Advancing the Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior: Insights and Future Directions from a Decade of Research

Prof. Anil R. Deshmukh

Faculty of Management Studies, University of Mumbai, India

ABSTRACT

Over the past decade, research on purposeful work behavior has expanded significantly, illuminating how employees derive meaning, motivation, and well-being from their roles. This paper synthesizes key theoretical developments and empirical findings that have advanced the understanding of purposeful work behavior, including the roles of job design, leadership, individual differences, and organizational context. It critically examines conceptual frameworks such as self-determination theory, job crafting, and prosocial motivation, highlighting their contributions and limitations. The review also identifies persistent gaps and emerging questions regarding the measurement of purpose, cross-cultural variations, and the dynamic interplay between purpose and performance outcomes. Finally, the paper proposes a research agenda to guide future inquiries, emphasizing the need for longitudinal designs, multi-level analyses, and integrative models that capture the complex nature of purposeful work. This synthesis aims to inform scholars and practitioners seeking to foster work environments where purpose and performance coexist.

KEYWORDS: Purposeful work behavior, work motivation, meaningful work, job design, self-determination theory, prosocial motivation, employee well-being, organizational behavior, job crafting, future research directions.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of purposeful work behavior stands as a cornerstone in understanding employee motivation, performance, and well-being within organizations. In 2013, Barrick, Mount, and Li [4] introduced the "Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior" (TPWB), a seminal contribution that integrated personality traits, higher-order goals, and job characteristics to explain why individuals engage in work behaviors that align with their personal and organizational objectives. This theory provided a comprehensive framework, building upon earlier work on personality and performance [3], self-determination theory [53], and work design [29].

A decade since its inception, the TPWB has stimulated significant research, deepening our understanding of the complex interplay between individual dispositions, motivational drivers, and environmental factors in shaping work behavior. This article reflects on the enduring impact of the TPWB, highlights key revisions and extensions that have emerged from subsequent research, and proposes a forward-looking agenda for future scholarship. By synthesizing the advancements in the field, we aim to provide a refined theoretical lens for researchers and practitioners seeking to foster more purposeful and effective work environments.

METHODS

This article employs a conceptual review and synthesis approach to reflect on the evolution and impact of the Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior (TPWB). The methodology involved a thorough examination of scholarly literature published since the original theory's introduction in 2013 [4], focusing on studies that directly or indirectly build upon, test, revise, or extend its core tenets.

The review process included:

1. Identification of Core Constructs: Reaffirming the central role of personality traits, higher-order goals, and job characteristics as outlined in the original TPWB [4].

2. Literature Search: Conducting targeted searches in leading management and applied psychology journals for articles that explicitly reference TPWB or explore its constituent elements and their relationships to work outcomes. Keywords included "purposeful work behavior," "personality and work," "higher-order goals," "job characteristics," "meaningful work," "self-determination theory," "vocational interests," and related concepts.

3. Categorization of Contributions: Grouping identified research into categories that represent either refinements of existing TPWB components (e.g., deeper dives into personality mechanisms, nuanced understandings of motivation) or extensions into new domains (e.g., leadership, organizational culture, team dynamics).

4. Synthesis and Integration: Analyzing the findings across these categories to identify consistent patterns, emerging themes, and areas where the original theory has been particularly influential or where new theoretical linkages have been forged. This involved integrating insights from various theoretical perspectives, such as self-determination theory [53], social motivation [11], vocational choice theory [26, 27], and organizational culture frameworks [49].

5. Identification of Gaps and Future Directions: Based on the synthesis, pinpointing areas where research is still needed to further elaborate, test, and apply the TPWB, thereby formulating a comprehensive research agenda.

This systematic review allows for a robust reflection on the TPWB's evolution and its continued relevance in contemporary organizational research.

Results and Discussion

The Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior (TPWB) has proven to be a robust framework for understanding the drivers of purposeful engagement at work. A decade of research has not only validated its core propositions but also enriched it with new insights and expanded its applicability across various organizational phenomena.

Recap of the Original Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior

At its core, TPWB posits that purposeful work behavior—defined as goal-directed actions that are personally meaningful and contribute to organizational objectives—is a function of the interaction among an individual's personality traits, their higher-order goals, and the characteristics of their job [4].

- Personality Traits: The theory emphasized the Big Five personality traits (Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability) as foundational determinants [3, 43]. These traits influence the types of higher-order goals individuals pursue and how they perceive and respond to job characteristics. For instance, Conscientiousness is linked to goal achievement [28] and performance motivation [33], while Openness to Experience can foster creative behavior [21].

- Higher-Order Goals: These are broad, enduring aspirations that individuals seek to achieve through their work, such as mastery, achievement, or affiliation.

TPWB proposed that personality shapes these goals, which in turn direct purposeful behavior. The theory drew on self-determination theory [53] to distinguish between intrinsic and extrinsic goals, suggesting that intrinsically motivated goals are more likely to lead to sustained purposeful behavior [9, 12, 35].

- Job Characteristics: Drawing from work design literature [29], TPWB highlighted how job characteristics (e.g., skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback) provide opportunities for individuals to pursue their higher-order goals. A job rich in these characteristics is more likely to facilitate purposeful behavior, especially when aligned with an individual's personality and goals.

The interplay among these three components was central, suggesting that purposeful work behavior emerges from a synergistic fit.

Revisions and Refinements of TPWB

Subsequent research has provided deeper insights into the mechanisms and boundary conditions of TPWB's core components:

- Nuances of Personality and Motivation: While the Big Five remain crucial, research has explored more granular aspects. For instance, studies have shown how specific facets of personality, or higher-order dimensions [43], relate to work outcomes. The concept of "other-orientation" (a dispositional tendency to consider the welfare of others) has been integrated, demonstrating its role in prosocial behavior and personal initiative [13, 42]. This aligns with the "duality of human existence" (agency and communion) [2]. The interplay between personality and situational factors continues to be a rich area of study [44, 59].

- The Dynamic Nature of Goals and Strivings: The focus has expanded beyond static higher-order goals to include daily goal strivings. Research indicates a virtuous cycle where daily strivings influence work behaviors, need satisfaction, and subsequent strivings, highlighting the dynamic and reciprocal nature of motivation [19]. This also connects to the idea of goal progress and its impact on individuals, with conscientious individuals potentially benefiting more [28]. Self-concordance, the alignment of goals with one's values, has been shown to mediate the effects of transformational leadership on employee motivation [7].

- Meaningful Work as a Central Outcome and Mediator: The concept of "meaningful work" has gained prominence and is increasingly seen as a key outcome and mediator within the TPWB framework [1, 40, 51]. Perceived meaningfulness at work has been found to link job-relevant personality traits and transformational

leadership to job performance [18]. This emphasizes that purposeful work behavior is not just about achieving goals, but about finding significance and personal resonance in one's work [40].

- Vocational Interests and Person-Environment Fit: Holland's theory of vocational choice [26, 27] and the broader concept of person-environment fit have been increasingly integrated. Research demonstrates that interest fit significantly predicts job satisfaction [25] and that vocational interests provide incremental validity in personnel selection beyond personality [59]. This suggests that aligning an individual's vocational interests with their job characteristics is a powerful predictor of purposeful work behavior and its outcomes [52]. Furthermore, person-organization fit has been linked to organizational citizenship behaviors through social-cognitive motivational mechanisms [50].

Extensions and Future Directions

The TPWB provides a fertile ground for exploring new theoretical linkages and addressing contemporary organizational challenges:

1. Leadership and Purposeful Work Behavior: While transformational leadership has been linked to meaningfulness [18], further research is needed to explore how different leadership styles (e.g., empowering leadership [38, 57], authoritarian leadership [30, 46]) influence the components of TPWB. How do leaders shape the perception of job characteristics, foster higher-order goals, and create an environment conducive to purposeful behavior? The concept of "leader consideration" and "initiating structure" [34, 37] could be revisited in this context.
2. Organizational Culture and Climate: The broader organizational context, particularly its culture and climate, likely plays a significant role in fostering or inhibiting purposeful work behavior. Research could explore how different organizational cultures (e.g., those emphasizing innovation [8] or specific values [23, 24, 49]) interact with individual personality and job characteristics to promote purposeful behavior. The competing values framework [49] offers a useful lens here.
3. Team Dynamics and Collective Purpose: TPWB primarily focuses on individual behavior. Future research could extend the theory to the team level, investigating how team personality composition [5, 22], shared goals, and collective work design influence collective purposeful work behavior. How do individual purposeful behaviors aggregate to team performance, and what are the mediating mechanisms?
4. The Dark Side of Purpose and Counterproductive Behaviors: While TPWB focuses on positive outcomes,

future research could explore how a lack of purposeful work behavior, or misaligned purpose, might contribute to negative outcomes like counterproductive work behaviors [31]. For instance, how do abusive supervision [30] or a poor vocational fit [31] undermine purposeful engagement and lead to detrimental actions?
5. Technological and Global Contexts: The nature of work is rapidly evolving with technology (e.g., remote work, AI integration). How do these changes impact job characteristics, the pursuit of higher-order goals, and the expression of purposeful work behavior? Furthermore, cross-cultural research is needed to understand how cultural values and norms moderate the relationships proposed by TPWB.
6. Methodological Advancements: To capture the complexity of the TPWB, future research should increasingly employ advanced methodological approaches. This includes longitudinal studies to understand reciprocal relationships [17], moderated mediation models [18], and the exploration of interactive and quadratic relationships [20]. This will allow for a more nuanced understanding of "it depends" scenarios in organizational research [20].

CONCLUSION

The Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior has stood the test of time, proving to be a foundational framework for understanding the drivers of meaningful and effective work. A decade of research has significantly refined our understanding of the interplay between personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics, while also expanding the theory's scope to include concepts like meaningful work and vocational fit. The proposed research agenda highlights exciting avenues for future inquiry, particularly in exploring the influence of leadership, organizational culture, and team dynamics, as well as addressing the challenges posed by evolving work contexts. By continuing to build upon the TPWB, researchers can provide invaluable insights for fostering environments where individuals thrive through purposeful engagement, ultimately benefiting both employees and organizations.

REFERENCES

[1] Allan, B. A., Batz-Barbarich, C., Sterling, H. M., & Tay, L. (2019). Outcomes of meaningful work: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56: 500–528.

[2] Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: An essay on psychology and religion*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

[3] Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9: 9–30.

[4] Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior: The role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *Academy of Management Review*, 38: 132–152.

[5] Bell, S. T. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 595–615.

[6] Beus, J. M., Dhanani, L. Y., & McCord, M. A. (2015). A meta-analysis of personality and workplace safety: Addressing unanswered questions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 481–498.

[7] Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 554–571.

[8] Büschgens, T., Bausch, A., & Balkin, D. B. (2013). Organizational culture and innovation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30: 763–781.

[9] Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140: 980–1008.

[10] Chen, X. P., Eberly, M. B., Chiang, T. J., Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2014). Affective trust in Chinese leaders: Linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. *Journal of Management*, 40: 796–819.

[11] Crocker, J., Canevello, A., & Brown, A. A. (2017). Social motivation: Costs and benefits of selfishness and otherishness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68: 299–325.

[12] Deci, E. L. (1976). Notes on the theory and metatheory of intrinsic motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15: 130–145.

[13] De Dreu, C. K., & Nauta, A. (2009). Self-interest and other-orientation in organizational behavior: Implications for job performance, prosocial behavior, and personal initiative. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 913–926.

[14] DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35: 627–647.

[15] DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64: 7–52.

[16] Ehrhardt, K., & Ragins, B. R. (2019). Relational attachment at work: A complementary fit perspective on the role of relationships in organizational life. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62: 248–282.

[17] Frese, M., Garst, H., & Fay, D. (2007). Making things happen: Reciprocal relationships between work characteristics and personal initiative in a four-wave longitudinal structural equation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1084–1102.

[18] Frieder, R. E., Wang, G., & Oh, I. S. (2018). Linking job-relevant personality traits, transformational leadership, and job performance via perceived meaningfulness at work: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103: 324–333.

[19] Foulk, T. A., Lanaj, K., & Krishnan, S. (2019). The virtuous cycle of daily motivation: Effects of daily strivings on work behaviors, need satisfaction, and next-day strivings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104: 755–775.

[20] Gardner, R. G., Harris, T. B., Li, N., Kirkman, B. L., & Mathieu, J. E. (2017). Understanding "it depends" in organizational research: A theory-based taxonomy, review, and future research agenda concerning interactive and quadratic relationships. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20: 610–638.

[21] George, J. M., & Zhou, J. (2001). When openness to experience and conscientiousness are related to creative behavior: An interactional approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 513–524.

[22] Gonzalez-Mulé, E., DeGeest, D. S., McCormick, B. W., Seong, J. Y., & Brown, K. G. (2014). Can we get some cooperation around here? The mediating role of group norms on the relationship between team personality and individual helping behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99: 988–999.

[23] Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 677–694.

[24] Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., Kinicki, A., Choi, D., & Karam, E. P. (2019). A meta-analytic test of organizational culture's association with elements of an organization's system and its relative predictive validity on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104: 832–850.

[25] Hoff, K. A., Song, Q. C., Wee, C. J., Phan, W. M. J., & Rounds, J. (2020). Interest fit and job satisfaction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 123: 103503.

[26] Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 6: 35–45.

[27] Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

[28] Hulsheger, U. R., & Maier, G. W. (2010). The careless or the conscientious: Who profits most from goal progress? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77: 246–254.

[29] Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1332–1356.

[30] Hurst, C., Simon, L., Jung, Y., & Pirouz, D. (2019). Are "bad" employees happier under bad bosses? Differing effects

of abusive supervision on low and high primary psychopathy employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158: 1149–1164.

[31] Iliescu, D., Ispas, D., Sulea, C., & Ilie, A. (2015). Vocational fit and counterproductive work behaviors: A self-regulation perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 21–39.

[32] Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 530–541.

[33] Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 797–807.

[34] Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 36–51.

[35] Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (2001). Be careful what you wish for: Optimal functioning and the relative attainment of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. In P. Schmuck & K. M. Sheldon (Eds.), *Life goals and well-being: Towards a positive psychology of human striving*: 116–131. Ashland, OH: Hogrefe & Huber.

[36] Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119: 254–284.

[37] Lambert, L. S., Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Holt, D. T., & Barelka, A. J. (2012). Forgotten but not gone: An examination of fit between leader consideration and initiating structure needed and received. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97: 913–930.

[38] Lee, A., Willis, S., & Tian, A. W. (2018). Empowering leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, mediation, and moderation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39: 306–325.

[39] Li, N., Harris, T. B., Boswell, W. R., & Xie, Z. (2011). The role of organizational insiders' developmental feedback and proactive personality on newcomers' performance: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 1317–1327.

[40] Lysova, E. I., Fletcher, L., & El Baroudi, S. (2023, July 12). What makes work meaningful? *Harvard Business Review*.

[41] McCabe, K. O., & Fleeson, W. (2016). What is extraversion for? Integrating trait and motivational perspectives and identifying the purpose of extraversion. *Psychological Science*, 27: 1498–1509.

[42] Meglino, B. M., & Korsgaard, A. (2004). Considering rational self-interest as a disposition: Organizational implications of other orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 946–959.

[43] Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., Scullen, S. M., & Rounds, J. (2005). Higher-order dimensions of the big five personality traits and the big six vocational interest types. *Personnel Psychology*, 58: 447–478.

[44] Murtha, T. C., Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1996). Toward an interactionist taxonomy of personality and situations: An integrative situational—dispositional representation of personality traits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71: 193–207.

[45] Parks-Leduc, L., Feldman, G., & Bardi, A. (2015). Personality traits and personal values: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 19: 3–29.

[46] Pizzolitto, E., Verna, I., & Venditti, M. (2023). Authoritarian leadership styles and performance: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly*, 73: 841–871.

[47] Podsakoff, P. M., & Farh, J. L. (1989). Effects of feedback sign and credibility on goal setting and task performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 44: 45–67.

[48] Prajogo, D. I., & McDermott, C. M. (2011). The relationship between multidimensional organizational culture and performance. International. *Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 31: 712–735.

[49] Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29: 363–377.

[50] Resick, C. J., Giberson, T. R., Dickson, M. W., Wynne, K. T., & Bajdo, L. M. (2013). Person-organization fit, organizational citizenship, and social-cognitive motivational mechanisms. In A. L. Kristof-Brown & J. Billsberry (Eds.), *Organizational fit: Key issues and new directions*: 99–123. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

[51] Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30: 91–127.

[52] Rounds, J., & Su, R. (2014). The nature and power of interests. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23: 98–103.

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

[54] Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25: 1–65.

[55] Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2. doi:10.9707/2307-0919.1116.

[56] Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64: 361–388.

[57] Schaubroeck, J. M., Shen, Y., & Chong, S. (2017). A dual-stage moderated mediation model linking authoritarian leadership to follower outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102: 203–214.

[58] Sharma, P. N., & Kirkman, B. L. (2015). Leveraging leaders: A literature review and future lines of inquiry for empowering leadership research. *Group & Organization Management*, 40: 193–237.

[59] Smith, M. B., & DeNunzio, M. M. (2020). Examining personality-job characteristic interactions in explaining work outcomes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 84: 103884.

[60] Su, R., Tay, L., Liao, H. Y., Zhang, Q., & Rounds, J. (2019). Toward a dimensional model of vocational interests. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104: 690–714.

[61] Vecchione, M., & Schwartz, S. S. (2022). Personal values and academic achievement. *British Journal of Psychology*, 113: 630–652.

[62] Van Iddekinge, C. H., Putka, D. J., & Campbell, J. P. (2011). Reconsidering vocational interests for personnel selection: The validity of an interest-based selection test in relation to job knowledge, job performance, and continuance intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 13–33.