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EXAMINING WORK AS CALLING

My dissertation consists of two essays that focus on the construct of work calling. In Essay 1, I investigate the construct of calling – specifically, focusing on the moderating role of context. Researchers have struggled to define the nature of calling and have proposed different conceptualizations of calling, ranging from a religious and transcendental view to a more secular integrative view. In my essay, I review the extant literature by comparing and contrasting different conceptualizations of calling. Empirically, two primary research questions are addressed: (1) How does calling influence the following three categories of outcomes: work attitudes, emotional exhaustion and task performance? (2) How does task and social context moderate the relationship between calling and its outcomes? Data for this study was collected from 268 teachers and aides from 68 child care centers. Results indicate that individuals with stronger calling have positive work attitudes. In addition, results support the moderating role of discrete organizational context features.

In Essay 2, I contribute to the extant theory on calling by examining the affective link between calling and two forms of emotional labor, surface acting and deep acting. Specifically, I examine the role of emotional labor in mediating the relationship between calling and its outcomes. Data for this study was collected from 195 teachers and aides from 42 child care centers. Findings indicate that calling is positively related with emotional performance and negatively related with emotional exhaustion. Further, results show that calling is positively associated with emotional labor, and in particular, is positively related to deep acting and negatively related to surface acting. Further, both surface acting and deep acting mediate the relationship between calling and its outcomes.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

We are here not because of the pay, or just to have a job – but because we like what we do! (Preschool Teacher)

For over fifty years, researchers have been trying to unravel the motivations of human work (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). The way individuals craft subjective meanings and experiences about their work is linked to work outcomes such as job performance, job satisfaction, and well-being (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin & Schwartz, 1997). Recently, researchers have proposed that the deepest form of subjective career success arises when individuals perceive their work to be purposeful, meaningful or in other words their work becomes a “calling” (Hall & Chandler, 2005; Dik & Duffy, 2009). In this chapter, I provide an introduction of work as calling and state the objectives of my dissertation. Next, I describe the context of the dissertation setting – the working conditions of child care providers. Further, I state the importance of examining calling among child care providers. Finally, I provide a brief summary of Essay 1 and Essay 2.

1.1 WORK AS CALLING

People who view their work as a calling seek fulfillment by using their career to promote greater good within their community and society at large. They are not exclusively interested in
either the monetary benefits or career advancement that the job offers (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler & Tipton, 1985; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). Rather individuals with a calling work for the meaningful fulfillment of doing so (Bellah et al., 1985) and get deep enjoyment and satisfaction from engaging in one’s work (Dobrow, 2006). They perceive work to be their purpose in life (Hall & Chandler, 2005; Dik & Duffy, 2009, Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Researchers have proposed different conceptualizations of calling, some viewing calling as originating from God or a higher being (Weiss et al., 2003), or stemming from some external source, such as, destiny (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Dik and Diffy, 2009; Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). Other researchers have adopted a broader secular view and see calling as originating from within the individual (Bellah, et al, 1985; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). While researchers have spent time examining the origins of calling, very few studies have paid attention to the individual, group, and contextual factors that mediate and moderate the process of creation and promotion of having a calling (Dobrow, 2004). My dissertation, consisting of two essays, examines the influences of context and emotions on calling at work. More specifically, I pursue three major objectives.

Firstly, I examine the consequences of having a high work calling. The extant literature on calling has primarily focused on examining the relationship between calling and affective outcomes such as job satisfaction (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997), work meaningfulness, and willingness to sacrifice (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). I wish to contribute to the existing literature by examining the effects of having a calling on work attitudes, emotional exhaustion and performance.
The second objective of my dissertation is to examine the role of context in moderating the relationship between calling and its outcomes. The positive effects of having a high calling can be intensified or diminished by the context in which it is experienced. I specifically look at two aspects of context dimensions: task context and social context. While task context dimension includes factors such as autonomy and uncertainty, the social context dimension includes the degree of social influence that individuals have on each other.

The final objective of my dissertation is to examine the affective link between calling and two forms of emotional labor, surface acting and deep acting. Individuals in relational work constantly regulate their emotions in interpersonal interactions (Hochschild, 1983; Sutton, 1991; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002). The process of emotional regulation, often in the form of emotional labor, leads to positive outcomes. Specifically, I examine the role of emotional labor in mediating the relationship between calling and its outcomes: emotional exhaustion and emotional performance.

1.2 CONTEXT OF THE DISSERTATION SETTING

My dissertation sample consists of childcare providers, specifically, preschool teachers and teacher aides. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010a), preschool teachers play a significant role in child development by providing early childhood care and education. Preschool teachers employ a variety of teaching methods to introduce children who have not yet entered kindergarten to activities and skill sets such as reading, writing, and expanded vocabulary. They also create awareness among children about physical and social sciences through innovative
instruction tools like music, films, games, artwork, and computers. Preschool teachers actively work with other colleagues, support staff, and parents to create a learning environment that inspires trust and confidence and motivates children to develop into productive citizens.

Naturally, contributing towards the process of nurturing children into fine individuals is the most rewarding and fulfilling aspect of a preschool teachers work. Other key aspects of their work are to understand the educational and emotional needs of children and develop suitable curriculum that not only enhances performance but also inculcates discipline. Preschool teachers have to undergo caregiver training and acquire qualifications, but many of these requirements differ according to State rules and regulations. These qualifications “range from a high school diploma with a national Child Development Associate (CDA) to a community college course or a college degree in child development or childhood education” (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010b).

Further, teacher assistants or aides who assist early childcare teachers need to have at least a high school diploma and on the job training.

A key focus in the early childhood care field is to ensure that everyone has access to high quality childcare. High quality childcare is characterized as certain aspects of the environment and children’s experiences that enhance and nurture child development (Layzer & Goodson, 2006). Previous research has identified two dimensions of quality childcare: structural and process. Structural quality of childcare is linked to certain aspects of childcare setting like group size, childcare provider training, education, and staff/children ratios (Philips & Howes, 1987; Howes, Whitebrook & Philips, 1992). However, these structural features vary in terms of State regulations governing staff/children ratios and group sizes. Studies show that preschool classrooms with lower staff/children ratios are associated with higher levels of classroom quality.
(Goelman, Forer, Kershaw, Doherty, Lero, & LeGrange, 2006). Process quality of childcare consists of less tangible aspects of childcare setting and focuses more on the relationship between children and the childcare providers, peers, and the nature of supervision provided in the classroom (Vandell, 2004).

As more and more women are joining the labor force, the demand for early child care has been steadily increasing. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010c) “women’s labor force participation is significantly higher today than it was in the 1970s, particularly among women with children. According to the projected trends, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010a) suggests that in between 2008 and 2018, the preschool teacher profession will grow by 19 percent, a robust growth rate much faster than the average for all professions. However, a major challenge facing the profession is high incidence of teacher turnover, with more than a third of childcare workers quitting their jobs each year. The reasons for high turnover in the childcare profession include low pay, stressful work, inadequate benefits, and lack of training opportunities. In May 2009, the median annual wages of preschool teachers were $24,540; the bottom 10 percent earned less than $16,420; the middle 50 percent earned $19,280 to $32,240; and the top 10 percent earned more than $43,570 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010c). Childcare workers and managers constantly worry about declining levels of care quality due to high turnover rates and working with inadequately trained coworkers (Whitebook & Bellm, 1999). High turnover rates of childcare staff puts enormous pressure on existing staff as they have to cope with the extra burden and also assist in efforts to integrate the new staff members.
The low wages of child care workers are also coupled with poor benefits. For many years, researchers (Modigliani, 1986; Whitebook, 1999; Whitebook, Howes, & Phillips, 1990, 1998) have examined the problem of low wages of child care workers. Some of the reasons offered are “institutional barriers to improving child care jobs, such as insufficient funding, lack of organizational representation, a stark resistance to national program standards, and unsupportive reimbursement and funding policies” (Whitebook, 1999). Some researchers have also argued that these low wages are due to child care work falling in the category of caring work and having a high representation of women, as they constitute almost 90% of the child care workforce (Ackerman, 2006). Caring work is defined as “any occupation in which the worker provides a service to someone with whom he or she is in personal contact” and is concerned about their welfare (England & Folbre, 1999). Childcare is still considered a predominantly female work and is viewed as an “extension of a women’s familial role of rearing children” (Whitebook, Howes, & Phillips, 1990). Due to a lack of clear distinction between a profession and a personal responsibility or a societal role, childcare work through the ages has been undervalued, both in financial terms and social status (Folbre, 2003; Lewis, 1988; Ackerman, 2006).

The problems of low wages and high teacher turnover rates pose a major challenge in the childcare profession. High quality care is determined by the strength of the bond that exists between the child and the caregiver (Whitebook & Sakai, 2003). Findings show that children who have experienced warm and stable care giving are ready for school, are more willing to learn, and are more likely to be proficient in social and language skills. Thus, high teacher

1.3 CALLING AMONG CHILDCARE PROVIDERS

Studies show that individuals’ motives to pursue a teaching career can be grouped into three factors: altruistic, intrinsic, and extrinsic (Harms & Knobloch, 2005; Seng Yong, 1995). Some of the reasons people choose a teaching career include a need to work with young people (Brown, 1992; Joseph & Green, 1986; Serow, Eaker & Ciechalski, 1992) and to contribute to their society (Brown, 1992; Chandler, Powel & Hazard, 1971; Freidus, 1992; Toppin & Levine, 1992). The role of early childhood caregivers in creating a high quality classroom environment is vital as children look up to them for inspiration and motivation (Burchinal, Cryer, Clifford & Howes, 2002). The passion that the preschool teachers and aides have for their work is apparent in comments like the following (from the initial focus groups conducted):

“I like working with kids...[I] always wanted to do this.”

“I love the children...seeing their excitement in finally getting it!”

“We are all in tune and friends to everyone, because we all got a job that we really liked to do”

Despite the low wages, many child care providers choose to remain in the field as they view their work to be meaningful and have a passion for their work. The childcare profession seems to be a suitable context to study individuals with a high work calling. In my dissertation, I seek to examine the outcomes of having a high work calling. Early childhood care profession
suffers from one of the highest turnover rates, and studies show that teacher turnover adversely affects overall child development (Whitebook & Sakai, 2003). While the turnover rate is high, there are many child care teachers who choose to remain committed to the child care field. In my dissertation, I focus on the relationship between calling and work attitudes of child care teachers.

Researchers constantly seek to understand the mechanisms of enhancing the quality of child care provided. In my dissertation, I use ECERS-R as a measure of task performance of child care teachers. ECERS-R measures the global quality of the classroom including process features such as interactions between childcare providers and children, interactions between peers, and opportunities for cognitive stimulation. Individuals with a high calling are always looking to engage meaningfully in their work and make a difference through their work (Weiss, Skelley, Hall & Haughey, 2003). In my dissertation, I examine the link between calling and task performance. Further, I investigate features of the work context that will impact the relationship of calling and its outcomes.

A key feature of childcare work is that childcare providers must maintain long term relationships with customers (that is, children and parents). Quality childcare depends on the stability and consistency of the relationship between the child and the caregiver, and this relationship should be emotionally engaging (Leeson, 2010). Findings show that children appear happier and do well in standardized cognitive and language tests when they enjoy high quality relationship with their caregiver (Burchinal, Roberts, Nabors, & Bryant, 1996). Further, children perform better and their language and social skills are well developed in situations where the caregiver understands the emotional needs of the child and responds to such needs (Howes,
Phillips, & Whitebrook, 1992). In essence, a great degree of emotional control is key to establish and maintain good relationships with both the children and their parents. Findings suggest that the process of emotional regulation, often in the form of emotional labor, leads to increased service performance (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Totterdell & Homan, 2003). In my dissertation, I examine the affective linkages between calling and its outcomes by examining the mediating role of emotional labor.

1.4 SUMMARY: ESSAY 1

In the first essay, I examine the moderating role of task and social context and examine how these two aspects of context dimensions impact the relationship between calling and its outcomes. Previous research has largely ignored the role of contextual factors that can impact the relationship of calling and its positive outcomes, and only one study has examined the role of economic factors, such as socio economic status, that may impact an individual’s ability to pursue his/her calling (Hall & Chandler, 2005). Dobrow (2006) contends that “The effects of having a calling can be amplified or reduced depending on the social context in which it was experienced” (Dobrow, 2006, p. 140 ). The essay articulates two primary research questions: (1) How does calling influence the following three categories of outcomes: work attitudes, emotional exhaustion and performance? (2) What role does task and social context have in the relationship between calling and its outcomes? Data for this study was collected from 268 teachers and aides from 68 child care centers. Results indicate that individuals with higher calling have positive work attitudes. In addition, results support the moderating role of discrete organizational context features.
1.5 SUMMARY: ESSAY 2

In the second essay, I seek to investigate the emotional aspects of calling. Previous research strongly suggests that individuals with a greater sense of calling were more likely to have greater emotional resources (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). Through this study, I contribute to the extant theory on calling by examining the affective link between calling and two forms of emotional labor, surface acting and deep acting. Specifically, I examine the role of emotional labor in mediating the relationship between calling and its outcomes. Data for this study was collected from 195 teachers and aides from 42 child care centers. Findings indicate that calling is positively related with emotional performance. Also, calling is significantly associated with emotional labor, and in particular, is positively related to deep acting and negatively related to surface acting. Further, results show that both surface acting and deep acting mediate the relationship between calling and its outcomes.

The findings from both essays of my dissertation contribute to the extant research on calling in two ways: First, I identify outcomes of having a high work calling and second, I explicate the moderating and mediating processes influencing calling and its outcomes.

In the next section, I present my first essay entitled “Work as calling: Does context matter? Following this section, I present my second essay entitled “Consequences of having a high work calling: Examining the mediating role of emotional labor.” In the final section, I conclude with a discussion and implications of the findings of the two essays.
ESSAY 1: WORK AS CALLING: DOES CONTEXT MATTER?

Extant research on calling shows that people with a strong calling are likely to enjoy high job satisfaction and have low absenteeism (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997); are more mature about their career development process, can clearly articulate their interests and abilities, and are firm about their career choices (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007); are more likely to cope with tension due to interrole conflict (Oates, Hall, & Anderson, 2005); and are likely to experience their work as meaningful and significant (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009).

Over the years the construct of calling has evolved from a purely religious belief to a more secular construct (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Hall & Chandler, 2005). While the construct of calling has been present in classical conceptualizations, such as Weber’s (1930) concept of a specific call to the ministry (cf. Bunderson & Thompson, 2009), it is only very recently that management researchers have started to examine the importance of having a calling in an occupational context. Dobrow (2004) argues that research has paid less attention to the individual, group, and contextual factors that mediate and moderate the process of creation and promotion of having a calling. Researchers have also struggled to define the nature of calling and have proposed various different conceptualizations of calling, ranging from a purely religious view (Weiss, Skelley, Hall, & Haughey, 2003), to a more transcendental view (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Dik & Duffy, 2009), and a broader, secular view (Dobrow, 2004; 2006;
Towards that end, my research contributes in two ways: First, I examine the relationship between calling and its outcomes. The extant literature on calling has primarily focused on examining the relationship between calling and affective outcomes such as job satisfaction (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997), work meaningfulness, and willingness to sacrifice (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). I wish to contribute to the existing literature by examining the role of calling in three categories of outcomes: work attitudes, emotional exhaustion and performance.

Second, I seek to extend the theory and research on calling by focusing on the role of context in moderating the relationship between calling and its outcomes. Very little research attention has been paid to the role of contextual factors that can impact the relationship of calling and its positive outcomes. Only one study has examined the role of economic factors, such as socio economic status, that may impact an individual’s ability to pursue his/her calling (Hall & Chandler, 2005). Dobrow (2006) contends that “The effects of having a calling can be amplified or reduced depending on the social context in which it was experienced” (Dobrow, 2006, p. 140). In my paper, I examine the moderating role of task and social context and examine how these two aspects of context dimensions impact the relationship between calling and its outcomes.

My paper is organized as follows: First, I provide an overview of the different conceptualizations of calling by comparing and contrasting the different conceptualizations of calling. Next, I review the extant empirical literature on calling and propose hypotheses based on the outcomes of calling. Further, I examine the role of context in moderating the relationship between calling and its outcomes. Finally, I present the research design, data analysis, and discuss the results. Figure 2-1 depicts my research model.
2.1 DIFFERENT CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF CALLING

As seen in Table 2-1, researchers have proposed different conceptualizations of calling. The classical view of calling has been the purely religious beliefs, in which calling is seen as originating from God or a higher being (Weiss et al., 2003). The “neoclassical” view and the transcendental view try to move a step away from the purely religious origins of calling by viewing calling as stemming from some external source, e.g., destiny, and not limited to religious beliefs. Another conceptualization of calling adopts a broader secular view, and conceptualizes calling as originating from within the individual (Bellah, et al., 1985; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). I now examine these different conceptualizations of calling in greater detail.
2.1.1 Religious View of Calling

While examining the history of work as a calling, Bunderson and Thompson (2009) put forth the classic conceptualization of calling by Protestant reformers as “that place within the world of productive work that one was created, designed, or destined to fill by virtue of God-given gifts and talents and the opportunities presented by one’s station in life.” The classic formulation “places upon individuals a solemn obligation to seek their calling and to make whatever sacrifices might be required to diligently and faithfully fulfill the duties associated with it for the glory of God and the welfare of the human family.”

Adopting a Christian religious view, Weiss et al. (2003) propose that calling involves discerning “particular work or career” that God has chosen for the individual to do. They identify the following five key features of Christian views of calling: A person does not choose his or her calling, but is chosen for him or her; calling is discerned by learning and practicing to hear one’s own voice, the voice of their community, and God’s voice; calling is a career that not only provides for one’s individual needs, but also provides for the common good; calling is not doing something heroic or impossible, but that one would do for oneself, his or her loved ones, and for the common good; and the choice of a calling cannot be imposed or coerced and should be an output of a person’s free will. Thus, proponents of the religious view of calling place emphasis on individuals pursuing that line of work that has been chosen for them by God.
2.1.2 Neoclassical and Transcendental View of Calling

Moving away from the purely religious origins of calling, theorists adopting the “neoclassical” and the “transcendental” conceptualization of calling, view calling as not only emerging from a religious source (such as God, or higher being) but also from some other source external to the individual (such as destiny, or fate) (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Dik & Diffy, 2009). In a recent study, Bunderson & Thompson (2009) explore the nature and consequences of calling at work among zookeepers and find that the zookeepers’ experience of calling was similar to the classical conceptualization of calling by Protestant reformers. The authors slightly build on the classical view and propose a “neoclassical” definition of calling: “one’s calling is that place within the occupational division of labor in society that one feels destined to fill by virtue of particular gifts, talents, and/or idiosyncratic life opportunities.”

Using a neoclassical framework, Dik and Duffy (2009) draw distinctions between the constructs of calling and vocation. They propose that calling and vocation – are two “valuable, inclusive, and cross-culturally relevant” constructs within the work domain. They define calling as “a transcendent summons, experienced as originating beyond the self, to approach a particular life role in a manner oriented toward demonstrating or deriving a sense of purpose or meaningfulness and that holds other-oriented values and goals as primary sources of motivation.” And vocation as “an approach to a particular life role that is oriented toward demonstrating or deriving a sense of purpose or meaningfulness and that holds other-oriented values and goals as primary sources of motivation.” Though the overlap between the two constructs is considerable, the authors argue that only individuals with callings as opposed to
those with vocation can “connect their work to an overall sense of purpose and meaningfulness toward other oriented ends from a source external to the self.”

2.1.3 Secular View of Calling

As opposed to the classical and the neoclassical conceptualizations of calling which view calling as emanating from some source external to the individual, the secular view of calling defines calling as emerging from within the individual. In my paper, I adopt the secular view of calling. Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton’s (1985) book - *Habits of the Heart* sparked a great deal of research interest on the three types of orientation people have towards their work. According to them, people articulate their work life in three distinct ways: jobs, careers, and callings. Individuals who see their work as a job are mainly attracted towards its material aspects and benefits. In essence, for these people work is a way to accumulate material resources and time, so as to enjoy these resources at leisure. Individuals who view their work as a career are not just interested in the monetary gains of their job, but also seek psychological benefits such as career advancement, positive work status, and high social standing. In contrast, individuals who view their work as a calling are not exclusively interested in either the monetary benefits or career advancement that the job offers. Instead, they seek fulfillment by using their career to promote greater good within their community and society at large. Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, and Schwartz (1997) empirically tested the usefulness of these three orientations and found that most people were able to associate themselves with one of the three orientations: job, career, and calling.

In a recent study, Dobrow (2004; 2006) expanded the nature of calling by offering an integrated typology for having a calling, comprising of seven elements: passion; identity; need to
do it/urgency; engulfs consciousness; longevity; sense of meaning; and self-esteem. Most of the elements in her definition of calling fall under the secular view, whereby calling originates from within the individual. Dobrow proposes that that there is a strong degree of overlap between the personal and work identities of individuals. Also, individuals have a sense of passion, enjoyment and satisfaction from engaging in one’s work. However, Dobrow’s definition also alludes to the “transcendental” view of calling, specifically the element of urgency. She articulates that people possess particular gifts or talents and “feel a sense of destiny about engaging in a particular type of work.”

Hall and Chandler (2005) also adopt a broader view of calling and define calling “as work that a person perceives as his purpose in life.” They argue that calling can “arise from a set of religious beliefs or from an individual’s sense of self and meaningfulness.” They further contend that individuals who have a calling are more likely to have both objective and subjective or ‘psychological ‘success (Hall, 1976). Such individuals possess career metacompetencies - identity awareness and adaptability – “both of which aid the individual in navigating the career ‘terrain’ and a sense of psychological success” (Hall & Chandler, 2005, p. 163).

2.1.4 Summary

The primary difference among the different conceptualizations of calling is the source or origin of an individual’s calling. For the religious theorists, calling originates from a summon from God; for the transcendental theorists, calling has an external, transcendental origin, such as destiny. According to the secular conceptualization of calling, in which this paper is embedded, calling originates from within the individual. Individuals find meaning in their work and they attain fulfillment by pursuing their line of work. Despite these differences about the origins of calling, researchers generally seem to agree on the purpose of calling. Individuals with a calling
should engage in work that serves community (Weiss, et al., 2003), view their calling as a duty to society (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009), contribute to the welfare of others (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Dik & Duffy, 2009), and engage in socially valuable work and link themselves to the larger community (Bellah et. al., 1985; Wrzesniewski, et. al., 1997).

2.2 CALLING AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS

In Table 2-2, I list some constructs from the organizational behavior and social psychology literature that are closely related to having a calling. The constructs of work preferences (specifically, intrinsic motivation), work flow, and work engagement seem closely related to calling as they draw on the common theme of how individuals find meaning and satisfaction from their work (Dobrow, 2006; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Dik & Duffy, 2009). Individuals’ preferences towards their work can be intrinsically or extrinsically motivated. Intrinsically motivated individuals are drawn towards work from which they derive internal satisfaction, such as enjoyment. On the other hand, extrinsic factors which motivate people include tangible incentives, such as money and recognition (Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, & Tighe, 1994). While researchers contend that individuals who have a calling have a relatively high level of intrinsic motivation (Dik & Duffy, 2009), individuals may be intrinsically motivated towards a task due to various reasons (for example, the work enables them to develop new skills, or is interesting or ‘fun’). Also, the work preferences construct applies towards work in general rather than a particular career (Dobrow, 2006).

Individuals with a strong calling may also display work engagement (expression of ‘preferred self’; Kahn, 1990) or have “flow” experiences (enjoyable experiences;
Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). However, researchers generally agree on the long term nature of calling as opposed to the episodic duration of both work engagement and experience of “flow.”

2.3 EMPIRICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

While researchers have proposed different conceptualizations of calling, very little empirical work has been done to examine the antecedents, consequences and other moderating and mediating factors associated with calling. Table 2-3 lists some of the empirical work done on calling in the area of organizational behavior and social sciences.

Using a religious framework, Davidson and Caddell (1994) examine the social and religious bases of people’s attitude to work by asking people belonging to Protestant and Catholic congregations to choose one among the following three options that best described their
attitude to work: a calling, a career, or a job. Work as calling referred to work having a special meaning regardless of money earned and time invested; work as career referred to work that is continuously engaged over a lifetime, which is similar, though pursued in different settings; and a job referred to work that essentially is paying and provides a monetary benefit and secured future. Results show that consistent with Weber’s (1963) thesis, when people internalize religion, they are more likely to view it as a calling than a career. Work factors, such as, full-time employment, job security and relatively large incomes are associated with people viewing their work as a calling.

Adopting a neoclassical definition of calling, Bunderson and Thompson (2009) explore the nature and consequences of calling at work among 982 U. S. zookeepers. The source of the zookeepers’ calling is external to their self; they need to discover their talents and embrace their work. The zookeepers’ experience of calling is found to be similar to the classical conceptualization of calling by Protestant reformers where overall calling was positively associated with occupational identification, moral duty, work meaningfulness, occupational importance, willingness to sacrifice, and perceived organizational duty. In addition, they found that occupational identification mediated the relationship between calling and both work meaningfulness and occupational importance; and moral duty mediated the relationships between calling and both a willingness to sacrifice and perceived organizational duty. The authors’ conclude that “calling leads people to identify with an occupation, view their work as a moral duty, derive meaning, and make sacrifices.”

Using a “transcendental” conceptualization of calling, Duffy and Sedlacek (2007) examine how the presence of calling and search for a calling is linked to the indices of career development in a group of first year college students. The presence of calling referred to a
student feeling “called to pursue a certain type of career” and was measured by two statements: “I have a calling to a particular kind of work”, and “I have a good understanding of my calling as it applies to my career.” The search for calling referred to a student “searching for a calling to a certain career” and was measured by two statements: “I am trying to figure out my calling in my career”, and “I am searching for a calling as it applies to my career.” The authors define calling as “the external pull some individuals may feel to pursue a certain career path” (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007, p. 591). Career development was measured through the following variables: career decidedness; career choice comfort; self clarity; indecisiveness; choice of work salience; lack of educational information. They found that the presence of calling is positively associated with decidedness, comfort, self clarity and choice-work salience and negatively associated with indecisiveness and lack of educational information. Further, they found that the search for a calling was negatively associated with decidedness, comfort, self clarity, and choice-work salience and positively associated with indecisiveness and lack of educational information. Thus, overall students having a calling were more mature in their career development process, whereas students searching for a calling were less mature in their career development process.

In another study, Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin and Schwartz (1997) provide empirical support for the three different work orientations – job, career, and calling – outlined by Bellah, et al. (1985) by adopting a broader secular approach. Respondents were asked to read three paragraphs about job, career, and calling dimensions and then indicate which one of them matched their views about work. A job was defined as “focus on financial rewards and necessity rather than pleasure or fulfillment and not a major positive part of life”. A career was defined as “focus on advancement”, and calling referred to “focus on enjoyment of fulfilling, socially useful work”. The study examines issues such as: how easy it is for people to classify themselves along
the three dimensions; what features of each dimension may be most significant; what objective and psychological features of occupations or persons are related to each dimension; and what the correlates of viewing one’s work as a job, career, or calling might be. The study’s sample included respondents from two work sites with a wide range of occupations – clerical to administrative personnel. Findings show that most respondents are able to clearly recognize the job-career-calling distinction; respondents with calling orientation have high levels of health and work satisfaction; respondents in lower level occupations view themselves “having either a job or a career”; and “satisfaction with life and with work” is linked to a person’s view about “his/her work than on income or occupational prestige”.

To find support for her integrated typology of calling, Dobrow (2006), uses a longitudinal study design to investigate the calling of high school students who wish to pursue a music career. She examines issues such as the nature of calling, the factors that play into the initial development of a calling (baseline level), the factors that influence how calling might change over time (trajectory), and the extent to which initial calling and change in calling influence behavioral, cognitive and affective outcomes. Results indicate that in general the initial development of calling and the change in calling depended on the musicians’ “involvement in calling domain and the social encouragement they received”, especially by their peers. Further, it was found that initial calling as well as change in calling were positively associated with the behavioral outcome - attending a music-oriented program; they were positively associated with all three cognitive outcomes - overestimating one’s musical abilities, ignoring discouraging career advice, and intending to pursue music professionally; and they were positively associated with general satisfaction with music.
Empirical findings generally support the positive effects of calling on an individual’s work life. For instance, calling respondents scored highest on the following variables: greater life, health, job satisfaction with better health (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997). Further, in comparison with respondents who viewed their work as a job, calling respondents missed significantly fewer days of work. Bunderson and Thompson’s (2009) findings also support the positive outcomes of calling. They find that zookeepers with a greater sense of calling perceived their work as meaningful and significant. However, the authors also note that the outcomes of having a calling are not always positive, and may have a cost associated with it. For instance, zookeepers with a high sense of calling were more likely to sacrifice money, time, and physical comfort or well-being for their work, and experienced heightened expectations. While studies have focused their attention on the affective outcomes of calling, there is not much known about how calling affects performance. Individuals with a calling gain deep enjoyment and satisfaction from their work and also view their work as a moral duty (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). I wish to contribute to the extant literature on calling by studying the effect of calling on performance. I contend that individuals with a stronger calling are more likely to engage in greater performance. In the next section, I examine in detail the effects of calling on work attitudes, emotional exhaustion, and performance and propose a few hypotheses.

2.4 THEORY

2.4.1 Outcomes of Calling

Work attitudes. Researchers have generally agreed on the construct of job satisfaction as an emotional state resulting from the evaluation or appraisal of one’s job experiences (Locke,
1976). This view of job satisfaction includes both cognitive and affective elements (Judge & Ilies, 2004). Calling is positively associated with general life satisfaction (Dobrow, 2004; Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006) as well as job satisfaction (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997; Dobrow, 2006). Individuals with a calling find their work meaningful (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009), have a passion for their work, and get deep enjoyment and satisfaction from their work (Dobrow, 2006). In their study on administrative assistants, Wrzesniewski, et al., (1997) found that employees who had a calling reported significantly higher job satisfaction.

Researchers have argued that the extent to which individuals’ jobs and communities are aligned with other aspects of their life spaces affect their intent to turnover (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001). Individuals with a strong calling have a desire that their work is socially valuable, significant and links them to the larger community (Bellah, et al., 1985). Such individuals are likely to have a greater investment in their jobs, in terms of resources that they put into the job. Individuals with a strong calling also have their personal and work identities tightly intertwined (Dobrow, 2006). They derive satisfaction from engaging in their work, are more likely to perceive their organizations as more attractive, and are likely to have a greater investment in their jobs thereby displaying higher levels of organizational commitment and lower intention to turnover (Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous, 1988).

Thus, I propose that individuals with a stronger calling will have positive work attitudes towards their organization and they will enjoy greater job satisfaction, higher organizational commitment and lower intention to turnover.

Hypothesis 1a: Workers reporting a stronger calling will have greater job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1b: Workers reporting a stronger calling will have a lower intent to turnover.
Hypothesis 1c: Workers reporting a stronger calling will have greater organizational commitment.

**Emotional Exhaustion.** Emotional exhaustion is defined as a state of plain enervation and mental fatigue, and is strongly linked to job burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Generally, people with a strong calling find their work to be meaningful and gratifying and therefore experience less stress (Dobrow, 2006). While most researchers argue that having a calling leads to less emotional exhaustion, some see a positive link between calling and emotional exhaustion. A reason for these mixed findings can be attributed to the different conceptualizations of calling utilized in these studies. For instance, Bunderson and Thompson, (2009) adopt a neoclassical view of calling which characterizes the bond between zookeepers and their work as forged by destiny and duty. They argue that zookeepers with a high calling are more willing to make sacrifices in terms of money, time and physical comfort for their work, thereby resulting, in more stress and emotional exhaustion.

In contrast, the secular view of calling characterizes the source of calling as both internal (self) as well as external (destiny). Individuals have been characterized as having a “will to meaning” (Frankl, 1963), which is “an innate drive to find meaning and significance” in one’s life. While the lack of meaning in one’s life is linked with depression and anxiety, having meaning in one’s life has been related to greater work enjoyment and happiness (Steger, et al., 2006). Researchers find that when individuals perceive their work as meaningful and are engaged in it because of their inner desire, they have less stress and emotional exhaustion (Treadgold, 1999; Steger et al., 2006). Thus, I argue that

Hypothesis 2: Workers reporting a stronger calling will have lower emotional exhaustion.
**Contextual and Task Performance.** Van Scotter, Motowidlo and Cross (2000) define contextual performance as “behavioral patterns that support the psychological and social context in which task activities are performed” (p. 526). Contextual performance goes outside the boundaries of a worker's job description, and includes “non-job specific behaviors, such as cooperating with coworkers” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). It shares conceptual similarity with constructs such as organizational citizenship behavior and prosocial organizational behavior (Conway, 1999). Researchers agree that individuals with a strong calling view their work as a means to contribute to the common good of others and have a constant desire to see their work as being socially valuable and significant (Bellah, et al., 1985; Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). They are willing to invest considerable time and energy to make a difference through their work and are therefore more likely to engage in contextual performance. Thus, I propose that,

*Hypothesis 3a: Workers reporting a stronger calling will show greater contextual performance.*

Task performance refers to “patterns of behavior that are directly involved in producing goods or services, or activities that provide indirect support for the organization's core technical processes” (Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000; p. 526). While researchers disagree on the source of calling, there is much more consensus on how individuals should pursue their calling. Researchers contend that individuals with a calling develop career metacompetencies, such as, identity awareness and adaptability, which help them to shape their career (Hall & Chandler, 2005). Individuals with a strong self-awareness are able to discern when their skills need to be updated, and individuals with strong adaptability are able to take action that will help them to acquire those skills, thus enabling the individuals to be self-directed learners. The classical view
purports that individuals should use their God-given gifts and talents to work productively for the benefit of humankind. Such individuals are willing to invest considerable time and energy to make a difference through their work (Weiss, et al., 2003). Individuals with a calling also have a strong sense of personal moral duty which prompts them to expend increased effort towards their work (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). Such individuals feel morally obligated to use their gifts, that is, their talents and skills, for the benefit of others. Thus, I argue that individuals with a strong calling are more likely to put increased effort in their work roles, thereby, exhibiting greater task performance. In their study on educators, Serow, Eaker, and Ciechalski (1992) found that prospective teachers with a calling towards their work were more committed, enthusiastic, and were eager to accept extra duties and teach for longer periods. Thus,

*Hypothesis 3b: Workers reporting a stronger calling will show greater task performance.*

### 2.5 THE ROLE OF CONTEXT

Human work within organizations does not occur in a vacuum, and is embedded within a milieu or an organizational “context” (Ross & Nisbett, 1991; Mowday & Sutton, 1993). Work context provides a rich source of interpersonal, social, and cognitive stimuli that shape organization behavior and determine work outcomes (Rousseau & Fried, 2001; Johns, 2001). Though the importance of contextual implications within organization behavior seems so obvious, previous research has ignored it or at best treated it as an appendage to the main findings. Johns (2006) argues that organizational context has been studied “in a piecemeal
fashion”, and often has gone “unmeasured and unmentioned.” Further, he finds that, even when measured, it is used as a control variable, thereby “controlling away” the impact of context. However, studies are emerging that articulate context as a distinct conceptual construct, operationalize it as a variable, measure the variance it generates, and directly implicate it in their analyses (Griffin, 2007).

Recent research on organizational context suggests that: contextual variables such as openness climate foster communication and participation within teams, thereby enhancing team performance (Mathieu, Maynard, Taylor, Gilson, & Ruddy, 2007); consensus in work role requirements is impacted by contextual factors such as occupational interdependence, autonomy, and routinization (Dierdorff & Morgeson, 2007); contextual factors such as organization values and organization structure influence the effectiveness of certain HR practices and their adoption (Toh, Morgeson, & Campion, 2008); and contextual factors (task, social, and physical) significantly influence managerial role requirements (Dierdorff, Rubin, & Morgeson, 2009).

In a broad sense, these findings show that organizational context might influence the way individuals ascribe meaning to their work. Hall and Chandler (2005) propose that the “enactment of a calling is the product of situational factors and an individual’s agency with a context.” In other words, individuals with a strong calling maneuver themselves within their contextual environment, due to a strong degree of overlap between their personal and work identities. Dobrow (2004) is more explicit about the contextual influences on calling as she identifies the following careers for further study: artists, musicians, humanitarian workers, and non-profit sector workers. In essence, I believe that context and the processes involved in the enactment of an individual’s calling are intertwined.
Before I develop specific hypothesis for contextual influences on calling, I provide a theoretical overview of organizational contexts. Cappelli and Sherer (1991) define context as “the surroundings associated with phenomena which help to illuminate that phenomena, typically factors associated with units of analysis above those expressly under investigation.” Context, according to Mowday and Sutton (1993) is a “stimuli and phenomena that surround and thus exist in the environment external to the individual, most often at a different level of analysis.”

Johns (2006) offers a comprehensive theoretical exposition on the role of context in organizational behavior. Context is defined as “situational opportunities and constraints that affect the occurrence and meaning of organizational behavior as well as functional relationships between variables.” In particular, the study identifies the following different facets of context: Context as situational salience, context as situational strength, context as cross-level effect, context as configuration of stimuli, context as an event, context as a shaper of meaning, and context as a constant. Further, Johns (2006) proposes two dimensions of context: Omnibus context, and discrete context. Omnibus context refers to very broad in scope and considers many features and particulars such as occupation (who), time (where), location (when) and rationale (why). Whereas, discrete context consists of “variables or levers” that “shape behavior or attitudes, and is viewed as nested within omnibus context such that the effects of omnibus context are mediated by discrete contextual variables or their interactions.”

Johns (2006) identifies three sets of salient dimensions of discrete context – task, social, and physical. Task context includes dimensions such as autonomy, uncertainty, accountability, resources, etc. Social context includes dimensions such as social density, social structure, social influence, etc. And physical context includes dimensions such as temperature, light, built environment, décor, etc.
Because calling is known to develop and evolve “over long periods of time, rather than being a static, often-hidden”, just waiting to be discovered, contextual factors are directly implicated in the process (Dobrow, 2004; Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). Towards that end, my paper examines the effects of two key dimensions of discrete context – task and social – on an individual’s calling. Researchers agree that the degree of discretion or autonomy that individuals have is an important contextual factor (Parker, Wall, & Jackson, 1997). Also, organizations differ in terms of their motives (for profit versus non-profit) and the extent of government regulations. I examine these two factors of work discretion and organization type as task context factors. The social context dimension includes the degree of social influence that individuals have on each other. Researchers agree that the interpersonal aspects of social context are influenced by the interdependence of outcomes as well as the extent of information sharing (Kelley, et al., 2003). Organizations differ in the extent to which they encourage employee input into organizational decisions. I examine the effects of task interdependence and participative decision making as social context factors influencing the relationship between calling and its outcomes.

2.5.1 Task Context

Work Discretion. Discretion refers to an individual’s degree of freedom in structuring his/her work elements such as job scheduling and work preferences (Ashforth & Saks, 2000). Having a high amount of discretion enables individuals to organize and schedule their own work (Ortega, 2009). Several studies have shown that having increased work discretion is related positively with employee well-being (Karasek, 1979; Fried & Ferris, 1987; Parker, 2003). Further, studies also show that work discretion is linked to higher levels of performance (Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger, & Hemingway, 2005; Langfred & Moye, 2004).
Individuals with a high calling seek to engage in work that is purposeful, meaningful, and significant for both themselves and the organization they work for. Giving such individuals a high degree of work discretion will allow them to fully engage in their work and derive satisfaction. Having freedom and flexibility in performing their day-to-day work will enable individuals with a strong calling to have more positive work attitudes, feel less emotional exhaustion and perform better. Thus, I propose the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 4: The relationship between calling and its outcomes will be stronger for employees who report high work discretion than for those who report less work discretion. Specifically,*

*H4a: The relationship between calling and job satisfaction will be more positive for employees who report high work discretion than for those who report less work discretion.*

*H4b: The relationship between calling and intent to turnover will be more negative for employees who report high work discretion than for those who report less work discretion.*

*H4c: The relationship between calling and organizational commitment will be more positive for employees who report high work discretion than for those who report less work discretion.*

*H4d: The relationship between calling and emotional exhaustion will be more negative for employees who report high work discretion than for those who report less work discretion.*

*H4e: The relationship between calling and contextual performance will be more positive for employees who report high work discretion than for those who report less work discretion.*

*H4f: The relationship between calling and task performance will be more positive for employees who report high work discretion than for those who report less work discretion.*

**Organization Type.** Data for this study has been collected from child care providers in the United States. Center-based child care in the United States is offered by both for-profit and non-
profit providers. Studies show that in general non-profit centers have higher quality (Phillips, Howes, & Whitebook, 1992; Whitebook, et. al., 1990; Sosinsky, Lord, & Zingler, 2007) and some of the factors attributed for this difference in quality are caregiver wages, caregiver education, fewer children per adult to care, and positive caregiver interactions in non-profit classrooms (Sosinsky, Lord, & Zingler, 2007).

In non-profit centers, the nature of management intent is best described as “altruistic” (Morris & Helburn, 2000). Individuals with a strong calling constantly evaluate the purpose of their work activities within a job and how these contribute to the common good and welfare of others (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Dik & Duffy, 2009). Such individuals are more likely to be able to pursue their calling in non-profit centers, where they would see a close alignment between their purpose and the organization’s purpose. In addition, higher quality indices, such as fewer children per adult to care, will enable individuals with a strong calling to engage meaningfully in their work. I contend that higher center quality as well as the “altruistic” management intent in non-profit centers will provide a suitable context and thereby strengthen the relationship between calling and its outcomes. Therefore, I propose that individuals with stronger calling are more likely to experience positive work outcomes in non-profit organizations.

_Hypothesis 5: The relationship between calling and its outcomes will be stronger for employees who work in non-profit organizations than for those who work in for-profit organizations._

Specifically,

_H5a: The relationship between calling and job satisfaction will be more positive for employees who work in non-profit organizations than for those who work in for-profit organizations._
H5b: **The relationship between calling and intent to turnover will be more negative for employees who work in non-profit organizations than for those who work in for-profit organizations.**

H5c: **The relationship between calling and organizational commitment will be more positive for employees who work in non-profit organizations than for those who work in for-profit organizations.**

H5d: **The relationship between calling and emotional exhaustion will be more negative for employees who work in non-profit organizations than for those who work in for-profit organizations.**

H5e: **The relationship between calling and contextual performance will be more positive for employees who work in non-profit organizations than for those who work in for-profit organizations.**

H5f: **The relationship between calling and task performance will be more positive for employees who work in non-profit organizations than for those who work in for-profit organizations.**

### 2.5.2 Social Context

**Task Interdependence.** Task interdependence is defined as “the degree to which group members need to work closely with others, share material, information, and expertise in order to complete their tasks” (Cummings, 1978). Most modern work roles require some form of reciprocal relationships with others to achieve work objectives. The degree of interdependence is high in jobs that are team-based, managerial, and have customer service settings (Dierdorff & Morgeson, 2007). Research findings on the effects of task interdependence, however, have been mixed, some suggesting positive outcomes, whereas others suggesting that it leads to negatives.
outcomes, such as conflict. Lam and Chin (2004) find that a high degree of task interdependence fosters increased interaction among group members, thereby providing more opportunities and incentives for collaboration action. High levels of task interdependence within a group also result in greater physical proximity, effective communication, increased cooperation, coordinated action, and collective planning (Gundlach, Zivnuska, & Stoner, 2006). Some researchers reporting a negative finding argue that high task interdependence intensifies interactions among team members and therefore creates more opportunities for conflict (Xie, Song, & Stringfellow, 1998). Researchers agree that “a calling links a person to the larger community, that is, a whole in which the calling of each contributes to the good of all” (Bellah, et. al., 1985). Such individuals constantly assess the purpose and significance of their work activities and how they can contribute towards the collective welfare of others (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Thus, I argue that individuals with a high work calling will thrive in conditions of high task interdependence. They will see this as an opportunity to work collectively with others to further the interests of the community through their work. Thus,

_Hypothesis 6: The relationship between calling and its outcomes will be stronger for employees who report high task interdependence than for those who report less task interdependence._

_Specifically,_

_H6a: The relationship between calling and job satisfaction will be more positive for employees who report high task interdependence than for those who report less task interdependence._

_H6b: The relationship between calling and intent to turnover will be more negative for employees who report high task interdependence than for those who report less task interdependence._
**H6c:** The relationship between calling and organizational commitment will be more positive for employees who report high task interdependence than for those who report less task interdependence.

**H6d:** The relationship between calling and emotional exhaustion will be more negative for employees who report high task interdependence than for those who report less task interdependence.

**H6e:** The relationship between calling and contextual performance will be more positive for employees who report high task interdependence than for those who report less task interdependence.

**H6f:** The relationship between calling and task performance will be more positive for employees who report high task interdependence than for those who report less task interdependence.

**Participative Decision Making.** Employees with a supportive work context engage in creative efforts, thereby engendering increased performance. This enhanced performance is due to the employee’s personal characteristics as well as the characteristics of the context in which he or she works, such as relationship with supervisors, relationship with co-workers, rewards, training systems, information sharing, team processes, and participative decision making processes (Shalley, Zhou, & Oldham, 2004). Miller and Monge (1986) define participative decision making process “the extent to which an organization and its managers encourage employee input into organizational decisions.” Participative decision making is linked with “high levels of job satisfaction (overall and individual facets), commitment, involvement, performance and motivation, and low levels of physical symptoms, emotional distress, role stress, absenteeism, intent to turnover, and turnover” (Spector, 1986). In essence, participative decision making is
linked to high employee perceptions of control, thereby reducing insecurity and increasing positive outcomes (Probst, 2005). Individuals with a strong calling possess a heightened sense of self control or what Hall and Chandler (2005) call enhanced “metacompetencies” or skills. These metacompetencies – self-awareness and adaptability – will be enhanced in a work context that encourages participative decision making. Individuals with a calling will thrive in a context where they can influence organization wide decisions. Thus, I propose that an individual with a stronger calling will experience positive outcomes within a supportive work context that encourages participative decision making.

Hypothesis 7: The relationship between calling and its outcomes will be stronger for employees who report greater participative decision making than for those who report lesser participative decision making.

H7a: The relationship between calling and job satisfaction will be more positive for employees who report greater participative decision making than for those who report lesser participative decision making.

H7b: The relationship between calling and intent to turnover will be more negative for employees who report greater participative decision making than for those who report lesser participative decision making.

H7c: The relationship between calling and organizational commitment will be more positive for employees who report greater participative decision making than for those who report lesser participative decision making.

H7d: The relationship between calling and emotional exhaustion will be more negative for employees who report greater participative decision making than for those who report lesser participative decision making.
The relationship between calling and contextual performance will be more positive for employees who report greater participative decision making than for those who report lesser participative decision making.

The relationship between calling and task performance will be more positive for employees who report greater participative decision making than for those who report lesser participative decision making.

2.6  METHOD

2.6.1  Sample

Data were collected through a survey of child care teachers and center directors. Existing research on calling has been done in varied settings, such as, among teenagers, zookeepers, members of religious congregations, and administrative assistants. Individuals who work with people rather than things are more likely to think of their work as a calling (Davidson & Caddell, 1994). Child care teachers are responsible for engaging the children in developmentally appropriate interactive activities and help them to build social skills. Child care teachers are responsible for engaging the children in developmentally appropriate interactive activities and help them to build social skills. Researchers note that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors play a role in individuals being drawn towards a teaching career (Seng Yong, 1995). Factors such as being able to work with young individuals as well as having an opportunity to give back to the community are some of the underlying motives why people pursue a teaching career (Chandler et al., 1971; Joseph & Green, 1986; Serow, Eaker & Ciechalski, 1992; Freidus,
1992; Brown, 1992; Toppin & Levine, 1992). Basing my study on child care teachers provides a suitable context in which to study the effects of having a calling.

Data were collected from 79 centers in two US states (32 centers in New Jersey and 47 centers in Pennsylvania). All the sites were selected from state-issued lists of licensed childcare centers. The childcare sites catered to working parents and offered full-day programming; offered classes for three- and four-year old children; and were non-religiously based. The Pennsylvania sample also included church-run programs and some federally-funded Head Start programs. The sites were sampled by geographic region to help capture the diversity of the populations in both states.

The initial phase of the study comprised of interviews and focus groups with the child care staff, which helped to develop the final survey instrument. Two data collection teams were formed to collect data from the two states. Initial contact was made in all centers to obtain information about all teachers and aides working in classrooms with 3 and 4 year old children and on an average, data was collected from three classrooms per center. The surveys were administered by the field researchers and collected back on the same day, usually during lunch, break time, or nap time. To ensure confidentiality, unique number IDs were listed for each participant at the back of the survey and no other identifying information was collected. Study participants were given a $20 gift card and each center was given a $25 gift card as a token of appreciation for participating in the study.

Two hundred and six teachers and 130 aides completed the survey instrument with an overall response rate of 91%. Surveys with missing values for some variables were excluded from the analysis and the final sample consisted of 268 teachers and aides. Also, performance
data could not be collected from 11 centers, and therefore only 68 centers were included in the final analysis. Ninety-five percent of the participants were female. The large size of women in the sample reflects the composition of the child care workforce in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010c). The average tenure of the sample was 4.34 years (s.d. = 4.89), and the average age was 39 years (s.d. = 12.4). 82 per cent of the participants were White. All the participants had high school education or higher.

2.6.2 Measures

Calling. To measure calling, four items were adapted from the questionnaire developed by Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, and Schwartz (1997). This questionnaire comprises of 18 items that distinguish three different work orientations that individuals have – job, career, and calling. Calling orientation describes those individuals who work for the meaningful fulfillment of doing so, and also have a desire that their work is socially valuable and significant (Wrzesniewski, et. al., 1997). The four items included were: “I would choose my current work life again if I had the opportunity”; “I enjoy talking about my work to others”; “My work is one of the most important things in my life”; and “My work is a chance to give back to the community” (Cronbach’s alpha = .75). Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with these four items using a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).

Work Discretion. Four items adapted from the scale developed by Jehn (1995) were used to measure work discretion (Cronbach’s alpha = .82). Items were as follows: Centers sometimes differ in how much freedom and flexibility teachers and assistants/aides have. Please answer each of the following thinking about how this center works. (1) How often can you decide on your own how to go about doing your work? (2) How often does your center allow you to be
creative? (3) When you have a new idea, how often can you try it out? (4) How often are you able to change a set process when you work? The scale ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

*Organization Type.* I controlled for organization type by categorizing the centers as either *for-profit* (coded as 0) or *non-profit* (coded as 1).

*Task Interdependence.* A four-item scale adapted from Campion, Medsker, and Higgs (1993) was used to measure task interdependence (Cronbach’s alpha = .74). Items were as follows: In a classroom, sometimes tasks or activities are done together, and sometimes one person starts and another person finishes. In your classroom, how often do you start a task or activity that is finished by someone else? In your classroom, how often do you finish a task or activity that was started by someone else? How often do you depend on the co-workers in your classroom to get your job done? How often do the co-workers in your classroom depend on you for information needed to perform their work? The scale ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

*Participative Decision Making.* Two items were used to measure participative decision making (Cronbach’s alpha = .67). Items were as follows: Different directors have different styles of decision making. Think about the way you typically make decisions that have center-wide implications, such as expanding program options, adjusting program hours or modifying program philosophy. “When you have to make decisions like that, how often do you make a tentative decision on an issue pertaining to the program and test the reactions of several teachers before making a final decision?”, “You ask a few of your most experienced staff to make key decisions regarding the program.” The scale ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (all the time).
Consequences of Calling

Work attitudes. Three different scales were used to assess job satisfaction, intent to turnover and organizational commitment.

Job Satisfaction. A five-item scale was used to measure job satisfaction (Cronbach’s alpha = .70). Items were as follows: Overall, how satisfied do you feel with the following: (1) the approach the center takes in working with children; (2) the amount of work they are expected to do; (3) their pay compared to workers at a similar level in the field; (4) the physical space available in the center; and (5) the benefits they receive. The scale ranged from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

Intent to Turnover. Five-items from the scale developed by Becker (1992) were used to measure the intent to turnover (Cronbach’s alpha = .81). Items were as follows: We’re interested in how people think about their future plans. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? (1) It is likely that I will actively look for a new job in early childhood education in the coming year; (2) It is likely that I will actively look for a new job in another field in the coming year; (3) I often think about quitting my job; (4) It would take very little change in my present work circumstances to cause me to leave this center; (5) There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this center beyond the coming year. The scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

\[1\] I ran the factor analysis using principal component analysis and found that the three measures (job satisfaction, intent to turnover, and organizational commitment) used to assess work attitudes were empirically similar. For the analyses, I ran these three measures separately. The factor analysis results are presented in Appendix A.
**Organizational Commitment.** To measure organizational commitment a four-item scale adapted from Bryk and Schneider (2002). Items were as follows: How do you feel about the center where you work and the early childhood education profession as a whole? Please answer how much you agree or disagree with each statement. (1) I wouldn’t want to work in any other center than the one I do now; (2) I would recommend this center to parents seeking a place for their child; (3) I usually look forward to each working day at this center; (4) I feel loyal to this center. The scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .85.

**Emotional Exhaustion.** The emotional exhaustion scale was adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Five items were answered on the following frequency scale: (1 = "never," 6 = "everyday"). Examples are "How often do you feel emotionally drained from your work" and "How often do you feel that working with children all day is really a strain for you." Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .88.

**Contextual performance.** A four-item scale was used to assess contextual performance. Items were as follows: Sometimes the work done by teachers and assistants/aides doesn’t involve working with children or being in a classroom. How often do you do each of the following? (1) Spend time advising or encouraging a child’s parents on issues that affect the family (such as custody disputes between parents); (2) Help the center director to solve unexpected work-related problems; (3) Work outside of normal working hours (such as work during breaks, stay late, take work home, etc.); (4) Volunteer to work on special projects or committees. The scale ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (everyday). Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .70.
Task performance. Task performance was assessed by trained observers who conducted the evaluations using the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale – Revised (ECERS-R) (Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 2005). The ECERS-R measures the quality of care provided in the classrooms by an assessment of the physical environment of the classroom and the warmth of interaction between the teacher and the children. The ECERS-R consists of 43 items within the following seven subscales – space and furnishings (e.g., room arrangement for play, child-related display), personal care routines (e.g., greeting/departing, meals/snacks), language-reasoning (e.g., encouraging children to communicate, using language to develop reasoning skills), activities (e.g., fine motor, math/number), interaction (e.g., general supervision of children, discipline), program structure (e.g., free play, group time), and parents and staff (e.g., provisions for parents, opportunities for professional growth). Each item is scored on a seven-point scale with a score of 1 representing inadequate and a score of 7 representing excellent. An overall score is calculated for each classroom across all items in the ECERS-R scale using standard scoring procedures (see Harms, et al., 2005 for more information on the ECERS scale and scoring).

Most of the data collectors were individuals who were involved in early childhood education. A week-long training program was provided to the data collectors before they carried out actual observations. On an average, the trained observers spent 4 hours to rate the ECERS-R instrument for each classroom. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was very high (.97), comparing favorably to the typical alpha value found for this instrument in past work, ranging from .81 to .91 (Harms, et al., 2005).
Control Variables

In my study, I focus on the discrete context factors, such as work discretion, which can be seen as nested within the omnibus context. The omnibus context factors have a much broader scope (Johns, 2006). I controlled for some of the omnibus context factors, such as state in which the centers were located, and annual wages of child care providers.

I initially explored age, education, classroom size, status at the individual level and Student SES, State, organization size and wages as control variables at the center level. Only status, organization size and State were found to be significantly correlated with the dependent variables of interest. Therefore, to maximize power, I included only these three variables as controls in subsequent tests of hypotheses. It would have been also useful to examine the effects of gender as a contextual variable. However, the data restricts further analysis of the effects of gender distribution in the workplace since majority of the sample consists of females (Females = 98%).

Status. Job status was represented by the job classification of the respondent. Those who held the job of teacher received a score of one and those who held the job of assistant/aide received a score of zero. Of the 268 in the final sample, approximately 62% (166) were teachers and 38% (102) were assistants/aides.

State. Data for this study was collected from two U.S. states, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. I controlled for the state in which the center was located (1 = New Jersey; 0 = Pennsylvania), since these states differ in their child care policies, rules and regulations, which in turn, can affect teacher performance.
Organization Size\(^2\). The size of the center was measured by the total number of children enrolled in the centers.

2.6.3 Analytic Strategy

Teachers and aides data was collected from several different child care centers. Due to the nested nature of the data, I used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to estimate the random coefficient models (Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, & Congdon, 2000). There were two levels of random variation. Level 1 variation includes the variation among teachers and aides within centers and Level 2 variation includes the variation among centers. Using HLM to analyze the data helped to overcome the problem of biased standard error estimates due to the interdependence of level 1 observations. First, I ran the null models (without any predictors) for the following outcome variables: work attitudes (job satisfaction, intent to turnover, organizational commitment), emotional exhaustion, and contextual performance. Next, to determine the extent of within and between group variance in the outcomes variables, I ran the one-way analysis of variance in HLM and computed the intra class correlation (ICC) coefficients (Snijders & Bosker, 1999). Results indicated that HLM was an appropriate analytic strategy since there was a significant amount of within and between-group variation in the outcome variables. I also grand-mean-centered level 1 predictors (excluding dummy-coded status variable), as suggested by Hofmann and Gavin (1998).

\(^2\) I ran some alternate analyses to determine the effects of center size more closely. There was one center with 632 enrollments. After removing it from the analysis, the mean was 83 and S.D. was 55. I ran the analysis excluding this center, but there was no change in results. I therefore retained this center in the analyses. I also grouped center size into 3 categories, (Low:1–83; Medium:84-167; and High:168-632) and then ran the analysis. I did not get any difference in results.
The model fit was estimated through deviance index values generated through the HLM analysis. The deviance index is the \(-2 \times \log\)-likelihood of a maximum-likelihood estimate (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992). For all the outcome variables, I ran models with the independent variables and the cross level interactions. To compare the models, I used the chi-square statistic to assess the difference in deviance between the two models, with the degrees of freedom equal to the difference in parameters for the two models.

The task performance construct was measured at the classroom level using the ECERS scale. Since the observations at the classroom level were not independent, I used the Generalized Estimating Equation (GEE) procedure. In the GEE procedure, the regression estimates are averaged across subjects to overcome the problems of non-independent observations (Liang & Zegler, 1986). There were 268 teachers and aides nested within 113 classrooms. The average number of teachers per center was 3.32 (harmonic mean).

### 2.7 RESULTS

All the Level 1 variables were collected from the teacher surveys and all variables at Level 2 were collected from the center director surveys. The complete list of all the study variables and the data source are presented in Table 2-4. Table 2-5 provides means, standard deviations, ICC values and correlations for all Level 1 and Level 2 variables. Data for task performance variable is excluded from this table since the variable was measured at the classroom level.
2.7.1 Results of HLM Null Models

The hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) results predicting work attitudes, emotional exhaustion and contextual performance are presented in Table 2-6 and the general estimating equation (GEE) results for task performance are presented in Table 2-7. Null models were run for the level 1 dependent variables of interest. Resulting ICC(1) values and associated chi-square tests revealed that 65 percent of the variance in job satisfaction resided between centers ($\chi^2 [68] =118.54, p < .001$), 54 percent of the variance in intent to turnover resided between centers ($\chi^2 [68] =108.49, p < .01$), 59 percent of the variance in organizational commitment resided between centers ($\chi^2 [68] =104.27, p < .01$), and 35 percent of the variance in emotional exhaustion resided between centers ($\chi^2 [68] =156.15, p < .001$), and 25 percent of the variance in extra role behavior resided between centers ($\chi^2 [68] =89.26, p = .05$).
2.7.2 Results of Outcomes of Calling

Table 2-6 summarizes the results of HLM analyses. All the “a” models include the control variables only; the “b” models add the main effects; and the “c” models add the interaction terms.

Hypothesis 1 proposes that a stronger calling will be associated with positive work attitudes (greater job satisfaction, higher organizational commitment and lower intention to turnover). Models 1b and 1c show that calling has a positive relationship with job satisfaction (β = .35, p<.01; β = .38, p<.01); models 2b and 2c show that calling has a negative relationship with the intent to turnover (β = -.41, p<.01; β = -.43, p<.01); and models 3b and 3c show that calling has a positive relationship with organizational commitment (β = .46, p<.01; β = .43, p<.01). Thus, Hypotheses 1a, 1b and 1c are fully supported.

Models 4b and 4c show that calling is significantly related to emotional exhaustion (β = -.53, p<.01; β = -.57, p<.01); Hypothesis 2 is also fully supported. Hypothesis 3a posits that a stronger calling will be associated with greater contextual performance. As seen in Model 5b and 5c, Hypothesis 3a is fully supported (β = .20, p<.05; β = .20, p<.05). The GEE results presented in Table 2-7 indicate that calling is not significantly related to task performance. Thus, Hypothesis 3b was not supported.

2.7.3 Results of the Role of Context

Task Context. To examine the impact of task context on the relationship between calling and its outcomes, I studied the effects of the following two variables: work discretion and organization type.
**Work Discretion.** Hypothesis 4 asserts that the relationship between calling and its outcomes will be stronger for employees who report high work discretion than for those who report less work discretion. Hypotheses 4a, 4b, and 4c were not supported.

As seen in Table 2-6, work discretion and calling interact to influence emotional exhaustion (Model 4c, $\beta = -.25, p<.05$), a finding consistent with Hypothesis 4d. To understand its meaning, I graphed the simple regression slopes. Figure 2-2 portrays the interactive effects of work discretion and calling on emotional exhaustion. It shows that workers with stronger calling have less emotional exhaustion when there is more work discretion than when there is low work discretion. Conversely, workers with weaker calling have more emotional exhaustion when there is more work discretion than when there is low work discretion.

As seen in Table 2-6, work discretion and calling interact to influence contextual performance (Model 5c, $\beta = .32, p<.05$). Figure 2-3 shows that workers with a stronger calling have greater contextual performance in centers with more work discretion, thereby supporting Hypothesis 4e.

As seen in Table 7, there was a moderating effect of work discretion on the relationship between calling and task performance; (Model 6b, $\beta = .17, p<.05$), thus hypothesis 4f was also supported. Figure 2-4 shows that workers with a stronger calling have greater task performance in centers with more work discretion.

---------------------------------------------

Insert Figures 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4 about here

---------------------------------------------
**Organization Type.** Hypothesis 5 states that the relationship between calling and its outcomes will be stronger for employees who work in non-profit organizations than for those who work in for-profit organizations. As seen in Tables 2-6 and 2-7, no interaction effect was found for calling and organization type. Thus, Hypotheses 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e and 5f were not supported.

**Social Context.** To assess the impact of social context on the relationship between calling and its outcomes I studied the effects of 2 variables: task interdependence and participative decision making.

**Task interdependence.** Hypothesis 6 states that task interdependence moderates the relationship between calling and its outcomes in such a way that workers with a stronger calling will have greater work outcomes when task interdependence is high. Hypotheses 6a, 6b, 6d, 6e and 6f were not supported. As shown in Table 2-6, results indicate that task interdependence and calling interact to influence organizational commitment (Model 3c, β = .11, p<.05). Figure 2-5 shows that workers with a stronger calling have greater organizational commitment when there is high task interdependence; thereby lending support to Hypothesis 6c.

-------------

Insert Figure 2-5 about here

-------------

Hypothesis 7 states that the relationship between calling and its outcomes will be stronger for employees who report greater participative decision making than for those who report lesser participative decision making. Hypotheses 7a, 7c, 7d, and 7e were not supported. As can be seen in Table 2-6, participative decision making and calling interact to influence intent to turnover (Model 2c, β = -.19, p<.05) and organizational commitment (Model 3c, β = .12, p<.05). Figure 2-
shows that workers with a stronger calling have lower intent to turnover in centers with more participative decision making, thereby supporting Hypothesis 7b. Figure 2-7 shows that workers with a stronger calling have higher organizational commitment in centers with more participative decision making, whereas workers with a weaker calling have less organizational commitment in centers with less degree of participative decision making, thereby supporting Hypothesis 7c. As seen in Table 2-7, participative decision making and calling interact to influence task performance (Model 6b, $\beta = .18$, $p<.01$). Figure 2-8 shows that workers with a stronger calling have greater task performance in centers with more participative decision making, thereby supporting Hypothesis 7f.

2.8 DISCUSSION

What are the consequences of having a high calling? What are the conditions under which workers with a high calling will thrive? My main objectives in this study were to provide answers to these two key questions. This study extends previous research by providing evidence that calling is associated with positive outcomes. A major contribution of the study is to identify the discrete context factors that enable individuals to pursue their calling.

In this study I examine two sets of relationships: First, calling and its association with outcomes such as, job satisfaction, intent to turnover, organizational commitment, emotional exhaustion, contextual performance, and task performance. Second, the effect task and social
context features have on the relationship between calling and its outcomes. I find that calling has positive outcomes in terms of work attitudes. Further, I find that discrete context features, such as work discretion, organization type, and participative decision making impact the relationship between calling and its outcomes.

Previously researchers have found that a higher calling is associated with greater job satisfaction (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997), work meaningfulness, and willingness to sacrifice (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). My study findings contribute to this stream of literature by finding evidence that a stronger calling is associated with more positive work attitudes. In other words, workers with a greater calling had higher job satisfaction, greater organizational commitment, and lower intention to turnover. Workers with a strong calling place high value on the work that they do and have a constant desire that through their work they are able to significantly contribute to the larger community (Bellah, et al., 1985). Researchers find that the degree to which individuals’ jobs and communities are aligned with other aspects of their life spaces affect their intent to turnover (Mitchell, et al., 2001). Further, there is a great degree of overlap between the personal and work identities of workers with a strong calling (Dobrow, 2006). These workers derive satisfaction from engaging in their work, are likely to perceive their organizations as more attractive, and thereby display higher levels of organizational commitment.

In my study, I also find that greater calling is associated with less emotional exhaustion. In a former study on zookeepers, Bunderson and Thompson (2009) find that zookeepers with a greater sense of calling are more willing to make sacrifices in terms of money, time and physical
comfort for their work, thereby having, greater stress and emotional exhaustion. In my study, I adopt the secular view of calling that characterizes the source of calling as both internal (self) as well as external (destiny). Thus, workers with a high calling perceive their work as meaningful and are engaged in it because of their inner desire, and therefore experience less stress and emotional exhaustion (Treadgold, 1999; Steger et al., 2006). Researchers agree that the lack of meaning in one’s life has been associated with depression and anxiety, having meaning in one’s life has been related to greater work enjoyment and happiness (Steger, et al., 2006).

I had expected workers with a stronger calling to exhibit high levels of contextual performance and task performance. While task performance includes the tasks, duties and responsibilities performed within the scope of an individual’s job description, contextual performance goes beyond the scope of a worker's job description. Contextual performance refers to the performance of task activities within the boundaries of psychological and social contexts (Van Scotter, Motowidlo, and Cross, 2000). Through their work, workers with a strong calling wish to contribute to the common good of others and have a significant impact on others in the community (Bellah, et al., 1985; Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). My study results find evidence that having a stronger calling is associated with greater contextual performance. However, I did not find support for the link between calling and task performance. Though there is no direct significant relationship between calling and task performance, it is interesting to note that this relationship becomes significant under certain discrete context conditions, such as high work discretion. Further, a possible reason for the lack of support for the relationship between calling and task performance could be due to measurement issues, since the construct of task performance was measured at the classroom level and not for the teachers at the individual level.
The second goal of my study was to examine the effects task and social context features have on the relationship between calling and its outcomes. In particular, I examine the role of two task context factors, work discretion and organization type, in influencing the relationship between calling and its outcomes. I find that workers with stronger calling have less emotional exhaustion when they have more work discretion. Further, I find that under conditions of high work discretion, workers with a stronger calling have greater levels of contextual and task performance. Studies have shown that having a high amount of discretion is positively related with employee well-being (Karasek, 1979; Fried & Ferris, 1987; Parker, 2003) and high performance (Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger, & Hemingway, 2005, Langfred & Moye, 2004). My results show that under conditions of high work discretion, workers with a strong calling are able to fully engage in their work, thereby showing higher levels of performance.

I examined organization type as the other task context feature and found no support for its moderating role in the relationship between calling and its outcomes. The study sample includes child care providers working in both for-profit and non-profit centers. Numerous studies show that in general non-profit centers have higher quality (Phillips, et al., 1992; Whitebook, et. al., 1990; Sosinsky, Lord, & Zingler, 2007) due to differences in caregiver wages, caregiver education, fewer children per adult to care, and positive caregiver interactions in non-profit classrooms (Sosinsky, Lord, & Zingler, 2007). However, a few studies have found no differences between for-profit and non-profit centers (Helburn, 1995; Morris & Helburn, 2000). In terms of differences between management philosophies, researchers generally agree that management in non-profit centers is more likely to have altruistic motives. I had expected workers with a stronger calling to see a closer alignment between their work purpose and the organization’s
purpose in non-profit centers. However, the lack of difference found between for-profit and non-profit centers implies that one will have to look deeper within these center types to understand the contextual differences between these centers. Future studies could examine specific factors such as resources and accountability in both for-profit and non-profit centers. For example, a difference in terms of resources is the inability of for-profit centers to accept charitable contributions (Sosinsky, Lord, & Zingler, 2007). Further, one could also explore higher level influences such as the rules and regulations imposed by different States. The data for this study was collected from two different states, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and these States differ in terms of the rules and regulations governing child care centers.

In terms of social context features, I examined the moderating role of task interdependence and participative decision making in the relationship between calling and its outcomes. In high task interdependence, there is greater degree of information sharing and collaboration among group members to achieve work outcomes (Cummings, 1978). In my study results, I find that workers with a stronger calling have higher organizational commitment when there is high task interdependence. Thus, in conditions of high task interdependence, workers with a strong work calling are able to work collectively with others and contribute through their work to the greater good of others (Bellah, et. al., 1985). They thereby perceive a stronger link and commitment to their organization.

The second social context feature I examine is the extent of participative decision making practices in the centers. I find that workers with a strong calling who work in organizations with more participative decision making practices had less intention to turnover, higher organizational
commitment and greater task performance. It seems that workers with a high calling can successfully voice their concerns when they work in organizations that have participative decision making practices. Such workers take active measures to enhance the work environment (Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous, 1988), thereby being able to engage meaningfully in their work. It is interesting to find that workers with a weaker calling did not have positive work outcomes when there was greater participative decision making. Similar to workers who have a low growth need strength and who do not respond positively to enriched work (Oldham, Hackman & Pearce, 1976), workers with a weaker calling are not affected by greater involvement in management practices.

Overall, the study findings make significant contributions to the extant literature on calling. Firstly, I find that having a higher calling has positive outcomes in terms of greater job satisfaction, lower intent to turnover, higher organizational commitment, lower emotional exhaustion, and greater contextual performance. As discussed earlier, the lack of a significant relationship between calling and task performance could be because of measurement issues. This certainly is one limitation of the study. However, the assessment of task performance is also a strength as this variable was measured independently by trained observers. All the other variables came from a single source, that is, the teacher survey, and may be impacted due to the common method bias. A major contribution of the study is to find evidence that discrete context features such as work discretion, task interdependence and participative decision making practices influence a worker’s ability to pursue his or her calling. Though I had not found a significant relationship between calling and task performance, when I examined the moderating role of discrete context factors, there were some interesting findings. Results show that when
there was both high work discretion and greater participative decision making practices, workers with a high calling engaged in high task performance. Thus, the study results shed light on the important moderating role of discrete context factors in influencing the relationship between calling and its outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source of Calling</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weiss, Skelley, Hall &amp; Haughey, 2003</td>
<td>Religious view – God or a higher being</td>
<td>Calling involves discerning “particular work or career” that God has chosen for the individual to do</td>
<td>Work serves community; deciding involves discernment (listening, reflection, prayer) to know the right path; discover your quintessential self or ‘genius’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunderson &amp; Thompson, 2009</td>
<td>Neoclassical view – transcendent, destiny</td>
<td>“One’s calling is that place within the occupational division of labor in society that one feels destined to fill by virtue of particular gifts, talents, and/or idiosyncratic life opportunities”</td>
<td>Embracing one’s calling as a duty to society; ‘fundamental tension’ – deep meaning does not come with real responsibility (personal sacrifices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy &amp; Sedlacek, 2007; Dik &amp; Duffy, 2009</td>
<td>Transcendental view – external to the individual but not limited to religious connotations</td>
<td>They defined calling “as a transcendent summons, experienced as originating beyond the self to approach a particular life role in a manner oriented toward demonstrating or deriving a sense of purpose or meaningfulness and that which holds other-oriented values and goals as primary sources of motivation”</td>
<td>Calling is “an ongoing process of evaluating the purpose and meaningfulness of activities within a job and its contribution to the common good or welfare” of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>View</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, &amp; Tipton, 1985; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, &amp; Schwartz, 1997</td>
<td>Secular view – originating from within the individual</td>
<td>Calling work orientation describes those individuals who work for the meaningful fulfillment of doing so, and also have a desire that their work should be socially valuable and significant</td>
<td>“A calling links a person to the larger community, a whole in which the calling of each is a contribution to the good of all.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrow, 2004, 2006</td>
<td>Secular &amp; Transcendental view – originating from within the individual; also destiny</td>
<td>Defined calling as comprising of seven elements: “passion; identity; need to do it/urgency; engulfs consciousness; longevity; sense of meaning; and self-esteem”</td>
<td>“Deep enjoyment and satisfaction from engaging in one’s work”; finding work to be meaningful and gratifying; personal and work identities are tightly intertwined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Chandler, 2005</td>
<td>Expansive view – Religious beliefs or originating from within the individual</td>
<td>Calling is “work that a person perceives as his purpose in life”</td>
<td>Important for subjective career success; person develops enhanced metacompetencies, enhanced psychological success and enhanced identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2-2. Calling and Related Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Work Engagement</th>
<th>Work Preferences (Intrinsic motivation)</th>
<th>Work flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>Personal engagement in a work context refers to “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s ‘preferred self’ in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive and emotional), and active, full role performances” (Kahn, 1990; p. 700)</td>
<td>“Intrinsic work motivation (e.g., Amabile et al., 1994; Lawler &amp; Hall, 1970) refers to the phenomenon of individuals engaging in work as an end in itself (e.g., because of the challenge it provides or because it satisfies interests) rather than as a means to some extrinsic end”</td>
<td>Flow is the “optimal experience” that occurs when “people are so involved in an activity that nothing else seems to matter; the experience itself is so enjoyable that people will do it even at great cost, for the sheer sake of doing it” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differences with calling construct</strong></td>
<td>Work engagement is episodic versus more stable calling construct</td>
<td>Work can be pursued intrinsically for reasons other than a calling; individuals who have a high calling are generally high on intrinsic motivation; work preferences does not address preference for a particular career but rather work in general</td>
<td>Flow examines experiences on an episodic basis which differs from the more stable calling construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Definition of Calling</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, &amp; Schwartz, 1997</td>
<td>Drawing inspiration from Habits of the Heart written by Bellah et al. (1985), the authors examine three distinct relations people have to their work: Jobs, Careers, and Callings. They define a person with a Calling as one who &quot;works for the fulfillment that doing the work brings to the individual&quot;</td>
<td>Survey (questionnaire) based</td>
<td>Employees at two work sites (n= 196) with a wide range of occupations including physicians, nurses, administrators, pharmacists, health educators, librarians, supervisors, computer programmers and analysts, medical technicians, administrative assistants, and clerical employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunderson &amp; Thompson, 2009</td>
<td>Adopting a “neoclassical” view of calling, they describe calling as &quot;that place within the occupational division of labor in society that one feels destined to fill by virtue of particular gifts, talents, and/or idiosyncratic life opportunities.&quot;</td>
<td>Interviews; surveys</td>
<td>982 zookeepers and 70 zoo directors from 157 different zoos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-3 (continued). Empirical Literature on Calling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Definition of Calling</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duffy &amp; Sedlacek, 2007</td>
<td>Define a calling as “a transcendent summons” toward a particular “life role” which involves other-oriented motivations.</td>
<td>A 230 item questionnaire addressing a variety of attitudinal, behavioral, and demographic variables</td>
<td>3091 first year college students at a large, mid-Atlantic, public university</td>
<td>“The presence of a calling positively correlated with decidedness, comfort, self clarity and choice-work salience and negatively correlated with indecisiveness and lack of educational information. The search for a calling negatively correlated with decidedness, comfort, self clarity, and choice-work salience and positively correlated with indecisiveness and lack of educational information. The presence of and search for a calling add unique variance in predicting career decidedness and career choice comfort”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrow, 2006</td>
<td>Defined calling as comprising of seven elements: “passion; identity; need to do it/urgency; engulfs consciousness; longevity; sense of meaning; and self-esteem”</td>
<td>Longitudinal design; survey based</td>
<td>567 high school musicians</td>
<td>Possible predictors of calling include personal characteristics, level of talent, behavioral involvement, and social encouragement; and the consequences of having a calling include domain-specific intentions and behaviors, “tunnel vision” types of cognitions, and subjective well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson &amp; Caddell, 1994</td>
<td>Examined calling from Weber’s thesis: “religion provides a framework within which some people come to think of work as having some sacred significance”</td>
<td>Survey based</td>
<td>1869 members from 31 Protestant and Catholic congregations</td>
<td>Results indicate that: respondents who worked with people thought of their work as a calling more than those who worked with things; as educational level increased, the tendency to view work as a calling also increased; females were more likely to view work as a calling; people high on religious salience and those with a high degree of religious participation viewed their work as a calling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL VARIABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Center Director Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>Center Director Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discretion</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>Center Director Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Interdependence</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Decision Making</td>
<td>Center Director Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Turnover</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>ECERS Classroom Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-5. Descriptive Statistics, ICC and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Variables (n=268)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>ICC(1)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Status</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Calling</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Work Discretion</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.236*</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Task Interdependence</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>.150**</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Intent to Turnover</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-.469**</td>
<td>-.153**</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-.548**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>-.628**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-.351**</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.209**</td>
<td>-.478**</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>-.541**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Contextual Performance</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.121*</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.156**</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>.116*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Variables (n=68)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 State</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Organization Type</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Participative Decision Making</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Organization Size</td>
<td>91.47</td>
<td>90.32</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>-.300*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
### Table 2-6. Hierarchical Linear Modeling Results for Work Attitudes, Emotional Exhaustion & Contextual Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1a</th>
<th>Model 1b</th>
<th>Model 1c</th>
<th>Model 2a</th>
<th>Model 2b</th>
<th>Model 2c</th>
<th>Model 3a</th>
<th>Model 3b</th>
<th>Model 3c</th>
<th>Model 4a</th>
<th>Model 4b</th>
<th>Model 4c</th>
<th>Model 5a</th>
<th>Model 5b</th>
<th>Model 5c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.56**</td>
<td>3.57**</td>
<td>3.56**</td>
<td>3.96**</td>
<td>3.98**</td>
<td>3.98**</td>
<td>2.26**</td>
<td>2.26**</td>
<td>2.26**</td>
<td>2.43**</td>
<td>2.42**</td>
<td>2.42**</td>
<td>2.43**</td>
<td>2.42**</td>
<td>2.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (Teacher=1; Aide=0)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (PA=0; NJ=1)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discretion</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>-0.41**</td>
<td>-0.43**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>-0.57**</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Interdependence</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Decision Making (PDM)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type (Non Profit = 1)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling X Work Discretion</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling X Task Interdependence</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling X PDM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling X Organization Type</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance Statistic</td>
<td>662.37</td>
<td>592.22</td>
<td>596.71</td>
<td>767.86</td>
<td>669.37</td>
<td>673.41</td>
<td>591.27</td>
<td>596.36</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>773.4</td>
<td>777.03</td>
<td>849.5</td>
<td>750.98</td>
<td>742.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of estimated parameters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square test</td>
<td>70.15**</td>
<td>4.49*</td>
<td>98.49**</td>
<td>4.04*</td>
<td>96.95**</td>
<td>5.09*</td>
<td>86.60**</td>
<td>3.63*</td>
<td>98.52**</td>
<td>8.37*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 2-7. General Estimating Equation Results for Task Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 6a</th>
<th>Model 6b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.45**</td>
<td>5.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (Teacher=1; Aide=0)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (PA=0; NJ=1)</td>
<td>-.97**</td>
<td>-.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discretion</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Interdependence</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Decision Making (PDM)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type (Non Profit = 1)</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling X Work Discretion</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling X Task Interdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling X PDM</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling X Organization Type</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIC\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>93.70</td>
<td>100.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QICC\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>89.42</td>
<td>101.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* p < .05; \** p < .01
\textsuperscript{a}Quasi Likelihood under Independence Model Criterion (QIC)
\textsuperscript{b}Corrected Quasi Likelihood under Independence Model Criterion (QICC)
Figure 2-1. Research Model: Summary of the Hypothesized Pattern of Relationships
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Figure 2-2. Effects of Work Discretion and Calling on Emotional Exhaustion

Figure 2-3. Effects of Work Discretion and Calling on Contextual Performance
Figure 2-4. Effects of Work Discretion and Calling on Task Performance

Figure 2-5. Effects of Task Interdependence and Calling on Organizational Commitment
Figure 2-6. Effects of Participative Decision Making and Calling on Intent to Turnover

Figure 2-7. Effects of Participative Decision Making and Calling on Organizational Commitment
Figure 2-8. Effects of Participative Decision Making and Calling on Task Performance
3.0 ESSAY 2: CONSEQUENCES OF HAVING A HIGH WORK CALLING: EXAMINING THE MEDIATING ROLE OF EMOTIONAL LABOR

3.1 INTRODUCTION

People who view their work as a calling are not exclusively interested in either the monetary benefits or career advancement that the job offers. Instead, they seek fulfillment by using their career to promote greater good within their community and society at large (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985; Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997). Individuals with a calling work for the meaningful fulfillment of doing so (Bellah et al., 1985); engage in work that serves community (Weiss, et al., 2003); view their work as a duty to society (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009); perceive work to be their purpose in life (Hall & Chandler, 2005; Dik & Duffy, 2009, Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007); contribute to the welfare of others (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Dik & Duffy, 2009); and engage in socially valuable work (Bellah et. al., 1985; Wrzesniewski, et. al., 1997). Researchers agree that having a high calling leads to positive outcomes such as job satisfaction (Dobrow, 2006) and organizational commitment (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009).

Very few studies have made an attempt to examine why having a high work calling translates to positive outcomes, such as job satisfaction and work meaningfulness. In their study on zookeepers, Bunderson and Thompson (2009) find that occupational identification mediates the relationship between calling and work meaningfulness. Further, they find that occupational
identification mediates the relationship between calling and perceived social importance of one’s occupation. Thus, zookeepers with a high calling have a greater identification with the zookeeping community and its ideologies which enables them to perceive their work as significant and important. Though researchers have focused on the cognitive aspects of calling, such as how individuals with a high calling think and ascribe meaning to their work, I argue that what is missing is the affective link between calling and its outcomes. In essence individuals with a high calling are deeply involved and passionate about their work and have greater emotional resources (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). I contend that such individuals will be able to actively shape their emotions and engage in emotional regulation. Findings suggest that the process of emotional regulation, often in the form of emotional labor, leads to increased organizational effectiveness (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1989; Fineman, 1993); increased service performance (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Totterdell & Homan, 2003); and higher levels of job satisfaction (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). In this paper, I aim to explore the affective side of calling by examining the role of emotional labor in mediating the positive relationship between calling and its outcomes such as emotional exhaustion and emotional performance.

The study is organized as follows: Firstly, I examine the outcomes of having a high calling. Secondly, I review the construct of emotional labor and examine the link between calling and emotional labor. Next, I examine the role of emotional labor in mediating the relationship between calling and its outcomes. Finally, I present the research design, data analysis, and discuss the results. Figure 3-1 shows the research model.
3.2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

3.2.1 Outcomes of Calling

Empirical findings generally support the positive effects of calling on an individual’s work life. For instance, calling respondents scored highest on the following variables: greater life, health, job satisfaction with better health (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997). Further, in comparison with respondents who viewed their work as a job, calling respondents missed significantly fewer days of work. Bunderson and Thompson’s (2009) research also confirms these positive, meaning-related outcomes of calling. They find that zookeepers with a greater sense of calling were more likely to feel that their work was both meaningful and important. However, the authors also note that the consequences of having a calling are not always positive, and may have a cost associated with it. For instance, zookeepers with a high sense of calling were more likely to sacrifice money, time, and physical comfort or well-being for their work, and experienced heightened expectations.

Emotional Exhaustion. Emotional exhaustion is defined as a state of plain enervation and mental fatigue, and is strongly linked to job burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Generally, people with a strong calling find their work to be meaningful and gratifying and therefore experience less stress (Dobrow, 2006). The secular view of calling characterizes the source of calling as both internal (self) as well as external (destiny). Individuals have been characterized as
having a “will to meaning” (Frankl, 1963), which is “an innate drive to find meaning and significance” in one’s life. While the lack of meaning in one’s life is linked with depression and anxiety, having meaning in one’s life has been related to greater work enjoyment and happiness (Steger, et al., 2006). Researchers find that when individuals perceive their work as meaningful and are engaged in it because of their inner desire, they have less stress and emotional exhaustion (Treadgold, 1999; Steger et al., 2006). Thus, I argue that

Hypothesis 1: Calling will be negatively associated with emotional exhaustion.

Emotional Performance. Emotional performance is defined as an “individual’s emotional responsiveness and attunement to another’s needs and goals” (Biringen, Robinson, & Emde, 1998). Some researchers view emotional performance as the display of genuine expression of a role-required emotion (Bono & Vey, 2007). Many occupations require the expression of positive emotions. For example, researchers have studied the influence of positive emotions in customer service settings (e.g., Barger & Grandey, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009). Some studies have also looked at occupations requiring negative display of emotions, such as bill collectors (Sutton, 1991). Individuals with a strong calling view their work as a means to contribute to the common good of others and have a constant desire to see their work as being valuable and significant (Bellah, et al., 1985; Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Some of the reasons people choose a teaching career include a need to work with young people (Brown, 1992; Serow, Eaker & Ciechalski, 1992) and to contribute to their society (Brown, 1992; Freidus, 1992; Toppin & Levine, 1992). Thus, I argue that individuals with a high calling are more likely to engage in emotional performance.

Hypothesis 2: Calling will be positively associated with emotional performance.
3.3 EMOTIONAL LABOR

A specific stream of research that examines emotion regulation as part of job role is *emotional labor* (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000). Managing emotions for a wage has been termed as emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Grandey, 2000). Hochschild (1983) defined emotional labor as “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display.” She argued that people often suppress feelings and display socially accepted emotions and regulation of this kind aimed at complying with societal norms is known as ‘emotion work.’ When the job roles or organizational display rules require the employees to exhibit particular emotions and suppress others, the emotion regulation is done for a wage. She argued that “service workers and customers share expectations about the nature of emotions that should be displayed during the service encounter”. These expectations shaped by societal and organizational norms were termed as ‘display rules’ by Ekman (cf Morris & Feldman, 1996). To adhere to these display standards, service workers are expected to act ‘friendly’ and mask anger and disgust, even when the client/customer behavior is not ‘friendly.’

Hochschild (1983) proposes that emotions can be managed through two basic methods: surface acting and deep acting. First, surface acting occurs by simulating emotions that are not actually experienced. In this type of acting there is incongruence between experienced and expressed emotion (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Second, deep acting involves actively inducing, suppressing, and shaping emotions. Hochschild (1983) gives an example of how flight attendants successfully produced appropriate emotions and suppressed inappropriate ones. She
argues that this change might be due to training sessions aimed at teaching flight attendants to imagine the “cabin as their living room, passengers as their guests, and to treat difficult passengers as children who need attention.” Hochschild (1983) emphasized that emotional labor primarily leads to negative outcomes for employees, such as stress and poor psychological well-being. She argued that there might be a strong and positive relation between emotional labor and job stress and psychological distress. The emotional display rules require employees to suppress negative emotions and the lack of a healthy expressive outlet results in emotional exhaustion and burnout. She ascribed this to phenomena known as ‘emotional dissonance.’ A service provider experiences emotional dissonance when he/she expresses organizationally desired emotions that do not represent his/her true feelings, thus creating a state of incongruence and in turn resulting in conflict and tension.

Using emotion regulation theory, Grandey (2000) compares surface and deep acting to response and antecedent focused emotional labor respectively. Grandey (2000) defines emotional labor as “the process of regulating feelings and expression of emotions in order to achieve organizational goals.” According to the general model of emotion regulation, the situation provides a cue to the individual, and the individual’s emotional response tendency informs that individual and others in the social environment. Emotion regulation can occur at two points in this process – antecedent focused and response focused. Grandey (2000) argues that these two processes of emotion regulation correspond to the emotional labor concept of deep acting and surface acting. She proposes that in antecedent focused emotion regulation, “an individual can regulate the precursors of emotion such as the situation or the appraisal.” In emotional labor terms this means employing strategies like “calling to mind events that bring about the emotions
needed in a certain situation or changing the attentional focus of personal thoughts about the situation.” In response focused emotion regulation, the individual modifies the physiological or observable signs of emotions. In emotional labor terms this means that the individual will change “his or her emotional expression instead of attempting to alter actual feelings” (Grandey, 2000).

To summarize, the constructs of surface and deep acting are conceptually different and they represent different motives. When individuals engage in deep acting, they make an effort to modify their emotions to match the required displays. The intent, then, is to seem authentic to the audience; thus, deep acting has been called “faking in good faith’ (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987: 32). In surface acting, employees modify their displays without altering inner emotions. This leads to emotional dissonance, or the “tension felt when expressions and feelings diverge” (Hochschild, 1983). Thus, surface acting seems to have negative effects on employee well-being. Employees perform deep acting with the intention to appear more authentic leading to better performance. Surface acting, on the other hand, will be more strongly related to employee well-being than deep acting. In the next section, I examine the relationship between calling and emotional labor.

3.3.1 Calling and Emotional Labor

Individuals with a high sense of calling enjoy high life and job satisfaction and have low absenteeism (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). Such individuals are more mature about their career development process, can clearly articulate their interests and abilities, and are firm about their career choices (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Individuals with a high calling perceive their work as intrinsically meaningful (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997). I argue that these individuals would be more likely to expend increased effort in actively inducing and
shaping their emotions, thereby engaging in more deep acting and less surface acting. In deep acting, individuals would make an effort to alter their inner feelings to match their emotional displays. In surface acting, feelings are changed from the “outside in,” whereas feelings are changed from the “inside out” in deep acting (Hochschild, 1983). Individuals with a strong calling are less likely to engage in surface acting, as they would not want to “mask” their expressions of emotions but rather make an effort to genuinely alter their emotions. The passion and meaningfulness that individuals with a high calling derive from their work, will prompt them to engage in deeper forms of emotional regulation, such as deep acting. Through engaging in deep acting, such individuals will attempt to express genuine emotions rather than feigned emotions. Thus, I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 3a: Calling will be negatively associated with surface acting.*

*Hypothesis 3b: Calling will be positively associated with deep acting.*

### 3.3.2 Surface Acting and Deep Acting as Mediating Mechanisms

Through engaging in more deep acting rather than surface acting, individuals with a high calling will be more emotionally sensitive and emotionally involved in their interpersonal interactions at work. Emotional exhaustion is defined as a state of plain enervation and mental fatigue (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In surface acting, there is a gap between individuals’ inner emotions and the expressed emotions that is harmful to the physical and psychological well-being of employees (Hochschild, 1983). Several studies find a positive association between surface acting and emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Martinez-Inigo, Totterdell, Alcover, & Holman, 2007). In deep acting, individuals attempt to
minimize the gap between inner and expressed emotions. However, researchers contend that the modification of internal states in deep acting is effortful and may lead to a reduction of cognitive resources, and lead to emotional exhaustion (Grandey, 2003). Many studies have found deep acting to have a weak effect or be unrelated to emotional exhaustion (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003) Therefore, I hypothesize that

**Hypothesis 4: Surface acting will mediate the relationship between calling and emotional exhaustion.**

Both forms of emotional labor – deep acting and surface acting – are effortful and represent different intentions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Grandey, 2003). In deep acting, individuals modify their feelings in order to seem authentic. Deep acting, therefore, has also been called "faking in good faith" (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987: 32). A child care teacher, for example, may try to understand a child’s problem, by imagining the problem from the child’s perspective and being sensitive to the child’s needs. Individuals with a low calling are much less attached to their work and would not expend effort to engage in high levels of deep acting. They would most likely resort to surface acting, in which they can modify their affective displays without changing their inner feelings (Grandey, 2003). In surface acting, individuals usually experience emotional dissonance as a result of a discrepancy between their inner feelings and outer expressions. Individuals engage in surface acting in order to conform to the display rules. A child care teacher, for example, would respond to an angry and irritable child by keeping a straight face and
hide her own irritability. Surface acting, is therefore also known as "faking in bad faith" (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987: 32).

Hochschild proposed that "deep acting has always had an edge over simple pretending in its power to convince" (1983: 33). In deep acting, individuals make changes to their internal state and thereby have more authentic expressions. In contrast, in surface acting the individual only manages displaying inauthentic expressions (Grandey, 2003). Researchers find that deep acting is related to higher ratings of performance, while surface acting is negatively related to performance (Grandey, 2003). For example, in their study on customer service interactions, Groth et al. (2009) find a positive relationship between deep acting and key dimensions of service quality such as reliability, responsiveness and assurance. Individuals with a high calling perceive their work as more rewarding and are likely to engage in less surface acting and more deep acting. Therefore, I hypothesize that both forms of emotional labor – surface acting and deep acting – will mediate the relationship between calling and emotional performance.

*Hypothesis 5a: Surface acting will mediate the relationship between calling and emotional performance.*

*Hypothesis 5b: Deep acting will mediate the relationship between calling and emotional performance.*
3.4 METHOD

3.4.1 Participants and Procedures

Data for this study was collected from 42 child care centers in Pennsylvania. All the sites were selected from state-issued lists of licensed childcare centers. Teachers and aides working in classrooms with 3 and 4 year old children were administered a survey. The surveys were administered by the field researchers and collected back on the same day. Also, trained observers rated the teachers on their interaction with children using the Emotional Availability Scales (Biringen, Robinson, & Emde, 1998).

One hundred and thirty six teachers and 67 aides completed the survey instrument with an overall response rate of 91%. Surveys with missing values for some variables were excluded from the analysis and the final sample consisted of 195 teachers and aides from 42 different centers. Ninety-five percent of the participants were female. The average age of the sample was 38 years (s.d. = 13.8) and 81 per cent of the participants were White. All the participants had high school education or higher.

3.4.2 Measures

Calling. To measure calling, four items were adapted from the questionnaire developed by Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, and Schwartz (1997). This questionnaire comprises of 18 items that distinguish three different work orientations that individuals have – job, career, and
calling. Calling orientation describes those individuals who work for the meaningful fulfillment of doing so, and also have a desire that their work is socially valuable and significant (Wrzesniewski, et. al., 1997). The four items included were: “I would choose my current work life again if I had the opportunity”; “I enjoy talking about my work to others”; “My work is one of the most important things in my life”; and “My work is a chance to give back to the community” (Cronbach’s alpha = .72). Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with these four items using a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).

*Surface and deep acting.* Items measuring surface acting and deep acting came from the emotional labor scale developed by Brotheridge and Lee, 2003. The surface acting scale consisted of three items and the deep acting scale consisted of three items. Individuals responded to each item on a 5-point Likert scale assessing frequency (1 = never to 5 = always). A sample surface acting item was, “pretend to have emotions that I don’t really have,” and a sample deep acting item was, “Really try to feel the emotions I have to show as part of my job.” The internal consistency reliabilities for these scales were .71 for surface acting and .80 for deep acting.

*Emotional Exhaustion.* The emotional exhaustion scale was adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Five items were answered on the following frequency scale: (1 = "never," 6 = "everyday"). Examples are "How often do you feel emotionally drained from your work" and "How often do you feel that working with children all day is really a strain for you.” Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .87.
Emotional performance. Emotional performance was assessed using the Emotional Availability (EA) Scales developed by Biringen, Robinson, and Emde (1998). Emotional availability refers to an individual’s emotional responsiveness and ‘attunement’ to another’s needs and goals (Emde, 1980). The EA Scales describe and assess four dimensions addressing the emotional availability of the teacher in relation to the children—sensitivity, structuring, nonintrusiveness, and nonhostility. Teacher sensitivity refers to a teacher’s awareness of and responsiveness to the children, creativity during play, quality of conflict negotiations, and the affective quality of the teacher–children interactions. Teacher structuring refers to the ability of the teacher to structure or scaffold interaction in a way that engages the children in sustained interactions. Teacher nonintrusiveness refers to the teacher’s ability to be available without intrusions on the children’s autonomy. Teacher nonhostility refers to ways of talking to or behaving with the children that are not abrasive, impatient, or antagonistic (Easterbrooks & Biringen, 2000). Trained observers assessed teacher interaction with children in each classroom. For every teacher, 4 different teacher-child interactions were assessed to rate the teachers. The average scores of the four EA scales were computed for every teacher. The scores for every teacher ranged from one to six. Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .82.

Control Variables

Status. Job status was represented by the job classification of the respondent. Those who held the job of teacher received a score of one and those who held the job of assistant/aide received a

---

3 I ran the factor analysis using principal component analysis and found that the four EAS subscales (adult sensitivity, adult structuring, adult nonintrusiveness, and adult non hostility) supported a single factor. The EAS scale details are presented in Appendix B.
score of zero. Of the 195 in the final sample, 68% (132) were teachers and 32% (63) were assistants/aides.

Tenure. Tenure was assessed by the number of years the employees had been working in the child care center. The average tenure was 6.2 years.

3.5 RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for each of the variables in the study are presented in Table 3-1. Previous studies have found a low to moderate correlation between the subscales of surface acting and deep acting (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Grandey, 2003). In my study, I found a significant positive correlation between surface acting and deep acting, $r = .35, p < .01$. I found a significant positive correlation between calling and deep acting, $r = .17, p < .05$. I also found a significant negative correlation between calling and surface acting, $r = -.28, p < .01$.

---------------------------

Insert Table 3-1 about here

---------------------------

4 I also performed a median split and ran cross tabulation to examine the distribution of workers with high and low levels of deep acting and calling. I also examined the distribution of workers with high and low levels of surface acting and calling. The results are presented in Appendix C.
The sample consists of a hierarchical data structure with two levels of random variation: variation among teachers and aides within centers (level 1), and variation among centers (level 2). I estimated the random coefficient models using hierarchical linear modeling (Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, & Congdon, 2000). I employed a set of regression equations as suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) to test for mediation. First, I tested regression path coefficients for independent links between study variables. Table 3-3 presents these results. Next, I tested a regression equation to determine the link between calling and the dependent variables once surface acting (or deep acting) were entered into the equation. A full or partial mediation of surface acting (or deep acting) is established if the significance between calling and the dependent variable(s) is reduced or nulled. Table 3-2 presents these results. Finally, I ran the Sobel test to determine the significance of the mediated effect of surface acting and deep acting (Sobel 1982; Krull & Mackinnon, 1999). Table 3-4 presents these results.

---

Table 3-2 summarizes the results of HLM analyses testing Hypotheses 1 and 2. All the “a” models include the control variables and the independent variable (calling); and the “b” models add the mediators.

Hypothesis 1 states that calling will be negatively associated with emotional exhaustion. As can be seen in Models 1a and 1b, calling has a negative relationship with emotional
exhaustion \((p < .01)\), thereby supporting hypothesis 1. Models 2a and 2b show that calling has a positive relationship with emotional performance \((p < .01)\), thereby supporting hypothesis 2.

---

Insert Tables 3-3 & 3-4 about here

---

Table 3-3 summarizes the results of HLM analyses testing Hypotheses 3a and 3b. Hypothesis 3a asserts that calling will be negatively associated with surface acting. As can be seen in Model 3, calling has a negative relationship with surface acting \((p < .01)\). Hypothesis 3b states that calling will be positively associated with deep acting. Results show that calling had a positive relationship with deep acting (Model 4, \(p < .05\)). Thus, both Hypotheses 3a and 3b were fully supported.

To test for mediation effect in Hypotheses 4a, I entered calling, surface acting and deep acting into the regression analysis for emotional exhaustion. I also entered deep acting to see if it has any meditational effect. According to the steps suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986), mediation effect can be established if both calling and emotional exhaustion have a significant relation with surface acting and if the relation between calling and emotional exhaustion is significantly lower (partial mediation) or no longer significant (full mediation) when surface acting is entered into the equation. As seen in Model 3b (in Table 3-2), there was a partial mediation effect for surface acting, \(p < .01\) \((z = -3.03, p < .01)\), thereby supporting Hypothesis 4.
To test for mediation effects in Hypotheses 5a and 5b, I entered calling, surface acting and deep acting into the regression analysis for emotional performance. Results indicate that when surface acting (and deep acting) were entered into the equation, calling was less statistically significant, and there was a full mediation effect for both surface acting (p < .05) and deep acting (p < .05; see Model 5b, Table 3-2), thereby supporting both Hypotheses 5a and 5b. The Sobel test results confirm the significance of the mediated effects of surface acting (z = 2.19, p < .05) and deep acting (z = 2.50, p < .05).

3.6 DISCUSSION

It is only very recently that management researchers have started to examine the importance of having a calling in an occupational context. Dobrow (2004) argues that research has paid less attention to the individual, group, and contextual factors that mediate and moderate the process of creation and promotion of having a calling. This paper examines the role of emotional labor in mediating the relationship between calling and its outcomes. While researchers have considered how some cognitive factors affect the relationship between calling and its outcomes, there is a lack of understanding of the affective nature of these linkages. Individuals with a high calling are passionate about their work and are more likely to have greater emotional resources (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). In this paper I identify two forms of emotional labor – surface acting and deep acting – as mediators of calling and its outcomes, such as emotional exhaustion and emotional performance.
The main goal of this study is to examine whether emotional labor mediates the relationship between calling and its outcomes. In particular, the study examines three sets of relationships: Firstly, calling and its association with emotional exhaustion and emotional performance. Secondly, calling and its relationship with emotional labor in terms of surface acting and deep acting. Finally, the mediating role of emotional labor in the relationship between calling and its outcomes. Findings suggest that having a high calling is associated with lower emotional exhaustion. Further, a high calling is positively associated with emotional performance. In line with my expectations, calling is associated with emotional labor, and in particular is positively related to deep acting and negatively related to surface acting. Results also indicate that both surface acting and deep acting mediate the relationship between calling and its outcomes.

Previously researchers have found calling to be related to occupational identification, moral duty, work meaningfulness, occupational importance, willingness to sacrifice, and perceived organizational duty (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009); and more maturity in the career development process (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). My findings indicate that having a stronger calling was associated with lesser emotional exhaustion. This is consistent with the very few initial findings on calling and its outcomes. Further, my study results also find evidence for a positive association between calling and emotional performance. While previous researchers have examined the affective outcomes of having a calling, this study contributes significantly to the current literature on calling by establishing the link between calling and emotional performance. Thus, workers with a high calling not only have positive work attitudes, but also
expend increased efforts towards their work, resulting in greater emotional performance. This is consistent with previous literature on calling which suggests that individuals with a high calling treat their work as a “duty towards society” and are more willing to make sacrifices, thereby ensuring high performance (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009).

The constructs of surface and deep acting represent different motives. When engaging in deep acting, an actor attempts to modify feelings to match the required displays. The intent, then, is to seem authentic to the audience; thus, deep acting has been called “faking in good faith” (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987: 32). In surface acting, employees modify their displays without shaping inner feelings. Doing this entails experiencing emotional dissonance, or the tension felt when expressions and feelings diverge (Hochschild, 1983). Individuals with a high calling perceive their work as intrinsically meaningful (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997). These individuals would be more likely to expend increased effort in actively inducing and shaping their emotions, thereby engaging in more deep acting. In deep acting, individuals would make an effort to alter their inner feelings to match their emotional displays. In surface acting, feelings are changed from the “outside in,” whereas feelings are changed from the “inside out” in deep acting (Hochschild, 1983). The study results show that individuals’ with a strong calling are likely to engage in more deep acting and less surface acting. Extant research on emotional labor suggests that deep acting is positively linked to performance (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987; Grandey, 2000), and surface acting is negatively related to job satisfaction (Abraham, 1998; Morris & Feldman, 1997). Similarly, calling literature proposes that individuals with a high sense of calling are likely to perceive their work as meaningful (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997), and enjoy higher levels of job satisfaction (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin & Schwartz, 1997). However, previous studies have ignored
the link between calling and emotional labor in terms of deep acting and surface acting. In my study, I found that individuals with a high calling engage in more deep acting and less surface acting. I contend that individuals with a high calling are more emotionally sensitive and emotionally involved in their work, and therefore engage in more deep acting. Conversely, I argue that individuals with a low calling engage in more surface acting, as they have less emotional resources to access and manage their emotions.

My study seeks to articulate the link between work as calling and emotional labor through the mediating role of surface acting and deep acting. The results show that surface acting mediated the relationship between calling and emotional exhaustion. In surface acting, there is a gap between the worker’s inner emotions and the expressed emotions, thereby, resulting in greater emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003).

I also found support for both surface acting and deep acting as fully mediating the relationship between calling and emotional performance. This finding suggests that individuals with a high calling will engage in less surface acting, which in turn, promotes higher ratings of emotional performance, that is, being sensitive and attuned to other’s needs and goals. In surface acting the individual only manages to display inauthentic expressions (Grandey, 2003). Therefore, displaying less inauthentic expressions leads to high emotional performance. As Hochschild proposed, "deep acting has always had an edge over simple pretending in its power to convince" (1983: 33). In deep acting, individuals make changes to their internal state and thereby have more authentic expressions. Researchers find that deep acting is related to higher ratings of performance (Grandey, 2003). Thus, my study findings contribute to the literature on
calling by finding evidence that individuals with a high calling engage in greater deep acting which in turn leads to higher emotional performance.

Very few studies have made an attempt to examine why having a high work calling translates to positive outcomes, such as emotional performance (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Dobrow, 2006). My study contributes to the calling literature by highlighting the importance of emotional labor. My findings suggest that surface acting plays an important role in influencing the relationship between calling and emotional exhaustion. On the other hand, deep acting, which consists of the authentic display of emotions, impacts the relationship between calling and emotional performance.
Figure 3-1. Research Model
### Table 3-1. Descriptive Statistics, ICC and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (n=268)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>ICC(1)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status (Aide=0; Teacher=1)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (years)</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Performance</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01

### Table 3-2. Results of HLM Analyses for the Outcomes of Calling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Emotional Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1a</td>
<td>Model 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.37**</td>
<td>2.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (Teacher=0; Aide=1)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (years)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep acting</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance Statistic</td>
<td>558.46</td>
<td>525.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of estimated parameters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square test</td>
<td>33.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01
### Table 3-3. Results of Regression Analyses for Surface Acting and Deep Acting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Surface Acting</th>
<th>Deep Acting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.53**</td>
<td>3.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (Aide=0; Teacher=1)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (years)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance Statistic</td>
<td>403.16</td>
<td>500.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of estimated parameters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01

### Table 3-4. Results of Tests of Indirect Effects and Total Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calling --&gt; Surface Acting --&gt; Emotional</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-3.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling --&gt; Surface Acting --&gt; Emotional</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling --&gt; Deep Acting --&gt; Emotional</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01
In the two essays of my dissertation I examined the influences of context and emotions on calling at work. Previous studies have found that having a high work calling is associated with job satisfaction (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997), work meaningfulness, and willingness to sacrifice (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). In my dissertation, I found that having a high calling results in positive work attitudes, lower emotional exhaustion, and increased performance. The positive effects of having a high calling can be intensified or diminished by the context in which it is experienced. In Essay 1, I found support for the moderating role of both task and social context factors in the relationship between calling and its outcomes.

In Essay 2, I examine the affective link between calling and two forms of emotional labor, surface acting and deep acting, and further examined how this emotional link influences emotional exhaustion and emotional performance. Individuals in relational work constantly regulate their emotions in interpersonal interactions (Hochschild, 1983; Sutton, 1991; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002). Essay 2 results confirmed the affective linkages between calling and its outcomes.

In the section below, I discuss the contributions of my dissertation research. Next, I discuss the limitations and future research directions. Finally, I present practical implications of my dissertation.
4.1 CONTRIBUTIONS

My dissertation makes several important contributions to the extant literature on work as calling. Firstly, it extends the previous literature on calling by focusing on the outcomes of having a high work calling. In Essay 1, I find that workers with a high work calling have positive work attitudes, in terms of greater job satisfaction, lower intent to turnover, and greater organizational commitment. Further, a high calling is associated with less emotional exhaustion and greater contextual performance. In Essay 1, I do not find support for a positive association between calling and task performance. However, I find evidence for this association in Essay 2 results. As noted previously, in Essay 1, the task performance variable was measured at the classroom level and not at the teacher level. However, in Essay 2, the performance variable was assessed by independent observers for every teacher. While previous researchers have examined the affective consequences of calling such as job satisfaction (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997) and greater willingness to sacrifice (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009), this study contributes greatly to this literature by finding evidence that workers with a high calling exhibit greater emotional performance.

The second contribution of my dissertation is to identify the conditions under which workers with a high calling thrive. In Essay 1, I examine the effects task and social context features have on the relationship between calling and its outcomes. I find that under conditions of high work discretion, workers with a stronger calling have lower emotional exhaustion and greater levels of contextual and task performance. Further, I find that in centers with greater task interdependence and participative decision making practices, workers with a stronger calling have higher
organizational commitment. Also, I find that workers with a stronger calling exhibit higher levels of task performance in centers with more participative decision making practices.

A third contribution of my dissertation is to integrate the constructs of calling and emotional labor to better understand the causal mechanisms of why calling leads to positive outcomes. In Essay 2, I explore the affective side of calling by examining the role of emotional labor in mediating the positive relationship between calling and its outcomes. Emotional labor is “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display” (Hochschild, 1983). Emotions can be managed through two basic methods: surface acting and deep acting. In surface acting there is incongruence between experienced and expressed emotion (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993), while in deep acting workers actively induce, suppress, and shape their emotions. As expected, I find that workers with a stronger calling engage in more deep acting and less surface acting. Further, my findings suggest that surface acting plays an important role in influencing the relationship between calling and outcomes such as emotional exhaustion and emotional performance. Thus, the negative effects of surface acting are more pronounced in impacting emotional exhaustion. On the other hand, I find that deep acting mediates the relationship between calling and emotional performance. This implies that deep acting or the display of more authentic expressions play an important role in influencing worker’s performance.
4.2 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

There are a few limitations of my dissertation. Firstly, in both Essays 1 and 2, many of the study variables were assessed using a single source and the study results might be influenced by common method bias. Further, in Essay 1, task performance was measured at the classroom level and not at the teacher level, thereby, causing difficulties in assessing the relationship between calling and task performance. However, in Essay 2, task performance was assessed at the individual (teacher) level by trained independent observers, using a measure widely used in the field of education.

In Essay 1, I examined the moderating effects of four context factors: work discretion, organization type, task interdependence, and participative decision making. However, a limitation of the analyses was that only two of these factors were measured at the organizational level. The context factors of work discretion and task interdependence were assessed at the individual level of analysis. Also, in Essay 1, work attitudes was assessed using three different measures (job satisfaction, intent to turnover, and organizational commitment). Though I ran the three measures separately for my analysis, a limitation was that these measures were highly inter-correlated.

Another limitation of the study is the generalizability of the findings. My dissertation sample consists of childcare providers, specifically, preschool teachers and teacher aides. Contributing towards the process of nurturing children into fine individuals is the most
rewarding and fulfilling aspect of a preschool teachers work. Being able to work with young individuals as well as having an opportunity to give back to the community are some of the underlying motives why people pursue a teaching career (Chandler et al., 1971; Joseph & Green, 1986; Serow, Eaker, & Ciechalski, 1992; Freidus, 1992; Brown, 1992; Toppin & Levine, 1992). Future researchers should consider testing the mediating and moderating factors between calling and its outcomes across other professions, and extending the findings beyond the child care setting.

Also, in my dissertation, I examine the moderating role of four context factors: work discretion, organization type, task interdependence, and participative decision making practices. Future studies should consider examining the moderating role of other context factors, such as organizational structure and broader omnibus context features, such as different occupational groups. Also, a limitation of my dissertation sample is that it is that the majority consists of females (98%) and thereby restricts further analysis of the effects of gender distribution in the workplace. This distribution is, however, representative of the actual demographic distribution in the field of child care education. Thus, it will be useful for future research to examine the effects of calling based on gender differences in other occupations where the gender distribution is evenly balanced.

In Essay 2, I find that while surface acting mediates the relationship between calling and work attitudes, deep acting mediates the relationship between calling and performance. It will be interesting to replicate some of these findings in an experimental setting, by manipulating contextual features and then observing the effects on performance.
4.3 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

My findings have two important practical implications. First, having a calling at the workplace is highly beneficial to both the individual and the organization. My research shows that individuals who have a strong work calling are more satisfied in their jobs, have less emotional exhaustion and exhibit higher levels of performance. This has implications for both the individual and the organization. Individuals should engage in work that they find meaningful – work which they can pursue as their calling. Organizations, on the other hand, will benefit by hiring individuals who have a strong work calling. As my findings show, such individuals have positive work attitudes and engage in higher levels of performance.

Second, my research shows that features of organizational context can greatly impact an individual’s ability to pursue their calling. Findings indicate that individuals with a high calling thrive in organizations that have more participative decision making practices and which offer high work discretion to these individuals. The field of child care education, featured in my dissertation is characterized by a high rate of turnover. Thus, organizations will benefit greatly by creating conditions that enable the conditions for individuals to pursue their calling. This seamless integration of individual goals and organizational goals will greatly benefit the organizations.
APPENDIX A

Factor Analysis

The construct of work attitudes was assessed by using 3 different measures: job satisfaction, intent to turnover, and organizational commitment. I ran a principal component analysis to assess whether these three measures were empirically similar. Using the principal component analysis, I estimated the factor loadings. The results are shown in Table 6. The number of factors was determined by examining the scree plot. Previous researchers have suggested factor loadings cut-off near .40 (Gorsuch, 1983). As seen in Table 6, the items for the three measures seem to be loaded on one factor.

Table 2-8. Factor Analysis Results for Work Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Principal Component Analysis (Factor loadings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn't want to work in any other center than the one I do now.</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this center to parents seeking a place for their child.</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually look forward to each working day at this center.</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel loyal to this center.</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that I will actively look for a new job in early childhood</td>
<td>-.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education in the coming year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that I will actively look for a new job in another field in</td>
<td>-.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the coming year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting my job.</td>
<td>-.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would take very little change in my present work circumstances to</td>
<td>-.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause me to leave this center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this center beyond</td>
<td>-.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the coming year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover Intention</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach your center takes in working with the children.</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of work you are expected to do.</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your pay compared to workers at a similar level in the field.</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical space available in the center.</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefits you get at this center.</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

THE EMOTIONAL AVAILABILITY SCALE

The EA Scales assess four dimensions addressing the emotional availability of the teacher in relation to the children—sensitivity, structuring, nonintrusiveness, and nonhostility. Here is a description of the scale dimensions.

DIMENSION 1: ADULT SENSITIVITY
The sensitivity scale rates adults on a scale of 9 (highly sensitive) to 1 (highly insensitive), according to the following criteria:

9. HIGHLY SENSITIVE Emotional communication between adult and infant is for the most part positive, appropriate, and creative. The highly sensitive adult displays much genuine, authentic, and congruent interest, pleasure, and amusement with the infant (as opposed to performing these behaviors), as demonstrated by warm smiles and giggles, interested eye contact, and comforting and playful physical contact.

7 GENERALLY SENSITIVE This adult is very similar to a ‘9’, except that there is a less spectacular quality to these adult–child exchanges. This rating refers to a ‘good enough’ adult.

5 INCONSISTENTLY SENSITIVE The adult is sensitive in some ways but the observer finds it difficult to give this relationship a clean bill of health. Parental inconsistency in behavior may be one telltale sign (including signs of inconsistency discussed at the end of the section on sensitivity).

3 SOMEWHAT INSENSITIVE Insensitivity is typically displayed in one of two general ways, one being an active/harsh style (overly active and overbearing) and the other being a passive/depressed/affectively flat (noninteractive and silent) style. Still, there are positives here.

1 HIGHLY INSENSITIVE This adult displays few areas of strength in interaction with his/her child.

DIMENSION 2: ADULT STRUCTURING
The scores for adult structuring range from ‘5’ (optimal structuring) to 1 (nonoptimal structuring), as described next.

5 OPTIMAL STRUCTURING The adult shows an appropriate degree of structuring. The adult’s bids are successful in structuring interaction. He or she lets the child lead while providing a supportive frame, that is, the adult offers the child the chance to explore and do things while providing a frame on which the child can build. In the context of limit-setting and discipline, the adult is firm (not harsh) and includes preventive measures whenever possible.

3 INCONSISTENT STRUCTURING There is overall inconsistency in the adult’s ability to structure and/or set limits. The adult may also show unvarying or repetitive attempts to structure that are not successful.

1 NON-OPTIMAL STRUCTURING The adult sets no limits and provides no structure for the child.

DIMENSION 3: ADULT NONINTRUSIVENESS
Adult nonintrusiveness is rated from 5 (nonintrusive) to 1 (intrusive), as described next.
5 NON-INTRUSIVE The adult does not overpower the interactions. He or she lets the child lead and bases play interactions on the child’s lead. The interaction is nonintrusive, smooth, and ‘spacious.’ The adult is available to the child without being intrusive and has a quality of emotionally ‘being there’ or emotionally available without necessarily doing something to the child.

3 SOMEWHAT INTRUSIVE The adult too frequently sets the pace of the interaction, asking questions, directing the course of play, making suggestions, and creating frequent theme changes, as opposed to following the child’s direction. Parental intrusiveness is not striking, however. Such behavior appears more directive and/or slightly overprotective rather than truly intrusive. The quality of being ‘at’ the child or doing something to the child is there as well, even if the child is unresponsive to the adult’s behaviors. Parental interventions may also have a matter-of-fact quality, introduced when the adult is ready.

1 INTRUSIVE The adult is highly over-stimulating and does not leave enough space in the interaction for the child to explore and lead. The adult controls the interaction, sometimes even physically, punishing or manhandling, and jumps in to do too much for the child, showing a lack of respect and space for not only the child’s wishes but also abilities. This adult is constantly ‘at’ the child or doing something to the child. This adult appears to want to ‘elicit’ certain behaviors from the child.

DIMENSION 4: ADULT NONHOSTILITY
The adult nonhostility scale assesses the degree of hostility, ranging from no observed hostility (‘5’) to covert (‘3’) to overt (‘1’) forms.

5 NONHOSTILE There are no expressions of overt or covert hostility toward the child, as can be discerned by the observer. The general emotional climate appears nonhostile. Slight covert hostility would get a rating of ‘4’.

3 COVERTLY HOSTILE Although signs of hostility are covert, the adult shows pervasive low-level negative affect, in the form of impatience, discontent, resentment, discomfort, boredom, ‘huffing and puffing’, rolling the eyes, teasing, raising the voice, or adopting a long-suffering attitude.

1 MARKEDLY AND OVERTLY HOSTILE This adult is overtly harsh, abrasive, and demeaning – facially and/or vocally. Parental behavior is threatening and/or frightening. Threats of separation or threats of abuse (‘You will get the board of education if you don’t stop that’) may be viewed as very hostile even if the adult is joking about it.
APPENDIX C

I performed a median split and ran cross tabulation to examine the distribution of workers with high and low levels of Deep Acting and Calling. I also examined the distribution of workers with high and low levels of Surface Acting and Calling.

Table 3-5. Deep Acting X Calling Cross Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deep Acting</th>
<th>Calling</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>% within Deep Acting</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>% within Deep Acting</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% within Deep Acting</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-2. Bar Chart: Calling X Deep Acting
Table 3-6. Surface Acting X Calling Cross Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Acting</th>
<th>Calling</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low % within Surface Acting</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High % within Surface Acting</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% within Surface Acting</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-3. Bar Chart: Calling X Surface Acting
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