environment Fit and Public Service Motivation." *International Public Management Journal* 11 (1): pp. 13–27.
- Steijn, B., and J. Van der Voet. 2017. "Relational Job Characteristics and Job Satisfaction of Public Sector Employees: When Prosocial Motivation and Red Tape Collide." *Public Administration* 97 (1): 64–80.
- Tadić, M., A. B. Bakker, and W. G. M. Oerlemans. 2015. "Challenge versus Hindrance Job Demands and Well-Being: A Diary Study on the Moderating Role of Job Resources." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 88 (4): pp. 702–25.
- Taylor, J. 2018. "Working Extra Hours in the Australian Public Service: Organizational Drivers and Consequences." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 38 (2): pp. 193–217.
- Van de Voorde, K., J. Paauwe, and M. Van Veldhoven. 2012. "Employee Well-Being and the HRM–Organizational Performance Relationship: A Review of Quantitative Studies." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 14 (4): pp. 391–407.
- Van den Broeck, A., T. Vander Elst, E. Baillien, M. Sercu, M. Schouteden, H. De Witte, and L. Godderis. 2017. "Job Demands, Job Resources, Burnout, Work Engagement, and Their Relationships: An Analysis across Sectors." *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 59 (4): pp. 369–76.

- Van Loon, N. M., W. Vandenberghe, and P. Leisink. 2015. "On the Bright and Dark Side of Public Service Motivation: The Relationship between PSM and Employee Wellbeing." *Public Money & Management* 35 (5): pp. 349–56.
- Van Loon, N. M., W. Vandenberghe, and P. Leisink. 2017. "Clarifying the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and In-Role and Extra-Role Behaviors: The Relative Contributions of Person–Job and Person–Organization Fit." *The American Review of Public Administration* 47 (6): pp. 699–713.
- Vandenberghe, W. 2007. "Toward a Public Administration Theory of Public Service Motivation: An Institutional Approach." *Public Management Review* 9 (4): pp. 545–56.
- Verquer, M. L., T. A. Beehr, and S. H. Wagner. 2003. "A Meta-Analysis of Relations between Person–Organization Fit and Work Attitudes." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 63 (3): pp. 473–89.
- Vigoda, E., and A. Cohen. 2003. "Work Congruence and Excellence in Human Resource Management: Empirical Evidence from the Israeli Nonprofit Sector." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 23 (3): pp. 192–216.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., and S. Meiri. 2008. "New Public Management Values and Person–Organization Fit: A Socio-Psychological Approach and Empirical Examination among Public Sector Personnel." *Public Administration* 86 (1): pp. 111–31.
- Warr, P. 1987. *Work, Unemployment, and Mental Health*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Worrall, L., and C. L. Cooper. 2007. "Managers' Work–Life Balance and Health: The Case of UK Managers." *European Journal of International Management* 1 (1–2): pp. 129–45.
- Xanthopoulou, D., A. B. Bakker, E. Demerouti, and W. B. Schaufeli. 2007. "The Role of Personal Resources in the Job Demands–Resources Model." *International Journal of Stress Management* 14 (2): pp. 121–41.
- Zelenski, J. M., S. A. Murphy, and D. A. Jenkins. 2008. "The Happy–Productive Worker Thesis Revisited." *Journal of Happiness Studies* 9 (4): pp. 521–37.